DID AS THEY PLEASED WITH THE TAX LEVY.

Supervisors Simply Ignore Mayor Sutro's Veto.

APPEAL TO THEMSELVES.

Numerous Political Appointments Scattered Among Their Friends.

TWENTY-ONE CHANGES MADE.

New Bicycle Order Introduced That Will Guide the Scorcher in His Rounds.

Twenty-one municipal employes were flung out of office by the Board of Supervisors yesterday to make room for as many of their friends. Superintendent Dunker did not occupy his usual place in the wedge. He voted against the action, but it is understood he did so simply to preserve the head of a relative in the County Clerk's office. His vote was not needed on the record, so his coworkers did the hacking at other heads and allowed him to devote his attention to the protection of a Dunker head. About eight Democrats were allowed to get in on the deal.

Mayor Sutro presented his expected veto of the $2 25 tax levy, and, as was expected, the Solid Eight simply ignored it. They appealed from his rulings to themselves and did pretty much as they pleased.

The resolution ousting the twenty-one employes provided that they shall retire on October 1, and that their successors shall take their places on the same date. The "outs" and the "ins" are as follows:

Janitor County Clerk's office, P. H. Kerrigan removed, Thomas Caveny appointed.

Janitor Surveyor's office, E. Dennis out, W. A. Adams appointed.

Janitor Superior Court, department 4, J. Green out, Chauncey F. Cooper in.

Janitor of Superior Court, department 6, Frank Frayne out, Dennis Coleman in.

Janitor Department 8, Fred Jackson out, Thomas C. Wilson in.

Department 12 janitor, A. Nagle out, Dennis Sullivan in.

Janitor Law Library, F. J. Pendergast out, Alfred C. Nagle in.

Janitor City Receiving Hospital. F. S. O'Connell out, Jack Hoey in.

Janitor outside entrances New City Hall, William Holland out, George Lynn in.

Janitor Police Courts 2 and 3, J. J. Powers out, Bernard Gilleran in.

Janitor Police Courts 1 and 4, J. Watson out, William F. Kelly in.

Engineer Fourth-street bridge, Frank McDermott out, Henry Healey in.

Messenger and janitor Justices' court, Louis Strohl out, James Taylor in.

Night watchman new City Hall, John J. Prendergast out, Charles Meyer in.

Gardener Portsmouth square, Thomas Jackson out, Dennis Dowd in.

Gardener Union square, Andrew Canavan out, H. Marks in.

Gardener Washington square, Joseph Merans out, Joseph Spoon in.

Bridge-keeper Fourth-street bridge, John Carson out, Thomas B. Dolan in.

Bridge-keeper Sixth-street bridge, W. O'Leary out, Herman Kihn in.

Driver of police patrol-wagon, B. Conlan out, John Donahue in.

Driver of police patrol-wagon, James Hynes out, J. Devitt in.

On the original draft A. Coleman was down for surveyor's janitor. He was scratched for W. A. Adams. Ralph Cohn for the place of gardener of Portsmouth square was scratched for Dennis Dowd.

There was a strong fight to oust Jack Hoey from the place of janitor of the City Receiving Hospital. Supervisor King threatened to pull out of the combination if this were done. As Supervisor Dunker was out by consent, the others could not afford any such defection, and Supervisor King was allowed to have his way.

The big crowd in the galleries craned forward when the resolution was read.

Supervisor Benjamin moved its adoption.

Supervisor Spreckels asked for the roll-call.

"I amend that the whole matter go over one week," interposed Supervisor Dimond. "We ought to ascertain why these wholesale changes are being made. The other side has made no explanation for this action. Surely in justice to the men ousted some examination ought to be made. Can't the gentleman from the Sixth (Supervisor Hughes) give us some reason for this change?"

Supervisor Hughes—Oh, I'm not called on to act.

"Who introduced the resolution?" demanded Supervisor Spreckels.

"Supervisor King," returned the chair.

"Then I suggest that Supervisor King give a reason for this change," continued Supervisor Dimond.

But Supervisor King looked shy, mumbled something and resolutely kept his seat.

The amendment to postpone the matter one week was lost by a vote of 7 to 4.

Noes—King, Scully, Benjamin, Hirsch, Hughes, Morgenstern, Wagner.
Ayes—Dimond, Dunker, Spreckels, Taylor.
Absent—Hobbs.

The resolution was carried by the same vote, and the crowd in the galleries filed out into the big corridors to discuss the situation.

Mayor Sutro's attempted veto of the $2 25 tax levy read as follows:

To the Honorable the Board of Supervisors—GENTLEMEN: On September 7, 1895, your honorable body passed to print an order providing revenue for municipal purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, fixing the rate at $1.567 and apportioning it to the thirteen different funds, as required by law.

At the completion of its publication in the newspaper such order again came before your body for action, and on September 16, 1895, in open session it was finally passed, the rate being fixed at $1.565, and myself presiding over your deliberations. In my opinion the above order comes now before me as Mayor for consideration. It is understood that my contention as to my right for approval or veto is denied for two reasons:

First—The language that has been used to express the sanction of this body is as follows: "After having been published five successive days, taken up, amended and adopted by the following vote." Section 68 of the consolidation act says: "Every such ordinance [referring to the tax levy, etc.], after the same shall pass the board, shall be presented to the Mayor," etc. Now it is stated that this body can by the use of the term "adopt" defeat the exercise of the Mayor's veto. In other terms, by the jugglery of words the same identical action may be differently characterized as to its ultimate effects. Is not the action of the board the same whether expressed by the term "adopt" or "pass"?

The Lexicon defines the word "adopt" as follows: "To take, to select," and the word "pass" as "To be enacted, to receive the sanction of a legislative body." In either case the logical and ultimate fact is that the sanction of the legislative body is expressed. The law regards substance not form.

The rule is laid down in Creighton vs. Manson, decided January, 1865, and relating to a street assessment in this City: "The instrument containing the expression of the legislative will need not necessarily be in the usual form of a municipal ordinance and be preceded by the words 'Be it enacted,' etc., but it may properly be, as in this case, in the form of a resolution; but whatever its form it amounts in substance to an ordinance and must be passed in the mode prescribed for the passage of ordinances."

