

MEN OF GALL.

How the Joneses and Belau Did Their Dirty Work.

Further Testimony in the Bruner Investigation—Stillwell Relates His Novel Experiences.

The committee of investigation into the charges of the San Francisco Examiner against Assemblyman Elwood Bruner assembled in Supreme Court Room No. 1 yesterday morning at 9 o'clock, Chairman Bledsoe presiding.

Grove L. Johnson asked the committee to reconsider their action, excluding attorneys from participation in the proceedings.

Chairman Bledsoe explained that in his view attorneys should be permitted. He asked for a motion to that effect, but none was heard.

Mr. Bledsoe recalled A. N. Lawrence to inquire if he was the Sacramento correspondent of the Examiner at the time the police bill was introduced.

"Yes," was responded.

"What was the position of the Examiner? Did it criticize Mr. Bruner's action in introducing the bill?"

"To the best of my recollection, the Examiner editorially approved of the bill, and did not criticize Mr. Bruner."

James Conisky was called, but was not present.

Timothy O'Meara was sworn; gave his residence as San Francisco, his occupation car-driver on Mission-street line.

In reply to questions from the Chairman and members of the committee, the following testimony was elicited:

"I first heard of the place on the police force about two weeks ago from Comisky. Comisky keeps a saloon at a little way off Comisky says to Jones: 'Here's the man that will just suit you.' Jones says, 'Have you got \$300?'

"I thought I could not get it, but he offered to get one for a friend and failed. I went toward the car and Comisky says to me in a low tone, 'I've seen a telegram from Sacramento, and it's all right.' Jones got on the car and rode down with me, an offer to get the place for me and for Comisky, too. I said Comisky was not eligible. Says Jones: 'It don't make a bit of difference; they'll be the same.'"

To the question, "Was Mr. Bruner's name mentioned as the man in Sacramento?" the witness replied: "I don't remember that name being mentioned, but I got the idea that Jones' friend was a member of the Legislature. I don't remember hearing Mr. Bruner's name till the Examiner folks spoke about it."

"Jones urged me to take the position; said I could not get it of Crimmins for less than \$700. Just before I was asked of him I told him I'd consider it, and he gave me his number. I did not intend to try for it, as I had heard my friends on the force say they were tired of it."

To a question, "Have you ever talked with Jones since about it?" the reply was "No."

"Have you talked with Comisky?" "Yes, pretty much every day. I joked with him and told him he'd be Police Commissioner. He said, 'I don't want to do that, and he said he was doing too well. When I said \$400 was too much, he said Moran and I were alike, he thought so too.'"

Questions from several members failed to connect the name of Bruner with the proposal of Jones. He persisted that he had heard of it first from the Examiner people.

To a question—"I never saw any telegram or letter, I never tried to, but Comisky said I was not fooling, he had seen the telegram."

"Have you ever talked with Mr. Stillwell about this?" "No."

To questions as to whether he knew Henderson, Lawrence and Jasper, witness answered no.

Dick Belau sworn. Gave his residence as San Francisco; his occupation clerk; had been discharged three or four months; had been in Sacramento off and on for two months, and then came to the committee to see how his story was as follows:

"Two weeks ago to-day I met Mr. Bruner in San Francisco and asked him if he would give me a letter to the Police Commissioners which would give a friend of mine a position on the police force. He said: 'I don't know as I have any influence; I don't know them. I haven't time to write it now. I'll see you in Sacramento when I am going up. Will you be up again?'

"This was at the Grand Hotel. I said I would come, and was here a week ago to-day. When I saw Mr. Bruner, I asked him if he had decided to do that favor. He said not yet, that an Examiner reporter had approached him to know if he had authorized anybody to see places on the police force. He asked me if I had authorized anybody to say so. I said no. He said: 'I'm not ready to consider your matter yet.'"

"On Tuesday evening I met Jones at the depot. He introduced his friend, Mr. Stillwell, as the one he wanted the letter for. We took the cars and came to the Capitol, where we met Bruner in the hallway. I asked him if he was ready to consider that proposition. He said: 'My friend is here, and there's \$400 in it. I want my fee of \$150 from you.' He said: 'All right, go in the library five minutes.' Stillwell and myself were in the library and Jones outside. Bruner said to Stillwell: 'Are you the man that wanted the position?' Stillwell said that he wanted it for his brother-in-law, Thomas Stoley. I asked again if Bruner would write the letter and repeated that there was \$400 in it, \$150 for me. Bruner asked what kind of a letter, and while writing it I asked Stillwell aside if he had the money, and when he said he had a certificate of deposit I told him to endorse it, which he did. Bruner asked if that letter would do. Stillwell said yes, and put it in his pocket. Bruner handed me \$70 and I waited outside till he gave me the rest—\$330, went down to the Capital Hotel and handed Jones \$50, telling him he might need it."

