ADVERSE TO BRUNER.

A Majority of the Committee Will Report Against Him.

The Testimony Reviewed at Length and Closely Analyzed—The "Examiner" Roundly Scored for Its Charges Against the Committee.

Following is the report prepared by the majority of the committee appointed by the Assembly to investigate the charges against Assemblyman Bruner. It was presented to the Assembly yesterday afternoon by Chairman Bledsoe, but the Assembly refused to receive it until to-day, when it was announced the minority report would be presented. This remarkable proceeding put Mr. Bledsoe in an embarrassing position. He had, in accordance with a well-established custom, allowed the reporters of the morning papers to make copies of the report, on the understanding that they would not use it until it was presented.

Mr. Bledsoe did present the report, and the reporters were thereby absolved from any further obligations in the matter. That the Assembly would refuse to receive it could not have been foreseen, and the findings of the committee had been telegraphed throughout the State before the Assembly refused to receive the report. Each of the San Francisco evening papers contained a synopsis of the report, with the findings of the committee, and the matter having thus been made public, we herewith present the report in full:

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, March 20, 1891.

Mr. Speaker: The Assembly Committee on Investigation, appointed by you on the 6th day of March, 1891, to investigate certain charges of official corruption made against Assemblyman Elwood Bruner by the San Francisco *Examiner*, has completed its labors, and herewith presents its report:

The committee realizes the very great importance of the duty which has devolved upon it.

The committee commenced its investigation on the evening of the 7th day of March, and was in session on the six succeeding nights, besides holding several day sessions. A large number of witnesses were examined, and each member of the committee listened to the testimony with close and careful attention. We are aware of the fact, however, that the San Francisco *Examiner* severely criticised the committee and persistently condemned its actions, and we desire to assert as our unqualified opinion, that the course pursued towards this committee by the *Examiner* cannot be commended by any fair and honest man. In the very beginning of the investigation the *Examiner* accused this committee of an intention to whitewash Elwood Bruner, and day after day it abused and villified the members of the committee without reason and without excuse. It was apparent that the purpose of the *Examiner* was to bully and intimidate the committee into giving a verdict against Mr. Bruner. But we wish to say that the purpose was not accomplished with us. The conclusions to which we have come in this case are the result of careful deliberation, close scrutiny of the testimony, and a purpose to do our whole duty to the best of our ability, without favor and without fear. The accusation against Mr. Bruner was made by the *Examiner* on the 5th day of March, 1891, and was substantially as follows:

That Assemblyman Elwood Bruner of Sacramento introduced and was influenal in passing a bill to increase the police ti rce of San Francisco; that in return for fo s efforts he was promised six positions h— the San Francisco police force; that he on empted to sell these positions for $400 attch, through brokers named Belau, eaaniel Jones and Louis Jones; that a re-Dorter for the San Francisco *Examiner*, pomed Stillwell, heard of the traffic, met nae brokers, and was taken to Bruner; thet Bruner sold to the said reporter a thaition on the police force of San Franpos o for the sum of $400, receiving in cisc ment for the same a certificate of depayit on a San Francisco bank; that the posorter represented to Bruner and the repkers that the position was purchased bro Thomas Stoley, who was in fact a for thical person, and that Bruner gave my reporter a letter of recommendation thethe Police Commissioners of San Franto c o, indorsing the said Stoley and recise sting his appointment to the said qu lice force. To the above accusation poruner made defense, substantially as Bollows:

f That he did introduce and was instrumental in passing a bill giving cities of over fifteen thousand inhabitants the right to increase their police force upon a certain ratio; that the only object he had in introducing the bill was that it would allow the Sacramento police force to be increased constitutionally; that no positions on the San Francisco police force were promised him as a reward for his services in passing the bill; that he never was offered any inducement of any kind by any man in reference to said police force bill; that he believed that there was a conspiracy on foot, headed by one Andy Lawrence, against himself and against the Republican party, to bring into ill-repute the actions of the California Assembly; that in pursuance of this belief he conceived a plan, and successfully carried it out, to entrap the conspirators and bring them to open shame; that in pursuance of this plan he did give a letter of recommendation, asking for a position on the police for one Stoley, and received therefor a certificate of deposit for *four hundred dollars;* that he was acting in good faith upon the knowledge that Andy Lawrence was a blackmailer, and was attempting to blackmail him upon the floor of the Assembly; and that his only object was to entrap those who were trying to entrap him.

In order to arrive at the truth we have endeavored to find an answer to the satisfaction of reason and of conscience for such questions as appeared to be material to a just determination of the inquiry. The questions are:

First—Did any guilty conspiracy exist between Elwood Bruner and the Police Commissioners of San Francisco?

Second—Did he have six or any less number of positions on the police force of San Francisco at his disposal?

Third—Was he offering such positions for sale through the medium of brokers or otherwise?

Fourth—Did he give the recommendation of Stoley and receive the $400 therefor as part of a plan to entrap and expose bad men, or did he do it with the intention of selling a position on the police force of San Francisco?

We shall endeavor to answer these material questions in the order above given, basing our opinions on the testimony, and giving our reasons for the conclusions arrived at. Before doing so, however, we wish to say that many considerations of mercy have strongly pleaded for an answer upon all of these questions in favor of the accused. His youth and his brilliant attainments; the commanding position occupied by him in the Legislature of the State; the knowledge that a decision against him would bring sorrow and shame to his innocent wife and children—these things had their weight with the committee and urged them to be lenient to the accused. And in the admission of testimony, for these merciful reasons, some evidence was allowed which would have been excluded in a court of law. But if the committee erred in the admission or exclusion of testimony, the error was on the side of mercy and in favor of the accused.

First—Did any guilty conspiracy exist between Elwood Bruner and the Police Commissioners of San Francisco?