In this connection it may be noted that at the same session in which the order under consideration was sanctioned an order levying assessment for the payment of Dupont-street bonds, and an order levying a tax of $0.685 for State purposes, were finally passed and were regularly presented to me for my approval and received my signature. In each of these three cases it is identically the same legislative action, and the same process of collection will be used in each case and conducted by the same officers and at the same time. Why should the Mayor's power be conceded in two cases and denied in the other, and justified by the capricious use of the word "adopt" instead of "pass"?

To my mind your attempt to nullify my authority is in plain violation of your official oaths; is revolutionary in its effects and is a deliberate overriding of the express words of the City charter. Against your trespass on the Mayor's prerogatives my solemn protest is hereby made.

It is a wise thing in our jurisprudence and supported by the experience of ages that the veto should exist. It is the one bulwark for the people against hasty legislation, ignorance, extravagance or crime. Here for this veto power, in favor of right and honesty and economy, I place my foot and shall stand as a rock, and if needed will vindicate my right by an appeal to the courts.

Second—The next reason for the denial of my power to veto is said to originate in section 3714 of the Political Code, as amended March 28, 1895. Relative to this question it provides: "The Board of Supervisors of each county must on the third Monday in September fix the rate of county taxes," etc. The contention is that this by implication excludes the Mayor from all participation in the municipal tax levy legislation.

The refutation of this contention will be best accomplished by a brief summary of preceding legislation.

On April 19, 1856, the consolidation act was passed, whereby the City and County of San Francisco were merged into a single entity, and according to the case of Wood vs. Election Commissioners, decided July, 1881, "is a continuation of the late municipal corporation, known as the 'City of San Francisco.'"

This charter, in article V, deals with the duties and powers of Supervisors. Section 68 contained in that article provides: "Every ordinance or resolution of the Board of Supervisors, providing for the expenditure of public moneys, or laying a tax or assessment, shall after publication be passed by the board and presented to the Mayor for approval."

While not conclusive, it is a circumstance pregnant with meaning that from that day to this every tax levy has been sent to the Mayor for approval—this being the single exception in all this period of forty years. This is supplemented by the fact that in July, 1879, my predecessor—Mayor A. J. Bryant—interposed his veto of the tax levy. It was regularly recognized by this body. Thereafter, in due time, his objections were considered and finally overruled by an affirmative vote of ten members.

It is a rule of construction, as old as the English law, "That words and phrases, the meaning of which in a statute has been ascertained, are, when used in a subsequent statute, to be understood in the same sense." Now the facts, for which this rule is invoked, are as follows: The consolidation act in section 71, contained in article V, and prescribing the duties of Supervisors, and all subsequent acts, including the amendment of 1891 and of 1895, use substantially the same words in conferring upon the Board of Supervisors the power to levy the municipal tax.

In every legislative act named there is a substantial identity of language. In none of them is there reference to the Mayor's power, so that when the amendment of 1895 was passed it must receive the same construction that had been impressed upon it by the Legislature and Supreme Court in all our preceding legislative history. This is true, since there is nothing in the act of 1895 that in terms or by implication excludes the Mayor.

Now, in the case of the People vs. McCreery, decided January, 1868, the veto power is distinctly recognized as existing in the Mayor. Consequently when the Legislature afterward used the same general language to vest authority in this board it must be held to have used it in reference to the construction placed upon these words by the Supreme Court in the case just mentioned. It is true that it was held in that case that the levy was invalid because the Mayor did not approve it on the day of the levy, but section 3885 of the Political Code—doubtless in abrogation of the narrow construction therein announced—was subsequently passed, and is as follows: "No assessment or act relating to assessment or collecting of taxes is illegal on account of informality, nor because the same was not completed within the time required by law." This section has always been in the Political code, taking effect January 1, 1873.

In Hart vs. Plum, decided 1859, it is held that the statute directing the assessment to be made on the first Monday in May is merely directory. This decision is commented on with approval and applied in the People vs. E. L. and Y. Company, decided April, 1874. It is admitted that the general revenue law of the State applies to this municipality. But the rule is universally recognized "that where by the charter the Mayor is a part of the law-making power his concurrence in legislative action is essential to its validity."

It is further admitted that the Legislature is invested with jurisdiction as to this municipality. But unless the Legislature specifically manifests its intent to deprive the municipality of its rights under the charter, no change is effected in the latter and its provisions must control. The legislative intent must be plainly and clearly manifested. The charter is not to be frittered away by frivolous construction. In Desmond vs. Dunn, decided April, 1880, in speaking of the consolidation act, the court says: "All such charters must remain in force until superseded or changed in the mode prescribed by the constitution. In the absence of any positive provision to the contrary, this is necessarily implied. * * * But charters not framed or adopted by authority of said constitution need not be subject to or controlled by general laws. Therefore, the charter of the City and County of San Francisco, which antedates the present constitution, and was not framed or adopted by authority of it, is not subject to or controlled by general laws." This language is approved in City of Stockton vs. a certain insurance company, decided October, 1887. In the last case there was a conflict between the Stockton charter and the State constitution as to the time of the tax levy. The former was upheld, being prior in time.

It is said there is a conflict between section 68 of the consolidation act and section 3714 of the Political Code, amended in March, 1895. There is no more inherent conflict than there is between sections 68 and 71 of the charter. Section 71 reads: "On or before the first Monday of May, annually, the board * * * shall levy" * * *, etc.

This gave the board discretion to make a levy on the first Monday of May. Could the board by thus delaying its action to the last day defeat or prevent the Mayor's veto or approval? If so, then section 68 becomes imperative as the mere whim of the board, or rather at its exercise of a lawful discretion, and the Mayor is stripped of an admitted power, without his consent and without any default on his part. If, therefore, sections 68 and 71 of the consolidation act can be harmonized, then the same reasoning applied to sections 68 and 3714 of the Political Code will bring them into unison. The Spring Valley Water case, Jacobs vs. Board of Supervisors, decided October, 1893, in relation to the Mayor's veto as to the water rates, is not in opposition to the views herein expressed. On the contrary, it expressly recognizes the veto power of the Mayor where it is clearly expressed in the consolidation act, for Justice Harrison pointedly says: "His approval is required to only certain classes of ordinances which are enumerated in that section" (referring to section 68, which in so many words gives him the veto on the tax levy).