In answer to questions, Belau said that he had known Daniel Jones six years, that he had received a letter from Jones within two weeks asking him if he could get a letter to the Commissioners to get a friend of his on the police force. He had written him he would do what he could, and had afterward telegraphed him to come up with the \$400. He supposed Jones thought he would have influence in the Legislature because he had been active in the Republican campaign. Bruner's name was mentioned in letters or telegrams. Had no understanding with Jones how much he (Belau) was to get.

Have not you and the Joneses been more or less together all the session? (With hesitation) "Yes."

"Did you suppose the letter for which you paid \$700 would get the position?" "I didn't suppose anything about it."

"Did you go to Assemblyman Hayes or Coffey with a similar proposition?" "No."

Evening Session.

The committee resumed the investigation at 7 o'clock in the evening, the first witness called being Richard Belau. In reply to a question by Mr. Gould, he said the time the subject of police appointments was broached to him was some eleven days ago, when he received a letter from Louis Jones. The latter did not ask witness to see any particular person, but asked him if he could use his influence to get a friend on the police force. Witness told Jones he must wait until he could see Mr. Bruner. He could not say why he did not go to some other member.

He first spoke to Mr. Bruner about it, and not the latter to him. He could not remember just what passed between them, but he said that at their meeting, except that Jones asked him to do what he could for a friend of his. Nothing was then said about compensation for his services.

The letter he got from Jones was replied to by him. Shortly afterward witness met Mr. Bruner at the Grand Hotel, and asked him if he would give him a letter of recommendation to the Police Commissioners in favor of a friend for a place on the force. He said he was very busy then, but would see him in Sacramento about it. No reference by either was made to any consideration for such a favor. He said that he had seen a couple of days afterward and had seen him. He did not speak to Mr. Bruner again about the matter until he had seen him at the Grand Hotel. He was then introduced to Mr. Bruner a week ago and asked him if he had considered his favor. Mr. Bruner replied that he had not, as he had been approached by another member of the Legislature, and informed that his name was being used by some person in connection with reported sales of places in San Francisco.

Soon afterward he met Bruner and told him that his friend was here. Reminded him that he had written a letter to Jones, but that he had not seen him since. He was then introduced to Mr. Bruner a week ago and asked him if he had considered his favor. Mr. Bruner replied that he had not, as he had been approached by another member of the Legislature, and informed that his name was being used by some person in connection with reported sales of places in San Francisco.

When the committee was again called to order by Mr. Palmer, the Business Manager of the Examiner, he testified upon the stand and testified to having provided reporter Stillwell with the \$300 on the order of the managing editor.

W. E. Gerber, Assistant Cashier of the California State Bank in this city, being called, produced the certificate of deposit given to Stillwell by Belau, and by the latter to Bruner. The first was presented at the California State Bank by a Mr. Longshore and paid, on Wednesday last, and on the following day the bank received notice from the Crocker-Woolworth Bank, from which it was issued.

Mr. Gerber said the certificate was first sent back from the bank to Deputy State Librarian Leake for his endorsement before he would cash it. Mr. Stillwell had been given the certificate in order to have it photographed. Mr. Bruner had not spoken to witness about the check.

DOESN'T KNOW STOLEY.

Mr. W. E. Hall, Clerk of the San Francisco Police Commissioners, testified that he knew the name of Stoley, and then he was excused.

REPORTER STILLWELL'S STORY.

C. J. Stillwell of the Examiner was next called. He said that on Saturday a week ago he was given a certificate of deposit by the name of Stoley, and then he was excused.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

Mr. Stillwell said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place. He said that he had been approached by a man who offered him a position on the police force, and was instructed to go to the Police Commissioners and ask for a place.

He made his statement in the Assembly. The Lieutenant-Governor testified. Lieutenant-Governor Redick was the next witness. He said that Daniel Jones, whom he had known for some time, came to him a week ago and asked for a letter recommending his brother for a place on the San Francisco Police force.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

W. J. Cox of San Francisco was the next witness. He testified that on the 24th or 25th of February Louis Jones got on his car and asked witness if he knew the police force. He said he did not know it, but he would give him a letter if it was the Maler bill, and Jones replied that Maler wasn't in it, that Bruner was the man who had pushed the bill through the Legislature.

Mr. Redick then denied the statement published in an alleged interview with Daniel Jones, in the Examiner, that he had secured the place for Bruner and Jones, and as a matter of fact, Jones had held no such position.

Mr. Redick was then excused.

witness not to breathe a word about what had happened, and he made the parties swear to do so. He then asked Jones, countering Jones, the latter asked if it was all right, and witness replied yes.

Chairman Bledsoe and other members of the committee then proceeded to business on some points of his testimony, but nothing of interest was elicited. He explained that his reason for not using his name in drawing the certificate of deposit was that his mission might not be exposed. He further said that nobody but the Jones brothers and Belau had introduced the matter. Bruner had anything to do with the police appointments. He did not know the character of these men at that time.

In response to other questions witness went over much of the same ground in relating the details of his interviews with the Jones brothers in San Francisco.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. Alexander was recalled and asked if he had said to Dr. Simmons that he was surprised that Mr. Bruner was caught, as he had been warned in advance. He replied that he had made a statement to that effect.