We are constrained to answer this question in the negative. Police Commissioners Hammond, Alvord, Tobin and Crowley of San Francisco were all examined, and all denied any promise of patronage or complicity with him. In fact, there was no evidence direct or indirect, which in any way connected the Police Commissioners of San Francisco with Mr. Bruner in immoral or illegal practices with relation to the appointments to the police force.

Second—Did Elwood Bruner have six or any less number of positions on the police force of San Francisco at his disposal?

To answer this question intelligently will require a brief summary of certain evidence. The testimony of Police Commissioner Crowley, Senator Maher and Bruner himself is to the effect that, prior to the present session of the Legislature, Police Commissioner Crowley had a bill prepared, the effect of which would increase the police force of San Francisco; that J. N. E. Wilson, an attorney of San Francisco, prepared the bill; that Senator Maher undertook to introduce the bill in the Senate at the request of Police Commissioner Crowley. Senator Maher, at the time he was requested to introduce the bill in the Senate, mentioned Bruner's name to Police Commissioner Crowley, and Crowley concurred in the opinion that Bruner would be a proper person to introduce the bill in the Assembly; in fact, Crowley wrote to the Chief of Police of Sacramento, who was interested in the passage of the bill, stating that Mr. Bruner would introduce the bill in the Assembly. Early in January, Senator Maher conversed with Bruner about the bill, and it was understood that Bruner would introduce the bill in the Assembly. On the 13th day of January Bruner did introduce the bill in the Assembly, advocated its passage, and was instrumental in passing it. The bill passed the Assembly on the 22d day of February. Bruner had a friend in San Francisco named Reed, and Reed had a friend whom he wished to get on the police force. Reed requested Bruner to give him a letter of recommendation for his friend. Bruner promised to do what he could for him. Subsequent to this, Bruner had a conversation with Maher, with regard to Reed's request, and Senator Maher intimated to Bruner that he (Bruner) would have influence with the Police Commissioners of San Francisco.

Senator Maher testified that he took the bill to Bruner and asked him to introduce it in the Assembly at the request of Police Commissioner Crowley, when he thanked Bruner for the interest he had taken in the bill. Subsequently Bruner asked him to help him get a man on the San Francisco police force. To this Senator Maher replied that Bruner would not need his assistance, thus intimating to Bruner that his own influence would be sufficient to accomplish the desired result.

Police Commissioner Crowley testified that the fact that Mr. Bruner had taken an interest in the bill would have given weight to his request for an appointment on the police force, and that such request would, probably, have been respected. Crowley also testified that Senator Maher told him that Bruner had a friend he would like to get on the police force, and Crowley expected that Bruner would call and see him about it.

We conclude that the testimony with respect to the preparation, introduction and advocacy of the bill, all tends to show that Bruner had reason to believe, and did believe, that he could secure at least one position on the police force of San Francisco. He was not a new hand in politics. He had been in public life long enough to know that the successful advocate of an important bill would have influence with its friends. The fact that he had been requested to introduce the bill; the fact that the bill originated with the San Francisco Police Commissioners; the fact that Senator Maher, a member of the Senate from San Francisco, was the chief advocate of the bill in the Legislature, and the further fact that Senator Maher intimated to him that his influence would be sufficient with the Commissioners for an appointment—these facts must have been sufficient to induce Bruner to believe that he had at least one position on the San Francisco police force at his own disposal for a suitable person.

Third—Was he offering such position or positions for sale through the medium of brokers, or otherwise?

In finding an answer to this question there must be taken into consideration several important circumstances. We have found that he believed that he had at least one position at his disposal, and that he had promised it to a friend. One of the most significant circumstances in connection with this matter is the fact that after promising to aid his friend, he suddenly and mysteriously abandoned any effort in that direction. With the power to aid his friend, and having promised him that aid, why did he not endeavor to secure the position for that friend? There is no answer to this question, except the plain inference that the project of Belau and the Jones brothers came between Bruner and that promise to his friend. There is a question when the intent was formed in Bruner's mind to sell a position on the police force of San Francisco. But it is immaterial when that purpose was formed. The plain and unmistakable inference to be drawn from the testimony is that the intent was formed. Bruner testified that the first time Belau intimated to him that there was money in a sale of the position was on Monday, March 2d, the day before the Stoley letter of recommendation was written, but it is undisputed that on the 23d of February Bruner met Belau at the Grand Hotel, in San Francisco, and had a conversation with him about appointments to the San Francisco police force. At that time the police bill had passed the Legislature, but had not been signed by the Governor. The bill was approved by the Governor on the 24th day of February, the day after Belau had his first conversation on the subject with Bruner. The fact was in evidence that Bruner, in that first conversation with Belau, informed Belau that he would see about the matter; and actually did use language indicating that Belau's request for the position might be complied with. He did not, as might have been expected, inform Belau at that interview that he had promised to a friend the only position in his power to give, and that he could not under any circumstances comply with Belau's request. It must not be forgotten that a letter to Bruner was written by his friend Reed on January 27th, nearly a month before the interview with Belau, asking for Bruner's aid in appointing a man on the police force of San Francisco. This letter reads as follows:

HALL OF RECORDS, SAN FRANCISCO, January 27, 1891.

Friend Bruner: I inclose you a card of Mr. Barnes, whose ambition is to become a policeman. He would be a credit to the force, for he is a man of quiet dignity and a perfect athlete, very gentlemanly and of good address. He is the man our mutual friend, Frank Bull, spoke to you about. There is such a rush down here for these positions that I don't like to complicate things too much by trying to force him in. Now, if when the time comes you will do this for me, some day I will reciprocate. Yours truly, E. B. REED.