According to my mind, the foregoing reasoning establishes my right to approve or veto the present municipal tax levy. This conclusion is held, notwithstanding the opinion of a very distinguished attorney, handed to me in print, last Saturday and given to some of our local banks at their solicitation. Considering his argument as the best that can be made on that side, the issue is reduced to the single one of a conflict between the charter and the code. But it has been shown above that there is no logical conflict. Both laws may be harmonized. It is not necessary, in this connection, to discuss the expediency of the veto. That is within the jurisdiction of the Legislature. If the veto power exists, this is a pre-eminent case for its exercise.

But it may be asked, "What is the effect of a veto?" The answer is this: Willingly conceding up to this time the legality of your levy, the charter commands that the Mayor's objections must be considered by this board. If you, by nine or more votes, overrule such objections, then your levy will become final and valid, and the tax rate will be fixed at $1 56½. If four or more members vote to sustain my objections, then this board must at once prepare a new tax rate.

In making your levy on the third Monday of September you have obeyed the law. That in turn compels the Mayor to do his duty. Then as a result thereof the charter directs you to take another step and make another levy if the veto be sustained by four or more votes.

It is not a pertinent or relevant criticism that further vetoes might be made.

The foregoing has been addressed to the question as to the mere legal existence of my veto power. But while thus impelled by public consideration to the maintenance of my official rights there is a further aspect in which the tax levy deserves consideration.

It may be well to remind you that the respective parties that stood sponsors for your characters pledged you to a tax levy, in substance, not exceeding $1 on the $100. This has been an unwritten law of this municipality for many years. The tax-paying public has accustomed itself to this burden and, in a general sense, prepared itself for its liquidation. Considering the stringent times, lack of money and of work, a tax levy of $1 567 is profoundly severe and startling.

It would seem, therefore, that there must necessarily be some extraordinary circumstance that would justify the violation of the specific pledges taken by you in order to obtain your office. Is there anything in the public exigency that justifies and compels this increased levy? My mind has carefully gleaned the whole field of public necessities, and does not find any such. An excessive levy is a calamity upon the City. Its tendency is to keep away outside capital and to prevent the investment of the surplus funds of our own people. It destroys confidence and establishes uncertainty as the rule of official life. It inspires extravagance in municipal affairs.

There are many items in the tax levy that might properly, with regard to efficiency and honesty, be materially reduced. Perhaps they would readily aggregate $1,000,000 or more. The present levy exceeds the pledges of all the political parties in their last campaign platforms.

It far surpasses the estimates of the Auditor, and is much higher than that proposed by the Finance Committee, and is the highest levy in the last twenty-five years.

It seems to me that a tax levy, somewhere in the neighborhood of $1—1 per cent on a $300,000,000 valuation—is ample to run our City on an economical basis, this being supplemented by about a million and a half dollars derived from other sources and available for our public uses.

For the above reasons my assent to the passage of Order No. 2903 is withheld, and my objections thereto are hereby presented for the consideration of this board.

Then came the battle.

Superintendent Dimond moved that the veto take the usual course.

Superintendent Hughes amended that it be placed on file.

"The amendment is out of order," promptly ruled Mayor Sutro, making a bold stand. "All measures of revenue are subject to the Mayor's order. Are you ready for the motion?"

The eight Supervisors glanced at one another. "On what motion?" demanded Supervisor Wagner.

"On Supervisor Dimond's motion," answered the chair.

"I appeal from any such ruling of the chair," sang out Supervisors King and Hughes.

So the appeal was put to the test vote, and resulted in the old, old way. The Solid Eight voted to a man in standing by themselves, and the chair was overruled.

Then the veto was placed on file by the regulation vote:

Ayes—King, Scully, Benjamin, Hirsch, Hughes, Dunker, Morgenstern, Wagner.
Noes—Taylor, Dimond, Spreckels.
Absent—Hobbs.

The only move now left is to bring suit to enjoin action to collect the levy. There is talk of Mayor Sutro and of the Civic Federation taking such action.

Supervisor Wagner introduced an order providing regulations to be observed in the use of bicycles, bicycle tandems, etc. It was referred to the License and Ordinance Committee.

The order provides that the rate of speed shall not be greater than eight miles an hour "on the streets in that portion of the City and County lying east of Devisadero street, north of Thirteenth street to Twentieth street, and lying north of Twentieth street from Guerrero street to the waters of the bay, nor at any time on any street in this City and County between one-half hour after sunset and one-half hour before sunrise, without having a lighted lamp in good order and condition attached to and in front of the same."

It also provides that riders must sound a whistle or bell when approaching within twenty-five feet of a street crossing. Riding on a sidewalk is prohibited.

Riders shall not carry children under six years of age.

Riders shall always keep to the right side of the roadway and to the right in passing vehicles.

The Chief of Police is charged with the duty of enforcing the order.

Penalty—Any person who shall violate this order shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment in the County Jail not less than thirty days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The appointment of John J. Sullivan as bond clerk was laid over one week. Meeting adjourned.

IS THE VETO LAWFUL?

Lawyers Are Divided in Opinion Over the Matter.

A number of lawyers differ with Attorney Bergin in his opinion that the Mayor has not the right to veto the tax levy of $2 25 recently adopted by the Solid Eight of the Board of Supervisors.

In speaking on the subject yesterday Attorney A. P. Van Duzer said:

If the Board of Supervisors has the power to ignore the Mayor's veto, why cannot they abolish the Auditor or any other officer that stands between them and the treasury? The opinion of Mr. Bergin, as published in THE CALL, in which he advises the savings banks that the Mayor be brushed aside, is only a reiteration of what the Southern Pacific attorneys have been claiming in the fraudulent sale of street franchises.

The Board of Supervisors must levy the taxes, and they must do it on that particular day or not at all. Common-sense ought to have a chance to do something occasionally. Let us apply a little to this proposition. A hundred things might intervene to prevent the board from acting on any particular day. Unavoidable accidents might prevent a quorum. Will it be contended that it has lost all jurisdiction to act?

The Supreme Court answered that question in the case of the Spring Valley Water Works vs. the City and County of San Francisco, 82 California Reports, p. 286. It will be remembered that the board passed an ordinance on the last day of February, 1889, fixing water rates for the year ending June, 1890. Section 1 of article XIV of the constitution is as follows, after providing that the rates for water are to be fixed by an ordinance of the board, to wit: "Such ordinances or resolutions shall be passed in the month of February of each year, to take effect on the first day of July thereafter."