Royal Baking Powder. Highest of all in Leavening Power.—U. S. Gov't Report, Aug. 17, 1889.



HOLLAND AND LUXEMBURG. The Kingdom of Holland was established in 1813—The First King.

After a illness extending over several years, William III., King of the Netherlands, died on November 24, at the age of 73 years. In point of duration of reign he ranks as the longest sovereign of Europe, having succeeded his father forty-one years ago.

The Kingdom of Holland—or, as it is more properly called, the Kingdom of the Netherlands—was established in 1813, the country having previously been a republic under the hereditary rule of the Princes of the House of Orange. Its religion was at the same time annexed to it, but was separated from it again, and became an independent Kingdom in 1830.

The first king was William I., the grandfather of the sovereign who has just died. It may be added that the late king, William III., was the grandson of the Emperor Paul, and nephew of the Emperor Nicholas of Russia.

William III., on the whole, as a liberal and enlightened monarch, was a liberal and enlightened monarch, who was a liberal and enlightened monarch, who was a liberal and enlightened monarch.

He was twice married; first to a princess of the royal family of Wurtemberg, who bore him two sons, both of whom died in infancy, and a daughter, who was his second wife. His second marriage was with the Princess Emma, a daughter of the Prince of Waldeck, whom King William led to the altar in 1841, when he was thirty years younger than her late husband, being only fifty-two years of age.

The only issue of his second union was a daughter, who became an heiress to the crown of the Netherlands, and has just been proclaimed Queen of the Netherlands, though she is only 10 years of age. Until she reaches the legal age of eighteen, the crown will be governed by her mother, Queen Emma, as regent.

Trappily, Queen Emma, though a foreigner, has succeeded in winning the affections and loyalty of the Dutch, and she has therefore a prospect before her of a peaceful rule.

Luxemburg is now to be separated from Holland, and to become an independent Duchy. The reason of this is that, while a woman may occupy the throne of Holland, the ancient law of Holland forbids a woman to become a ruler. The Duchy, therefore, passes to the next heir, who is the Grand Duke Adolphus, the deposed sovereign of Nassau, who, indeed, has already assumed the government of Luxemburg.

It has been suspected by many that Germany has for some time looked toward Holland with covetous eyes. The annexation of that thirty little kingdom to the empire would, no doubt, be of signal advantage to the latter. Its broad seas, its many good harbors, its industries and orderly character of its people would be of material benefit to the large State.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the object desired by the Germans; for its possession would add greatly to their military strength, in either defending themselves from an attack, or attacking the Grand Duke Adolphus, though expelled by the German Emperor from Nassau, is on friendly terms with the Emperor, and is not likely to be a favorable opportunity, be bribed into delivering Luxemburg into German hands.

At all events, the change in the sovereignty of Holland and the Grand Duchy is an interesting one, and is not unlikely to give rise to important consequences in Europe.

RIO GRANDE TRAIN ROBBERY. The Instigator of the Plot Proves to be a Rich Rancher and Merchant.

Brownsville (Tex.), March 9.—The whole parties of a plot which resulted in the robbery of a train on the Rio Grande road January 29th, and the loss of \$25,000, have been brought to light. The instigator, Juan Benites, a rich rancher and merchant at El Sauz ranch, is in jail here, and has confessed. The Chief of Police ran down the ranch blacksmith and carpenter who made the crosslock which was used to open the train, and through their confession secured Benites and several other members of the gang.

The leader of the party is a well-known smuggler named Simon Garcia. The night after the robbery he stole three horses and left for Mexico. He is being pursued by the Mexican cavalry. A portion of the stolen money was recovered, and all the robbers will probably be captured. They are all ranchers living in this country. One of the gang got \$4,000, while the rest only got \$1,800 each. There was a disagreement, and one of the bandits, named Angel Cortines, was shot and killed by the leader.

RIOTOUS STRIKERS. They Attack and Injure a Cloak Manufacturer and His Family.

New York, March 9.—Twenty-five or thirty Polish Hebrews went to Jamaica, Long Island, early this morning to wreak vengeance upon Herman Greenbaum, proprietor of the cloak manufactory, who was employing non-union people. They smashed in the doors and proceeded to destroy the stock. The proprietor and his wife were kicked and beaten, and a child was thrown on the manufacturer's four-year-old son, burning him in a terrible manner. Frank Ring, the man said to have thrown the vitriol, was captured at New York this afternoon. The child cannot survive his injuries. Greenbaum and his wife are also both in doctors' hands.

A Washington Hotel Burned.

Lewaco (Wash.), March 9.—A fire started yesterday afternoon in Stout's Hotel, at Sea View, and the hotel and contents were burned to ashes. The flames, fanned by a strong wind, spread rapidly, and all efforts to save the contents were useless. The total loss was about \$10,000; insurance, about \$4,500. The fire is supposed to have originated from a defective flue.

THE POINT. From a Catholic Archbishop down to the poorest of the poor.

ST. JACOBS OIL. The Great Remedy For Pain.