P. S. If you wish, I will send Barnes up to see you.

Upon the day that Bruner received the above letter he wrote a letter to Reed in reply, telling him that if he could be of any assistance to his friends at the proper time he would do what he could, and later, in a personal interview with Jesse Marks, a San Francisco politician, and a friend of Reed's, Bruner said that when the proper time came, if he had any influence with the Police Commissioners, he would assist Barnes to get the place. Yet there is no evidence that Bruner ever really endeavored to get a position for Barnes, or any other friend of Reed's. At about the same time that Bruner had the interview with Belau at the Grand Hotel, Daniel Jones and Louis Jones, brothers, of San Francisco, were attempting to induce certain car-drivers on the Mission-street line to purchase positions on the police force of San Francisco for the sum of $400 each. In considering the testimony of the Jones brothers, and of Belau, it cannot be denied that they are men of the most depraved and worthless character. Their demeanor on the witness-stand, their personal appearance, the manner in which they testified and the numerous contradictions in their testimony, all indicate that they are contemptible and dishonorable wretches, who would sell themselves for a song. Louis Jones testified that the first advances in the matter were not made by him, but were made to him by a car-driver named Moran, and that he informed Moran that he would write to a friend at Sacramento about the matter. Belau's testimony with regard to the sum of $400, and with regard to the Jones brothers' connection with the case, was evidently a mixture of falsehood and truth. Belau was afraid to tell more than half the truth, and was manifestly acting under powerful constraint of some kind. It is evident from the testimony of the Jones brothers and Belau, however, taken in connection with other testimony, that the scheme for the sale of a position on the police force of San Francisco originated with these three individuals. They had learned that Bruner had introduced the police bill in the Assembly; Belau had met Bruner frequently at the State Capitol, and the three selected Bruner as the instrument by which they would effect such sale. Belau operated at Sacramento, and worked upon Bruner; the Jones brothers operated in San Francisco, and worked upon the Mission-street car-drivers. James Comisky, who keeps a saloon on the corner of Thirty-first and Mission streets, San Francisco, testified that he heard one of the Jones brothers offer to get positions on the police force for $400 each. Edward Moran testified that one of the Jones brothers offered to get him a position on the police force for the sum of $400, and that Jones said that the position would be secured through a friend at Sacramento. W. G. Cox testified that Jones offered him a position on the police force for the sum of $400, and assured him that Bruner would give him a letter that would make his appointment sure. And on February 24th Belau sent the following telegram to Louis Jones:

SACRAMENTO, Cal., Feb. 24, 1891.

To Louis Jones, 2523 Mission Street, San Francisco: Party says it goes for five; bring stuff to-morrow. Answer if you come. DICK.

And on March 2d, Belau sent the following telegram:

SACRAMENTO, March 2, 1891.

Louis Jones: Will call San Francisco. Will wire answer to-morrow. DICK.

And on March 3d, Belau sent the following telegram:

SACRAMENTO, Cal., March 3, 1891.

Louis Jones: Will call San Francisco. Yes, it goes; but bring doe. DICK.

If Bruner's testimony be true, that the first time it was intimated to him that there would be money in the transaction was on Monday, March 2d, what are we to understand by the above telegrams? And how are we to reconcile with Bruner's testimony the four hundred dollar offers made by Jones to Comisky, Moran, and Cox? It is true that the telegram of February 24th, uses the language, "Party says it goes for five." The words "five" evidently refers to the sum of money to be paid for the position, and Belau may have raised the figures from four to five with some selfish motive of appropriating the extra amount to himself. What party was it to whom it referred? Could it have been anyone else than Bruner? He had had an interview with Bruner at the Grand Hotel, San Francisco, on the 23d of February, the day before. Bruner went back to Sacramento on the night before this telegram was sent.

It is plain to us that the party referred to in the telegram was Bruner; that the word "five" referred to the amount to be paid for the position, and that Belau had found another opportunity of conferring with Bruner between the time of the Grand Hotel interview and the sending of the telegram. We conclude that the question, "Was Bruner offering such position or positions for sale through the medium of brokers or otherwise?" must be answered by saying that the Jones brothers and Belau originated the scheme for the sale of positions on the police force of San Francisco; that Belau selected Bruner as the instrument to be used for the purpose of effecting such sale, and that the offers which were made by the Jones brothers to the car-drivers on the Mission-street Railroad line were made in furtherance of this design.

Fourth—Did he give the recommendation of Stoley, and receive the $400 therefor, as part of a plan to entrap and expose bad men, or did he do it with the intention of selling a position on the police force of San Francisco?

We shall refer to the facts as proved, indicating wherever necessary the important points made in Bruner's defense. On the 28th of February the San Francisco *Examiner* received the following letter:

Examiner: One Jones, 2523 Mission street, is soliciting the drivers on the Mission-street cars, particularly the blue line, to apply for appointment on the police force. Jones agrees their appointment for $400. He claims to represent Assemblyman Bruner, of Sacramento, to whom he refers, and says that Bruner has six (6) places in the new appointments. Respectfully, J. JASPER.

Jones is trying to get a little advance money.

The above letter, the author of which neither the committee nor the *Examiner* was able to find, induced the *Examiner* to begin an investigation of the matter referred to in it, and to this end a reporter named Stillwell was authorized to interview the car drivers on the Mission street railroad, and was furnished with four hundred dollars for the purpose of purchasing a position from Bruner. The *Examiner* employed Stillwell to act as a detective. The representatives of the paper at Sacramento were also instructed to investigate the matter, but were left in ignorance of Stillwell's employment and movements. Stillwell secured the confidence of the Jones brothers, accepted the offer of a police position for a friend of his at a price of four hundred dollars, and was sent to Sacramento to see Belau.