The ordinance passed in February, 1889, above referred to, was not the one desired by the Spring Valley corporation. Whereupon it brought suit, obtained an injunction and asked for a decree declaring the ordinance void and commanding the board to pass another one. February went by and summer passed into autumn, and it was not until January, 1890, that the Supreme Court rendered its decision on the appeal taken in the case. In that decision they declared that the ordinance passed was totally void and commanded the board to frame and pass another ordinance fixing rates for the year ending June 30, 1890, and this was eleven months after the time in which the constitution says the board shall pass act.

If anything is settled in law it is that when the law directs a thing to be done on a certain date the act required may be done at a subsequent time as of the day named, or, as expressed in legal phrase, nunc pro tunc.

The next point made by Mr. Bergen is that section 68 of the consolidation act is repealed by section 3174 of the Political Code, as amended by the last Legislature. Now, the only amendment to that section ever made was to change the time of the levy from the third Monday in June to the same date in September. Yet the Mayor's signature has been required to these orders.

It is very evident that the Legislature did not intend that section 3714 of the Political Code should repeal any part of the section of the consolidation act quoted. If they did they would have said so. The law does not allow the repeals of statute by implication. "If the two statutes are repugnant the court must reconcile them, if possible." A column might be filled with extracts from decisions of our Supreme Court showing that they have established the doctrine—if anything can be established—that laws can only be repealed in two ways. First, by so declaring a repeal in the act, and, second, when the two acts are so inconsistent that the courts cannot reconcile them, and the manifest intent is apparent that the later act was intended to take the place of the first.

THE STOCK MARKET.

The Gold Hill stocks were very weak yesterday at a marked decline. Challenge dropped from 95c to 80c and Confidence from $2 70 to $2 30, sales in both being large. An improvement in the Ophir mine sent that stock from $1 80 up to $1 95, but it dropped back again to $1 70. Sierra Nevada was stronger at $1 05, and Con. Cal. & Va. was steady at $2 80, as the best figures. Best & Belcher advanced to $1 20, but fell back again. The other stocks showed no particular changes, but the day was a lively one for trading.

After the boards adjourned there was a rally in Potosi, which advanced to 70c under sales of 4200 shares. The other stocks were quieter, but steady.

NOTES.

The Pacific Transfer Company paid a dividend of 50 cents per share yesterday.

In the Occidental Consolidated mine quartz with bunches of pay ore is showing in the bottom of the winzes below the 550 level.

In the Alta mine a new east crosscut has been started near the face of the north drift on 825 level.

The yield of the Overman mine for the past week was five tons of ore, the average assay of which was $55 15 per ton.

In the Con. Cal. & Va., on the 1100 level, the upraise started in the main north lateral drift at a point 66 feet in from the shaft station has been continued up with two compartments 21 feet; total 65 feet; top in porphyry showing narrow streaks of quartz and clay separations. Samples taken for assay show only nominal value. Have shipped to the Morgan mill 264 tons and 680 pounds of ore. The average assay value (per battery samples) of all the ore worked during the week (398 tons) was $27 53 per ton. Bullion shipped to the office in San Francisco, assay value, $11,203 30. Bullion on hand in assay office (clean up), assay value, $14,000. Are making repairs on the 1500 and 1600 levels, in the way of keeping open the drifts for the circulation of air.

In the Hale & Norcross mine the streak of ore in No. 1 upraise above the 970 level is still holding as last reported, and they are preparing to start upraise 2 at a point 70 feet south of No. 1 on a streak of ore. They continue to stope ore above the intermediate level 30 feet below the 975. During the past week they extracted from all the workings 27 tons of ore, assaying per mining-car sample $65 52 per ton.

The Chollar mine shipped 39 tons of ore, assaying $24 07, to the Nevada mill during the past week, and the Potosi shipped 100 tons, assaying $43 11.

Work was resumed in the Andes mine last Monday, and the north drift from the west crosscut from the top of the upraise from the 420 level was extended 10 feet; total length, 70 feet. The face is in porphyry and streaks of quartz.

In the Ophir the usual prospecting work was done 80 feet above the sill floor of the 1465 level and in the old Central tunnel part of the mine. In the latter region it is officially stated that the west crosscut from the end of the northwest drift from the crosscut from the top of the upraise, 117 feet above the tunnel level, is looking better, and that the face is in a quartz formation assaying $2 to $8 per ton.

In the Sierra Nevada mine the upraise from the Layton tunnel level is up 23 feet, with the top in quartz and porphyry, and on the 900 level the north drift from east crosscut 3 from the main north lateral drift is in clay and porphyry.

BRUNSWICK LODE OPERATIONS.—Shaft 1 on Hale & Norcross ground near the Chollar north boundary has been sunk for a distance of 12 feet on the incline; formation of quartz and porphyry showing some value; total depth 137 feet. Shaft 2 on the boundary of the Con. California and Virginia and Best & Belcher mines has been sunk for a distance of 12 feet on the incline; total depth 89 feet, bottom in porphyry. Tunnel 1 on Savage ground, started at a point 75 feet north of Sutro tunnel shaft No. 3, has been extended 27 feet, passing through clay, porphyry and quartz; total length 322 feet.

BOARD SALES.

Following were the sales in the San Francisco Stock Board yesterday:

REGULAR MORNING SESSION COMMENCING AT 9:30

200 Alpha.....16	600 C C & V.2.80	750 Mexican..79
800 Andes.....58	400 Conf.....2.60	200 78
500 Belcner...62	150 ....2.55	100 Occidtl....20
500 B & B...1.15	100 ....2¼	10 Ophir...1.95
200 ....1.20	150 ....2.45	300 ....1.90
300 Bodie.....40	1300 Con Imp.05	1000 ....1.85
400 Bullion....21	150 Crown Pt.58	100 ....1.80
300 Caleda....14	400 G & C.....58	700 Ovrmn....25
200 15	100 H&N....1.65	600 Potosi ....[illegible]
300 Chalge....90	300 Julia.....03	500 Savage.....45
2000 86	200 Justice....09	750 S Nev...1.05
400 87	500 L Wash....03	650 Union.....69
150 Chollar...61	200 Mex.......80	700 Y Jacket..57

AFTERNOON SESSION—2:30.