In the meantime, on Saturday, February 28th, in pursuance of telegraphic instructions from the *Examiner*, A. M. Lawrence and I. Alexander, *Examiner* reporters, interviewed Bruner and informed him that rumor was connecting his name with sales of police force positions. And here it is proper to notice one feature of Bruner's defense. He claims in his own defense that he believed there was a conspiracy on foot, headed by Lawrence, against himself and against the Republican party, to bring into ill-repute the actions of the California Assembly. There is absolutely no proof to sustain this claim. It was shown conclusively that Lawrence had nothing whatever to do with the *Examiner's* investigation; that he simply interviewed Bruner, telling him of the current rumor, and reported to his paper. He did not know of Stillwell's employment, and was not taken into his confidence until after the Stoley letter was written. These facts appear from the testimony of Henderson, Ward, and Lawrence himself, and are undisputed. And Bruner admitted on the witness-stand that Lawrence warned him of the rumor against him. But he nevertheless testified that on March 3d, three days after Lawrence had warned him, he considered that Lawrence was engaged in a conspiracy to ruin him. The inconsistency of this testimony is at once apparent, and it is simple justice to Lawrence to say that there is not a particle of testimony which shows that he ever attempted to injure Bruner in any way.

Stillwell came to Sacramento on Tuesday, March 3d, arriving here at 8:40 P. M. He brought with him a certificate of deposit for the sum of four hundred dollars, issued by the Crocker-Woolworth Bank, of San Francisco. He was accompanied by Daniel Jones. Both Daniel and Louis Jones had talked freely with Stillwell about the matter in hand, and Louis Jones told him that Bruner was the man whose letter of recommendation would secure a position on the police force of San Francisco. Stillwell and Jones met "Dick" Belau at the depot or on the cars, and the three went together to the State Capitol. What transpired at the Capitol was related by Stillwell in a clear and connected manner, and it was plain that he was endeavoring to testify to nothing but the truth. The testimony shows that Stillwell and Belau met Bruner in one of the alcoves of the State Library; that Bruner there wrote and delivered to Stillwell the following letter, taking the name, age and occupation of the person to be recommended from a memorandum prepared by Belau:

SACRAMENTO, Feby, 3, 1891.

To the Police Commissioners of San Francisco—DEAR SIRS: I very much desire that you would appoint Mr. Thomas Stoley upon the police force of your city. He is a man of good habits, a thorough Republican, and am satisfied would give entire satisfaction. Very respectfully, ELWOOD BRUNER.

The letter was inclosed in an envelope which was addressed as follows:

Hon. Police Commissioners,
Old City Hall,
San Francisco.

The letter was dated February instead of March, by mistake. When Bruner had finished the above letter he received from Stillwell a certificate of deposit on the Crocker-Woolworth Bank of San Francisco for the sum ot $400. He immediately gave to Belau the sum of $70. Then he walked into the private office of the library, borrowed $90 from Assistant Librarian Leake, turned over to Leake the said certificate of deposit as security, went back out into the library and handed Belau $80 more. The total sum given by Bruner to Belau was $150. While in the private office of the library Bruner asked Leake to have the certificate of deposit cashed for him on the following morning. On Wednesday morning, March 4th, Leake sent the certificate of deposit to the California State Bank of Sacramento, and it was cashed by that bank. Subsequently the certificate was sent to San Francisco for collection, and was refused payment by the bank from which it issued. The certificate was not indorsed by Bruner, and was indorsed by Assistant Librarian Leake. And now we come to a further consideration of the defense made by Bruner, that in giving the letter of recommendation and receiving the $400 he was acting in good faith, with the object of exposing wicked conspirators and bringing them to punishment. He testified that the memorandum from which he wrote the letter of recommendation was not in Stillwell's handwriting, therefore a forgery must have been committed; he wanted to entrap the forger; and he had the certificate of deposit cashed in order that the forger might be caught by following the certificate. Yet it appears that Assistant Librarian Leake was his personal friend of long standing, and Leake was allowed to run the risk of losing $400 without caution or warning. And it further appears that Bruner paid $70 of his own money to Belau. The committee has been unable to reconcile Bruner's theory of forgery with any theory of innocent intention on his part. A man of his ability and legal training would have thought of many probable events which would prevent the tracing and recovery of the certificate. The chances that it might be paid without protest, or lost, or destroyed, or in many other ways put out of hope of recovery and use as evidence, would have been impressed upon a mind like Bruner's with indelible distinctness. Bruner testified that there were in the private office of the library, when he went in to borrow the money of Leake, State Printer A. J. Johnston, his brother Alvin Bruner, Assistant Librarian Leake and William Govan; and that he walked hurriedly into the room, in an excited condition, with the certificate of deposit in his hand, exclaiming as he closed the door behind him, "I have got the s—s of b—s." But this testimony of Bruner, as showing an intention of exposing conspirators, is not fully corroborated by the gentlemen who were in the room. Mr. Leake testified that Mr. Bruner seemed to be jubilant, but he considered the cause to be Bruner's success only a short time before in defeating in the Assembly a bill in which he (Leake) was interested. Neither State Printer Johnston nor William Govan noticed anything in Bruner's manner to excite comment or curiosity. It is a remarkable fact that the exclamation was made in a room not more than twenty by fifteen feet in size, and yet not one of the witnesses (including Alvin Bruner) heard it distinctly enough to remember the exact language used. Not one of the gentlemen present was curious enough to ask a question, notwithstanding they were all Bruner's personal friends, and one of them his brother. It is only charitable to pass this circumstance by without further comment, than to express the opinion that whatever elation Bruner felt was due to some recent act of his on the floor of the Assembly, and whatever exclamation he made was uttered with relation to that act. Another most remarkable fact, the fact most material to the proper decision of this case, is that Bruner did not confide in a human soul from the time he received the certificate of deposit up to the time when he made his statement on the floor of the Assembly. On Tuesday night, immediately after receiving the certificate, he was in the presence of warm personal friends—his brother, Alvin Bruner, State Printer Johnston, Govan and Leake. They were men who had known and had been intimate with Bruner for years. To no one of them did he confide a single word or thought with relation to the matter. He was a member of a legislative body, whose presiding officer was known to command respect and confidence. In him he did not confide. On the very night of the transaction, after he had, as he claims, entrapped the conspirators who had been trying to entrap him, he sat in his seat on the floor of the Assembly, and yet did not rise in his place and triumphantly proclaim the victory he had achieved, and ask the Legislature and the people of the State to sustain him.

It is true that Judge Armstrong and Alvin Bruner testified that he intimated to them that the *Examiner*, or the *Examiner* reporters, had conspired to entrap him. But that was before the transaction in the library. After it he did not confide in them, nor is it true that he confided anything whatever of the matter to State Printer Johnston, although it is conceded that he did deposit the sum of $250 in Johnston's safe. We repeat, Bruner did not confide in a human soul from the time he received the certificate of deposit up to the time when he made his statement on the floor of the Assembly.

Is it natural or reasonable to conclude that a man who was trying to entrap his enemies would have acted in this manner? Would he not have arranged for witnesses to the whole transaction? Would he not have confided in his friends or relatives? Would he not have followed the dictates of ordinary prudence, and protected himself from any possibility of unjust criticisms?

It is with the profoundest and deepest regret, and with sincere feelings of pity, that this committee finally concludes and finds that Elwood Bruner did not give the recommendation of Stoley, and receive the $400 therefor, as a part of a plan to entrap and expose guilty conspirators, but that he did do it with the intention of selling a position on the police force of San Francisco, and appropriating to the use of himself and accomplices the proceeds thereof. Respectfully submitted,

A. J. BLEDSOE, Chairman.
A. J. JACKSON,
F. H. GOULD,
JOHN R. MATHEWS.

BEFORE JUDGE CRAVENS.

Foutz Will Appeal His Case to the Superior Court.

L. C. Foutz was to have received sentence yesterday for beating his wife, but his attorney asked that judgment be postponed until Monday, to give him time to file a statement on appeal. Judge Cravens granted the continuance.

The cases of Leon Bouchard, charged with battery, and "Butch" Van Tine, accused of beating a restaurant-keeper out of a meal, were dismissed on the payment of costs.

George Blake, who was brought from Dixon to this city and charged with defrauding a hotel-keeper out of the price of a meal, had his trial set for to-day.

SUPERIOR COURT.

Department One—Catlin, Judge.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1891.

B. H. Covell and wife vs. W. W. Washburn, administrator—Motion for new trial argued and submitted.

Peter Haas vs. Charles Zimmerman—Demurrer overruled.

John F. Hickson vs. John P. Brissel—Continued.

F. D. Myers vs. Sacramento City—Continued.

John F. Fenton, an insolvent debtor—Insolvent ordered discharged.

Louis Myers et al. vs. John Lawton et al.—Continued.

Amelia Gehring vs. H. M. and Mrs. Amy Gillig—Demurrer sustained, and ten days to answer.

Mooney vs. Mooney—Continued.

In re. W. B. Walters, an insolvent debtor—Notice to creditors on application for discharge.

People vs. John Hughes—Continued.

In re. J. D. Smith, on habeas corpus—Continued.

Department Two—Van Fleet, Judge.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1891.

Estate of Sarah F. Schulmeyer, deceased—Decree of distribution.

Estate of Nicholas Tusch, deceased—Order authorizing erection of monument and appointing Carl Strobel, John Olsen and Charles McLaughlin appraisers.

Estate of Henry Keema, deceased—Continued one week.

Estate of Thomas Dwyer, deceased—Order of sale of personal property.

Estate of B. Gorman, deceased—Order confirming sale of personal property; same orders in estates of Elizabeth Cisco and James Eagan, deceased.

Estate of P. Erauw, deceased—Order setting apart homestead.

Estate of Deliliah Bloom, deceased—Order of sale of personal property.

Estate of J. R. Watson, deceased, hearing of citation to executrix—Continued one week.

Estate of Lorinda Washburn, deceased, petition to sell real estate—Continued one week.

Estate of Joseph Kreuzberger, deceased—Letters to petitioner; bond, $300. Appraisers—G. Kreuzberger, B. Kreuzberger and N. Harvie.

Estate of Catherine Smith, deceased—Decree discharging administrator.

Estate of Edward B. Peterson, deceased—Letters to W. F. Peterson; bond, $2,000.

Estate of Anna Tyler, deceased—Order raising bond of administrator to $2,500.

E. W. Jones vs. J. A. Parker—Demurrer overruled; ten days to answer; notice waived.

John H. McKune vs. A. T. J. Reynolds—Demurrer withdrawn; twenty days to answer; notice waived.

S. Prouty vs. W. H. Devin et al.—Demurrer continued one week.

Elizabeth Ray vs. John A. Parker et al.—Demurrer continued one week.

W. P. Harlow vs. Joseph Hahn—Demurrer continued one week.

Martha E. Kirk vs. Benjamin F. Kirk—Set for to-morrow at 10 A. M.

SUPREME COURT MINUTES.

IN BANK.

WEDNESDAY, March 18, 1891.

14,050—In the matter of H. Wierbitszky & Co., in insolvency—There being no certificate to the transcript the said motion is granted and the appeal dismissed. McFarland, J. We concur: DeHaven, J., Sharpstein, J., Paterson, J., Harrison, J.

THURSDAY, March 19, 1891.

20,708—People vs. Wheatley; 20,775—People vs. McGregger—Rehearings denied. The Court.

13,938—City of Pasadena vs. Stimpson—This cause having heretofore been argued and submitted before the court in bank, and the constitutional number of Justices qualified to act therein not being able to arrive at a conclusion, ordered that the submission be set aside and that the case be set in the Los Angeles bank calendar for argument. Beatty, C. J.

13,761—Hick vs. Thomas—Ordered that cause be submitted. The Court.

The Western Settler's Chosen Specific.

With every advance of emigration into the far West a new demand is created for Hostetter's Stomach Bitters. Newly peopled regions are frequently less salubrious than older settled localities, on account of the miasma which rises from recently cleared land, particularly along the banks of rivers that are subject to freshets. The agricultural or mining emigrant soon learns, when he does not already know, that the Bitters afford the only sure protection against malaria, and those disorders of the stomach, liver and bowels to which climatic changes, exposure and unaccustomed or unhealthy water or diet subject him. Consequently he places an estimate upon this great household specific and preventive commensurate with its intrinsic merits, and is careful to keep on hand a restorative and promoter of health so implicitly to be relied upon in time of need.