250 Andes.....56	200 CC&V. 2.70	600 Savage....45
200 Belcner...62	200 G & C.....55	100 44
500 B & B..1.10	100 H&N...1.65	300 Seg Bel....11
700 Challge...83	300 Kentck....15	100 S Nev...1.05
200 84	400 Mex.......78	100 ....1.00
400 Chollar...64	200 Ophir...1.70	400 Union C..69
700 63	100 ....1¾	100 Yel Jack..52
150 Confd...2.40	600 Overmn...23	1100 53
100 ....2.45	400 24	

Following were the sales in the Pacific Stock Board yesterday:

REGULAR SESSION—10:30.

300 Alpha.....16	400 Chal C....82	400 Mexican..79
400 15	300 80	300 78
400 Alta......12	400 Chollar...60	800 Occidtl....21
200 Andes....61	100 62	300 20
350 60	300 CC&V..2.80	800 Ophir...1.90
400 58	400 ....2¾	400 ....1⅞
400 57	200 ....2.70	150 ....1.82½
300 56	900 Confid...2⅛	300 ....1.80
200 Belcher...64	200 ....2.47½	300 Ovrmn....25
300 63	400 ....2.45	600 24
200 62	300 ....2.40	300 23
600 B & B...1⅛	200 ....2.35	400 Potosi 66
200 Bodie.....42	200 ....2.30	1000 Savage...44
600 41	1000 Con Imp.04	500 Scorpion..05
900 40	2000 05	400 S B & M..10
900 Bullion...22	1600 C N Y...03	900 S Nev...1.05
800 21	500 C Point....53	400 ....1.07½
300 Bulwer ...10	400 52	400 ....1.10
600 Caledonia.14	500 Exchqr...06	400 ....1.00
400 Chal.......97	600 G & C.....57	500 Sil Hill....04
300 96	200 H&N...1.65	800 Union 68
300 95	500 Julia......03	200 67
600 88	800 Justice....09	500 Utah......10
700 87	400 10	800 Y Jacket..60
500 86	600 Kentk.....15	300 59
900 85	500 L Wash....03	400 58
500 84	200 Mexican..82	500 56
800 83	600 81	200 55

AFTERNOON SESSION—2:30.

400 Alpha.....15	500 Crown P..51	50 Ophir....1¾
500 Alta......12	800 Chollar...62	250 ....1.77½
200 Andes....55	400 61	300 Potosi....67
200 Belcher...61	250 CC&V2.72½	800 Seg Bel...12
200 B&B.1.07½	400 G & C....57	350 S Nev...1.00
300 Bodie.....40	200 H&N....1⅝	200 ....1.02½
500 Bullion...20	500 Kentck...15	400 ....1.05
300 Bulwer....10	400 Mexican..68	300 Union 67
1000 Chal.....80	500 Mono.....14	500 Utah......10
600 Confid..2.30	400 Overmn..24	400 Y Jacket..54

CLOSING QUOTATIONS.

MONDAY, Sept. 23—4 P. M.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
Alpha Con.....	13	15	Jackson........	15	—
Alta............	10	12	Julia...........	02	04
Andes..........	55	57	Justice.........	08	09
Belcher........	61	—	Kentuck.......	14	15
Best & Belcher	1.10	1.15	Lady Wash....	02	03
Benton Con....	35	—	Mexican.......	77	79
Bodie..........	40	42	Mono	—	13
Bullion........	21	22	Mt. Diablo.....	15	—
Bulwer.........	10	12	Nevada Queen.	—	05
Caledonia......	13	14	Occidental.....	—	22
Challenge Con.	84	85	Ophir..........	1.70	1.75
Chollar.........	64	65	Overman	24	25
Con. Cal. & Va.	2.70	2.75	Potosi..........	70	71
Con. Imperial.	04	05	Savage.........	44	45
Confidence.....	2.40	2.50	Seg. Belcher...	10	11
Con. New York.	02	—	Sierra Nevada	1.00	1.05
Crown Point...	52	53	Scorpion.......	05	—
EastSierra Nev	—	05	Silver Hill.....	03	04
Exchequer.....	05	06	Silver King....	—	20
Eureka Con....	05	—	Syndicate......	—	04
Gould & Curry.	55	57	Union Con.....	69	70
Hale & Norcrs.	1.60	1.65	Utah...........	10	11
Iowa...........	—	04	Yellow Jacket.	54	56

STOCK AND BOND EXCHANGE.

MONDAY, Sept. 23—2 P. M.

UNITED STATES BONDS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
U S 4s coup..	111½	—	U S 4s reg...	110½	—

MISCELLANEOUS BONDS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
Cal-stCble5s.	110	—	Do, 2d iss 6s..	101	—
Cal Elec L 6s	107¼	109	P & O Ry 6s..	110	120
Cntra C W 5s	—	100¾	P & Ch Ry 6s.	97½	101
Dpnt-st ex-cp	77	95	Pwl-st RR 6s.	—	116½
EdsnL&P 6s.	106⅞	107⅞	Reno, WL&L	102	105
F&CH RR6s	103	—	RiverWCo 6s	—	100
Geary-stR5s.	99½	102	SF&NPRR5s	102½	—
LosAng L 6s.	—	—	SPRRAriz 6s	97	98½
Do.Gnted.6s.	—	102½	SPRR Cal 6s.	114¼	115¼
Mkt-stCble6s	123⅛	124	SPRR Cal 5s.	87½	100
NevCNgR8s.	—	102	Do, 1 con gtd.	87½	100
N P C R R 6s.	100	—	SPBrRCal6s.	—	100
Ny R Cal 6s..	102	104	SV Water 6s..	121	121½
N Ry Cal 5s..	—	—	SV Water 4s..	99⅞	—
Oak Gas 5s..	104	—	StktnG&E 6s	102	105
Do, 2d iss 5s..	104	—	SunstT&T 6s	—	103
Omnibus 6s..	120	—	Sutter-stR5s.	110½	112½
PacRollMbs.	102	—	VisaliaWC6s	—	92