BEECHAM'S pills cure bilious, nervous ills.

Lost—Found.

LOST—ON THURSDAY AFTERNOON, A gold clover leaf lace pin with diamond setting. Return to 1004 Fourth street and be rewarded. mr21-2t*

LOST—A SMALL OPEN FACE GOLD watch and chain attached; supposed to have been lost in coming to or going from the Capitol building. Finder will please return to the Western Hotel. 1t*

FOUND—A BAY MARE ABOUT 4 YEARS old, having part of harness on. Owner can have the same by proving property and paying charges. Apply to GEORGE SHERMAN, Riding Academy, Sixth and M sts. 1t*

Royal Baking Powder.

DECISIVE Baking Powder Tests

The United States Official

Investigation of Baking Powders, made, by authority of Congress, in the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., furnishes the highest authoritative information as to which powder is the best. The Official Report

Shows the ROYAL to be a cream of tartar baking powder, superior to all others in leavening power (*U. S. Dept. Agricult'e Bulletin 13, p. 599*).

Dr. Price's Baking Cream Powder.

Used in Millions of Homes—40 Years the Standard.

Church Notices.

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, I STREET, between Twelfth and Thirteenth—Rev. W. H. Latourette will preach at 11 A. M. and 7 P. M. Home School, 12:15. Washington Mission, 3:30. Welcome to all of our services. ma21-2t*

CENTRAL M. E. CHURCH, ELEVENTH street, between H and I—Rev. C. H. Beechgood, pastor. Services at 10:45 A. M. Subject: "Heirs of God." Epworth League, 6:30 P. M., followed by the preaching service. Evening subject: "Time for Work." *

CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, SIXTH street, between I and J—Rev. J. B. Silcox pastor. Hours of service, 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M.

EMMANUEL BAPTIST CHURCH, TWENTY-fifth and N streets—Rev. H. B. Hutchins, pastor. Preaching at 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. Sunday-school at 12:15.

ENGLISH LUTHERAN CHURCH, FIREmen's Hall, Eighth street, between J and K—Rev. W. S. Hoskinson, pastor. Palm Sunday. Morning subject: "The King Cometh." Evening: "The Wedding Ring." The congregation urged to be present. All made welcome. *

FOURTEENTH-STREET PRESBYTERIAN Church, between O and P—Rev. G. P. Tindall, pastor. Services at 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. Sabbath-school at 12:15 P. M. Young people's meeting at 6:45 P. M. "The Abolition of Moral Evil Possible," the subject for the morning; in the evening, "Who is Sufficient for These Things?" The public are cordially invited.

FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH, EIGHTH street, between N and O—Preaching of the Gospel by J. B. Haston of Chico at 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. Sunday-school at 9:45 A. M. Young people's meeting at 6:30 P. M. Come. All seats free. *

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, NINTH street, between L and M—Pastor, Rev. W. Ward Willis. Rev. J. Downie of Petaluma will preach morning and evening. Sunday-school, 12:15. Song service, 7. *

FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY, CASTLE Hall, northwest corner of Ninth and I streets—Preaching at 11 A. M. by Rev. C. P. Massey. Subject: "Sentiment versus Utility." Sunday-school at 12:15. A cordial invitation is extended to all. *

M. E. CHURCH SOUTH, SEVENTH street, between J and K—Preaching by the pastor, Rev. A. C. Bane, at 11 A. M.: "Difficult Doctrines Made Plain." At 7:30 P. M.: "Robbed, Wounded and Left for Dead." Everybody invited. *

SIXTH-STREET M. E. CHURCH, BEtween K and L streets—Rev. Arnold T. Needham, pastor. Preaching at 10:45 A. M. Subject, "Wesley and His Work." In the evening Mrs. Ella Thomson, Ph. D., Chairman for the Pacific Coast of Y. W. C. A., will deliver an address on "Our Duty to the Girls." Epworth League, 6:30 P. M. *

ST. PAUL'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, Eighth street, between I and J—Rev. John F. von Herrlich, rector. Palm Sunday. Services at 8 A. M., 11 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. Sunday-school at 12:45. Mission School at 3 P. M.*

WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERIAN Church, Preaching morning and evening by the pastor, Rev. R. M. Stevenson. Sunday-school at 12:15 P. M. Young People's meeting at 6:30. All are kindly and cordially invited to these services. *

Meeting Notices.

REGULAR MEETING OF UNION Lodge, No. 21, A. O. U. W., THIS (Saturday) EVENING, at 7:30 o'clock, in Grangers' Hall, corner of Tenth and K streets. Sojourners invited. W. T. GORE, M. W.
C. W. BAKER, Recorder. 1t

Wanted.

WANTED—A FIRST-CLASS SALESwoman; one who has had years of experience. Apply to C. H. GILMAN, Red House, between 9 A. M. and 4 P. M. mr21-3t

WANTED—A GIRL TO DO COOKING and housework. Apply 1027 G street; also a young girl to assist in cooking and housework for family of two. Apply same address. 1t*

WANTED—THREE MILLINERY APprentices who have had some experience. Apply to C. H. GILMAN, from 9 A. M. to 4 P. M., Red House. mr20-3t

WANTED—BY A YOUNG GIRL, A situation to do light housework. Inquire at 916 Q street. mr20-2t*

WANTED—ONE OR TWO CHILDREN to board; good home and care. Address JOHN, this office. mr20-7t*

WANTED—RESPECTABLE GENTLEMAN and wife, or two gentlemen, to take nice, sunny front room and board in private family. Address P. O. box 150. mr20-5t*

WANTED—A GOOD CATHOLIC WOMAN to take care of two children; will have a good home. Apply at 1025 Front st. mr19-3t*

WANTED—ALL PERSONS WANTING reliable male and female help will call at J. J. SMITH'S EMPLOYMENT OFFICE, 524 K street, at the office of Capital Transfer Company. mr1-1m*

WANTED TEAMS—PARTIES WITH teams or traction engines to take contract to haul three million feet of lumber. All summer's work; for further particulars address, EL DORADO MILL & LUMBER CO., Diamond Springs, Cal. fe14-tf

WANTED—MEN FOR FARMS, VINEyards, dairies and all kinds of labor. Women and girls for cooking and general housework. Plenty of work for desirable help. Apply at EMPLOYMENT OFFICE, Fourth street, K and L.