WATER STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
Contra Costa.	—	61	San Jose.....	—	100
Marin Co....	50	—	Sprng Valley	100¼	100¾

GAS STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
Capital.......	—	39¾	PacificLight.	45¼	46
Central.......	95	—	SanFrancsco	70½	70¾
Oak G L & H.	46⅜	—	Stockton.....	18	23
Pac Gas imp.	77⅛	78½			

INSURANCE STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
FiremansFd.	157½	—	Sun...........	55	—

COMMERCIAL BANK STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
AmerB&TC.	—	—	LondonP&A.	126	127½
Anglo-Cal...	50	56	London&SF.	—	31
Bank of Cal..	228½	—	Merch Ex...	12½	—
Cal SD&TCo.	53	55½	Nevada......	—	—
FirstNationl.	178	—	Sather B Co..	—	—
Grangers....	—	—			

SAVINGS BANK STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
GerS&LCo..	1590	—	Sav & Loan..	—	150
HumbS&L.	1000	—	Security......	240	265
Mutual	—	42½	Union Trust.	826	840
SF SavUnion	489	505			

STREET RAILROAD STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
California....	104½	—	Oak.SL&Hav	—	100
Geary-st......	50	75	Presidio.....	—	13½
Market-st....	41	41¾	Sutter-st.....	—	—

POWDER STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
Atlantic D...	12	14½	Judson.......	—	—
California....	80	100	Vigorit.......	35c	—
Giant........	11½	12½			

MISCELLANEOUS STOCKS.

	Bid.	Asked.		Bid.	Asked.
Blk DCoalCo.	—	10	PacAuxFA..	1¾	—
Cal Cot Mills.	—	—	Pac Borax...	98	100
Cal Dry Dock	—	—	Pac I & N Co.	—	30
EdisonLight.	93⅞	94½	Pac Roll Mill	17½	—
GasConAssn.	—	—	Parf Paint Co	—	9
HawC&SCo..	6½	7	Pac Trans Co	—	26½
HutchSPCo..	11⅛	11½	PacT & T Co.	—	60
JudsonMfgC.	—	—	Sunset T & T.	30	45
MerExAssn.	100	110	United C Co..	—	25
OceanicSSCo	—	25			

MORNING SESSION.

Board—50 S F Gaslight, 70¾; $10,000 S V 4% Bonds, 99⅞.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Board—45 Edison Light & Power Co, 94; 25 Giant Powder Con, 11; 25 do, 11½; 50 Hutchinson S P Co, 11¼; 20 Pacific Gas Imp, 78; 100 Pacific Lighting Co, 45½; 5 S F Gaslight, 70¾. Street—50 S V Water, b 3, 100½.

IROQUOIS OF THE FORTIETH.

They Hold a Meeting and Elect Officers and Committees.

The Branch Iroquois Club of the Fortieth Assembly District held a meeting last evening at Franklin Hall, on Fillmore street, near Bush. The meeting was called to order by Robert Haight, temporary chairman. In the election of officers L. F. Manzer was chosen permanent chairman, Henry Brandenstein secretary, and W. J. Riordan treasurer.

A committee on finance was appointed by the chairman consisting of Robert Haight, Robert Ferral, M. C. Hassett, T. P. Riordan and C. D. Wheat.

The primary election laws were read and explained to the club, and the members exhorted to join in closer organization.

The Outcome of Two Small Fires.

The premises of John Fer at 28 and 28½ Welsh street were damaged by fire to the extent of $400 early yesterday morning. An alarm was turned in from box 63 and the Fire Department soon had the blaze under control. The premises of Annie Greeny at 26 and 26½ Welsh street were later on found to be in a blaze, and before it was put out damage to the extent of $350 was done. The cause of the original fire is unknown.

REVERENCE IS RELEGATED.

Rev. J. A. Cruzan's Address on the Trend of Religious Thought.

ILL-TIMED JEST RESENTED.

What the Presbyterian Ministers' Union Thinks of Dr. McCosh of Princeton.

Rev. J. A. Cruzan, pastor of the Park Congregational Church, and one of the stalwarts of the Congregational Monday Club, addressed that club yesterday on "The Present Trend of Religious Thought." He said:

There was never before such a search for religious truth as to-day. There has been a recasting of statements, but not any unsettling of essential doctrines.

Christ is the great illuminating factor of the age. He, whom Isaiah called "The Desire of the Nations," was never so universally recognized as now.

Another marked tendency of the age is a belief in the fatherhood of God.

The question of duration of punishment is a burning one, continued Mr. Cruzan.

The attempt to inculcate the doctrine of eternal punishment is as futile in the light of present accepted truth as it is to try to dam the Niagara with straw.

The imminence of God is recognized now as never before.

Our little systems of dogma may need readjustment. The things that may be shaken are disturbed in order that those that cannot be shaken be recognized in their eternalness and universality.

Mrs. Cooper did not agree with the speaker in regard to George Eliot. She thought no irreligious thinker could write "The Choir Invisible."

"Sin is not self-inflicted," said Rev. Walter Freear.

Professor Foster said the statement that punishment was self-inflicted was one of those truths that is said to obscure other truths.

Rev. Mr. Harris doubted whether those tendencies presented by the paper are actual tendencies of present thought.

Dr. Pond said he was in hearty sympathy with the address from beginning to end.

Dr. W. D. Williams said the chief speaker had undoubtedly given expression to the present trend of religious thought.

Rev. W. H. Tubb thought George Eliot's novels and some others required recasting.

Deacon E. C. Williams said this was not an age of reverence. "The old woman" laws were honored more in the breach than the observance. He referred to the ordinance against bicycle-riding on some of the Oakland streets being disregarded.

Here some one made a jocose allusion to theological professors violating that ordinance, and Professor Foster protested that they did not.

Rev. Joseph Rowell thought the idea of the fatherhood of God was permitted to absorb and exclude others, and when so considered was fallacious.

In closing the discussion, Mr. Cruzan said there was as good authority as Saint John for the doctrine, "God is love."

Presbyterian Union.

Rev. F. S. Brush of Alameda addressed the Presbyterian Ministerial Union on the subject of "The Personality and Teachings of Dr. McCosh of Princeton."

Commenting upon the appearance of the departed president of the great theological school, he said: "He looked the brainy and brawny Scot he was."