To Let or Rent.

TO LET—FOUR NICELY FURNISHED rooms with piano, also bath; suitable for light housekeeping. Reference required. Address this office. mr20-3t*

TO LET—FURNISHED ROOMS, SINGLE or en suite; also, stable to rent. 721 G street. mr18-5t*

HOTEL OF 100 ROOMS, ALL FURnished, full of boarders and roomers, to lease; best location. Inquire at 1007 Fourth street. mh2-tf

FURNISHED ROOMS AT CENTRAL House, from $5 per month upwards; also family rooms at low prices. HORNLEIN BROS., Proprietors. mr19-1y

FOR RENT OR SALE—SMALL CHICKEN ranch; good buildings; windmill. Apply to CARL STROBEL, 317 J. mr19-3t*

TO LET—THREE TENEMENTS, THREE rooms each; also one house, 8 rooms, partly furnished (suitable for lodging or boarding-house); also some rooms, furnished or unfurnished, suitable for light housekeeping. For particulars apply at WOOD YARD, 401 I street. All cheap rent. mr6-tf

918 SECOND ST.—FOR RENT OR LEASE, building now known as the Roma Hotel. Apply to CARL STROBEL, 317 J st. mr16-7t*

TO RENT—FURNISHED AND UNFURnished rooms, suitable for housekeeping; rents from $4 to $8. Inquire at 309 M st. f6-tf

For Sale.

FOR SALE—ONE PAIR AMERICAN work horses; weight 1,200 and 1,300; 7 years old; work single or double; will sell one or both. Apply 1613 P street. mr21-3t*

FOR SALE—ACRE LOTS; SOUTH SACramento; 10 to 80 acres, from $65 to $80 per acre. Apply to STROBEL, 317 J. mr21-7*

FOR SALE—ON INSTALLMENTS, FIVE desirable building lots, with or without houses, in South Sacramento. Inquire Melvin's Installment Store, 718 K st. mr21-tf

FOR SALE—A FRESH MILCH COW AND calf. Apply to 1920 Third street. mr21-3t*

FOR SALE OR EXCHANGE FOR CITY property, 120 acres fine fruit land, with good house, small orchard and vineyard. Address B. W., 730 Eighth street, Sacramento. mr20-3t*

FOR SALE—HALF INTEREST IN COFfee and chop-house. Inquire at the Evergreen Restaurant, corner Third and K streets. On account of sickness. mr20-3t*

FOR SALE CHEAP—A LARGE SECONDhand farm wagon in good condition. Apply at 1021 Tenth street. mr19-4t

FOR SALE—A SCHOLARSHIP AT THE Bainbridge College, Sacramento; will be sold cheap. For terms and particulars address JOHN McCARTY, Latrobe, Cal. mr15-1w

FOR SALE—THOROUGHBRED BROWN Leghorn eggs, 50 cents per setting of thirteen. J. R. CATLETT, Pleasant Grove, or THOMAS LYNN, 1401 O street, Sacramento. mr15-7td&4tw

$1,200 FOR SALE—PAID-UP LEASE TO Blue Canyon Hotel, worth $450, and furniture, etc., worth $1,000; will sell lease, furniture and goods in house for $1,200. For terms and particulars apply to L. E. SMITH, Trustee, 1217 L street, or FELTER, SON & CO., Second street, between J and K, Sacramento. mr14-tf

FOR SALE ONE OF THE FINEST AND largest saloons in the city; extra family entrance; best location; stock and lease. Inquire at this office. mr9-tf

FOR SALE OR TO RENT ON LEASE—TEN acres of bottom land, one mile below Washington, Yolo county. If sold will take small payment down. Apply to EDWIN K. ALSIP & CO., Real Estate and Insurance Agents, 1015 Fourth street. fe22-tf

FOR SALE—A FIVE HORSE-POWER ENgine, in good order; also, small boiler. Inquire of SACRAMENTO PACKING AND DRYING CO., 611 G street, Sacramento. mr18-1mWS

Banking Houses.

PEOPLE'S SAVINGS BANK.

Sacramento City.....California

Guaranteed capital.....$410,000
Paid up capital..... 225,500
Reserve and surplus..... 56,000

Term and ordinary deposits received. Dividends paid semi-annually. Money loaned on real estate only.

To encourage children and people of limited means to save, deposits of $1 will be received and interest paid thereon. For further information address,

WM. BECKMAN, President.
GEO. W. LORENZ, Cashier.

NATIONAL BANK OF D. O. MILLS & CO.,

Sacramento, Cal.—Founded, 1850.

Saturday Hours.....10 A. M. to 1 P. M.

Directors and Shareholders:

D. O. MILLS.....1,538 Shares
EDGAR MILLS, President.....1,538 Shares
S. PRENTISS SMITH, Vice-Pres. 250 Shares
FRANK MILLER, Cashier..... 351 Shares
C. F. DILLMAN, Asst. Cashier..... 125 Shares
Other persons own.....1,198 Shares

Capital and Surplus, $600,000.

Chrome Steel Safe Deposit Vault and Time Lock.

FARMERS' AND MECHANICS' SAVINGS BANK

Southwest Corner Fourth and J streets, Sacramento, Cal.

Guaranteed Capital.....$500,000

LOANS MADE ON REAL ESTATE. Interest paid semi-annually on Term and Ordinary Deposits.

B. U. STEINMAN.....President
EDWIN K. ALSIP.....Vice-President
D. D. WHITBECK.....Cashier
C. H. CUMMINGS.....Secretary
JAMES M. STEVENSON.....Surveyor

DIRECTORS:

B. U. STEINMAN, EDWIN K. ALSIP,
C. H. CUMMINGS, W. E. TERRY,
SOL. RUNYON, JAMES McNASSAR.
JAS. M. STEVENSON.

CALIFORNIA STATE BANK And Safe Deposit Vaults,

SACRAMENTO, CAL.

Draws Drafts on Principal cities of the World.

Saturday Hours, 10 A. M. to 1 P. M.

OFFICERS:

President.....N. D. RIDEOUT
Vice-President.....FRED'K COX
Cashier.....A. ABBOTT
Assistant Cashier.....W. E. GEBER

DIRECTORS:

C. W. CLARKE, JOS. STEFFENS,
GEO. C. PERKINS, FRED'K COX,
N. D. RIDEOUT, J. R. WATSON.
W. E. GERBER.

SACRAMENTO BANK.

THE OLDEST SAVINGS BANK IN THE city, corner Fifth and J streets, Sacramento. Guaranteed capital, $500,000; paid up capital, gold coin, $300,000; loans on real estate in California, July 1, 1890, $2,898,442; term and ordinary deposits, July 1, 1890, $2,709,394. Term and ordinary deposits received. Dividends paid in January and July. Money loaned upon real estate only. The Bank does exclusively a savings bank business. Information furnished upon application to

W. P. COLEMAN, President.
ED. R. HAMILTON, Cashier.

CROCKER-WOOLWORTH NATIONAL BANK,

322 Pine street, San Francisco.

PAID-UP CAPITAL, $1,000,000. SURPLUS, $250,000.

DIRECTORS.

CHARLES CROCKER.....E. H. MILLER, JR.
R. C. WOOLWORTH.....President
W. E. BROWN.....Vice-President
W. H. CROCKER.....Cashier

Business Cards.

DR. S. BISHOP,

LATE RESIDENT PHYSICIAN AND SUperintendent of the Nevada State Insane Asylum. OFFICE, room 12, Postoffice Block. Residence, 1516 O street. mr11-1m

ARCHITECTS.

N. D. GOODELL AND F. H. SCHARDIN have associated themselves together as Architects and Builders. OFFICE—Pioneer Hall, Seventh street, between J and K, Sacramento, Cal. Consultation and estimates made free of charge.

MRS. MARION STIRLING, M. D.,

LATE LADY PRINCIPAL OF DUFFERIN Medical College for Women, and Superintendent of Women's Hospitals and Dispensaries in Northern British India. Diseases of women and children a specialty. OFFICE—Room 7, Odd Fellows' Temple.

H. F. ROOT. ALEX. NEILSON. J. DRISCOL.

ROOT, NEILSON & CO.,

UNION FOUNDRY—IRON AND BRASS Founders and Machinists, Front street, between N and O. Castings and machinery of every description made to order.

Attorneys-at-Law.

D. K. TRASK,

LAWYER, FULTON BLOCK, LOS ANGEles, Cal. Attends to business in Southern California for non-residents and attorneys. Practices in all courts. Letters promptly answered.

CHARLES H. OATMAN,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR-AT-LAW. OFFICE—420 J street, Sacramento, Cal. Notary Public.

A. L. HART,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW—OFFICE, SOUTHwest corner Fifth and J streets. Rooms 12, 13 and 14, Sutter Building.

THOMAS W. HUMPHREY,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR-AT-LAW. Southwest corner Seventh and J streets, Sacramento, Cal. Notary Public. Collections.

Dentistry.

F. F. TEBBETS,

DENTIST, 914 SIXTH ST., between I and J, west side, opposite Congregational Church.

DR. W. C. REITH,

DENTIST, LINDLEY BUILDing, southeast corner Seventh and J streets, Sacramento, Cal.

C. H. STEPHENSON,

DENTIST, CORNER SEVenth and J streets, over Lyon's Dry Goods Store.

H. H. PIERSON DENTIST, 511-1ST SAC.

CAPITAL PHARMACY,

Under Capital Hotel, cor. Seventh and K Sts.,

J. S. O'CALLAGHAN, Proprietor,

AGENT FOR FRENCH TANSY WAFERS, for the relief and cure of painful and irregular menses. They are safe and sure.

A SURE CURE FOR THE LIQUOR AND OPIUM HABITS. The East India cure for these habits can be given without patient's knowledge, and is the only known specific for the purpose. NOT INJURIOUS. fe17-tf

HAMMER'S GLYCEROLE OF TAR

For Coughs and Colds.

A SPEEDY AND RELIABLE CURE.

Fourth and K streets and all Sacramento druggists. ja13-6m

R. A. OLMSTEAD. S. P. OLMSTEAD.

R. A. OLMSTEAD & CO.

Wish to announce that they have reopened the store formerly occupied by J. C. SCHADEN, corner Fourth and L streets, with a complete stock of

Groceries, Provisions, Etc.

The place has been renovated, and the stock is first-class in every particular, and will be sold at cash prices which will defy competition. mr4-tf

DRUNKENNESS LIQUOR HABIT.

IN ALL THE WORLD THERE IS BUT ONE CURE. DR HAINES GOLDEN SPECIFIC

It can be given in coffee, tea, or in articles of food, without the knowledge of patient if necessary It is absolutely harmless and will effect a permanent and speedy cure, whether the patient is a moderate drinker or an alcoholic wreck. IT NEVER FAILS. It operates so quietly and with such certainty that the patient undergoes no inconvenience, and soon his complete reformation is effected. 48 page book free. To be had of

JOSEPH HAHN & CO., Fifth and J Streets