"Dr. McCosh was in sympathy with the intellectual life of the day, though not always agreeing with all the details of it."

Rev. Duncan Munro's sense of humor overcame his hereditary Presbyterian reverence for the names in the denominational annals. He made what was considered an irrelevant remark about McCosh rhyming with "bosh" and "gosh."

Mr. Brush promptly expressed his indignation at an affront offered to himself and the memory of Dr. McCosh.

Mr. Munro expressed contrition for the jest if it was ill-timed.

Dr. Noble said he owed much to the teachings of Dr. McCosh, and Dr. Hodge and Rev. E. E. Clark spoke in a similar vein.

Methodist Preachers' Meeting.

There was an informal discussion of church reports at the Methodist preachers' meeting. Arrangements were made to secure a floral piece to be sent to the home of Dr. John Coyle for the funeral of his son, and appropriate resolutions of condolence were adopted.

Dr. Wythe will read a paper next week on "The Psychology of Regeneration."

The Clericus.

Rev. W. A. M. Breck read a "Plea for Unity in Parish Work" at the meeting of the Clericus.

Visiting Missionaries.

Miss Silber, Miss Babbitt and Rev. Mr. and Mrs. Partch, en route to China and Japan, will address the Board of Occidental Missions on Monday.

Baptist Ministers.

The Baptist Ministerial Union discussed plans for meetings at the various Baptist churches early in November, when General J. T. Morgan, secretary of the Board of Baptist Home Missions, and W. C. Woods, Pacific Coast secretary of the same, will present their work.

Sold the Old Church.

The board of directors of the Baptist State Convention yesterday executed a deed for the transfer of the old church property at Nevada City to Edwin T. R. Powell. The building is forty years old, and services in it have been discontinued. The building will be converted into soda works. The purchase price, $1000, will be applied upon the indebtedness of the convention.

Memorial Church Improved.

The Memorial Presbyterian Church was much improved by its new paper and frescoing, and its members looked upon the improvements with pride at the service Sunday. A new organ was also appreciated.

Missionary Meeting.

The Oakland district meeting of the Chester-street Methodist Church will be held in the Chester-street Methodist Church on Friday.

Evangelist Yatman in the City.

Evangelist Charles Yatman, who is making a tour around the world, will conduct a two weeks' revival at Central Methodist Church, this City, commencing on the 2d prox. He will sail for New Zealand on the 17th prox. He expects to spend this week in the Sierras.

McLEAN'S DIVORCE.

Judge Hebbard Issued the Decree on the Ground of Cruelty.

Anthony McLean, who made Evangelist Watt the corespondent in his suit for divorce from Carrie McLean, received his decree of separation yesterday, but on the ground of the defendant's extreme cruelty.

The community property is divided, one-half to each, and the custody of the children is to be determined by Judge Hebbard when the decision is signed.

A Bad Investment.

Louis T. Engle, 1237 Twenty-fifth street, told Judge Conlan yesterday that he had been swindled by James M. Jackson, 6 Eddy street. He said he was induced by Jackson to pay him $150 for an interest in certain patent medicines on the promise that the income to each would be $80 per month. He found that Jackson had deceived him and he wanted him arrested for obtaining money under false pretenses. A warrant for Jackson's arrest was issued.

NEW TO-DAY—DRY GOODS.

SEVEN EXTRA SPECIALS

FOR

To=Day's Trade!

In connection with the EXCEPTIONALLY CHOICE VALUES presented throughout our Mammoth New Fall Stock we offer to-day's specials

At Bargain Prices!

TIES! TIES! TIES!

At 15 Cents.

75 dozen ALL-SILK TECK AND FOUR-IN-HAND SCARFS, satin lined, in a variety of new colors, worth 25c, 35c and 50c, will be offered at 15c each.

HANDKERCHIEFS!

At 2 Cents Each.

300 dozen MISSES' AND CHILDREN'S COLORED BORDERED HEMSTITCHED HANDKERCHIEFS, regular price 50c per dozen, will be offered at 2c each.

At 3 Cents Each.

200 dozen LADIES' COLORED BORDERED HEMSTITCHED HANDKERCHIEFS, regular price 75c per dozen, will be offered at 3c each.

GLOVES! GLOVES!

At 60 Cents.

40 dozen LADIES' 6-BUTTON LENGTH MOUSQUETAIRE CHAMOIS SKIN GLOVES, in white and natural color, regular value $1, will be closed out at 60c a pair.

At 65 Cents.

550 dozen LADIES' BIARRITZ KID GLOVES (special purchase), in dark and medium colors, former price $1, will be closed at 65c a pair.

At 90 Cents.

650 dozen LADIES' 5 AND 7 HOOK KID GLOVES, improved Foster hook (special purchase), in colored and black, former prices $1 25 and $1 50, will be closed out at 90c a pair.

NOTE.—Every pair guaranteed and if not satisfactory money refunded.

CORSETS! CORSETS!

At $1.00.

LADIES' CORSETS, made of fine English coutil, sateen striped, long waist and high bust, with patent loop eyelets, perfect French model, regular price $1 50, will be closed out at $1 each.

J. J. O'Brien & Co.

MURPHY BUILDING,

Market Street, corner of Jones,

SAN FRANCISCO.

'TWIXT EARTH AND HEAVEN

A Farmer's Strange Loves for His Dead and Living Wives.

A Letter Found After Death Reveals the Motive That Prompted It.

OAKLAND OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO CALL, 908 Broadway, Sept. 23.

The mystery surrounding the death of Albert Schultis, who was found dead in his home at Dublin, near Haywards, last week, has been cleared up. The deceased ended his life by taking strychnine, but as every one supposed he was as contented as he appeared, much surprise was expressed at his death. Last February he married his deceased wife's sister, and to all outward appearance he was a contented and happy man.

A letter was found yesterday written by Schultis in which he tells very plainly three reasons that induced him to end his life. He seemed as anxious to meet his departed wife in the great unknown as to remain with her sister on earth. He also kept to himself the terrible secret that he feared he was going insane, and lastly, he had debts to meet and nothing to pay with.

SATURDAY MORNING, Sept. 14.

O God! This is my last day on earth alive! The boys all want their money and I have it not to pay and I would rather meet death than owe and not pay. O God! have mercy on me. My head is so heavy, and if people only knew how I suffered they would not blame me. Now the court will have to settle all business. I hope it will do justice to all. My darling, my darling, how hard for you to be left among strangers! You will have friends that will be good to you. It is better that I die as I do and harm no one else. Oh, how glad I am to go. You, my darling, have kept me for months and I have kept this feeling in my head from you all. Now, I must not hurt any one—only myself. O God! how I have suffered the past three years. I have hid it all I could, till I cannot any more. God will have mercy on me. I have two pictures in my pocket—one of my darling here on earth, the other of my darling in heaven. I know, O God, that I shall meet them there—O God, grant that I may. I have asked and prayed for wisdom and light, and I believe God will receive me. Oh, my darling, so hard for you! I hope all will be kind to you. Good-by, all—be kind to my darling Sarah. O God, forgive me and take me! May I see my darling in heaven. O God! yes have mercy on me. O God, have mercy on me and point out some way that is right for me. Something tells me to take my life. O God, is it right? I have been tempted many times to commit suicide since Jennie died, and have done all I could to prevent it. I should have gone months ago, only for leaving my dear one. Oh, how I have prayed for wisdom down on the creek, and I believe God has heard my prayers. I have lived months just for you, but my head feels so I can't stay here on earth. O God, protect and keep my Sarah from all harm, and may the people be kind to the dear one. Something tells me to leave this earth, and I must go; so good-by to all. God will be with me, and I hope to meet my darling Jennie in heaven, and Sarah you will come soon, God bless you. Oh, how I love you. Now let the court settle up my business. There is enough to pay all if honestly settled and some left for my darling; good-by all. Don't think I fear to die—oh, I have wanted to go so long, and now the time has come. Oh, my darling, don't let it make you grieve; take care of yourself. It is better I go as I do for fear I might do worse. God will forgive me. Oh, I will meet you in heaven—yes, yes I will! Good-by all—the last. A. S.

Albert Schultis was born September 14, 1828, in New York State, and wrote his farewell letter on his sixty-seventh birthday. The ranch on which he had resided for thirty years was incumbered for $10,000, but is worth three times that amount. About two years ago his wife died, and he married her sister last Februray.

REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS.

Henry Pedlina to James Pedlina, lot on N line of McAllister street, 131:3 E of Masonic avenue, E 25 by N 137:6; $10.

Samuel Williamson to John Center, lot on E line of Castro street, 26:8 S of Hill, S 20 by E 80; $10.

Evan E. and Ann Jones to Henry Kohler, lot on E line of Kearny street, 83:6 N of Green, N 54 by E 108; $10.

Belinda Duffy to Alicia Duffy, lot on W line of Hyde street, 114:7 S of Vallejo, S 22:11 by W 91:8; $10.

Thomas Jennings to Mary A. Jennings, lot on N line of Pacific street, 114:6 W of Taylor, W 23 by N 60; gift.

Same to Hannah Jennings, lot on S line of Pleasant street, 114:1 E of Jones, E 23:5 by S 60; gift.

Mary E., James F. and Peter J. Creegan to Mary Creegan, lot on SE corner Stevenson street, 421:11 SW of Sixth, SW 30 by SE 75; also lot on SE corner of Sansome and Broadway, S 50 by E 40; also lots 41 to 45 in block 250, Haley and O'Neil Tract; $1.

Henning and Henrietta Thode to Union Brewing Company, lot on NE corner of Solano and Florida streets, N 150 by E 100; stock in corporation.

Congregational Associates to Richmond Congregational Church, lot on SW corner of Clement street and Seventh avenue. S 75 by W 120; $——.

John Boyd to Solomon Getz, lot on W line of Eighteenth avenue, 125 S of Eighth street, S 25 by W 120; $10.

Charles Oswald to Daniel Sullivan, lot on SW corner of V street and Forty-first avenue, W 240 by S 600; $10.

Uno Ovlin to Swan Halverson, lot on N line of Sagamore street, 25 E of Orizaba, E 46:8 by N 125, block C, Railroad Homestead; $10.

Hannah Oram to John Oram, lots 25 and 26, Holiday Map A; gift.

Laurel Hill Cemetery Association to Samuel H. Kent, lot 2892, on NE corner of Live Oak and Greenwood avenue; $125.

ALAMEDA COUNTY.

Nellie F. Byrnes of Oakland to Joseph Phipps of Oakland, lot on W line of Grove street, 155 S of Thirty-fourth, S 45.92, W 117.83, N 34.73, E 116.56 to beginning, being portion of plat 10, Rancho V. and D. Peralta, Oakland; $10.

George L. Voice to Fred G. Weston of Oakland, lot on S line of Jones street, 290 W of Telegraph avenue, W 60 by S 100, being portion of lots 12 and 14, corrected map of Jones Tract, quitclaim, Oakland; $10.

Bernhard E. Everson to James Kelly of Berkeley, lots 11, 12 and 13, block 54, tract B, Berkeley L. and T. I. Association, Berkeley; $10.

James Mowat of Los Angeles to Maggie Mowat of Los Angeles, lots 57, 58, 59, block B, amended map Christiania Tract, Berkeley; gift.

S. B. Rountree to Albert S. Woodbridge of Oakland, lots 14 and 15, block 25, resubdivision of Smith's subdivision of Mathews' Tract, Berkeley; also lots 27 to 30, resubdivision of block B, Prospect Hill Tract, Berkeley Township; $1550.

Frederick Leuenberger to Emil Leuenberger, lot on N line of Clinton avenue, 100 W of Willow street, W 50 by N 150, being lot 7, block N, lands adjacent to Encinal, Alameda; $10.

Thomas Shannon (by attorney) to L. D. Manning of Oakland, lot on N line of Thirtieth street, 315 W of West, W 50 by N 140, being lot 32, block 2033, Rowland Tract, Oakland; $5.

George and Emily M. Bartholomew to Michael Y. Stewart, lot on S corner Sixth avenue and East Eleventh street, SW 114 by SE 150, block 20, Clinton, subject to a mortgage to Oakland Bank of Savings for $2000, East Oakland; $10.

J. J. Lerri of Oakland to Alexander McAdam of Oakland, lot 14, block E, Christiani Tract, Berkeley; $10.

Joseph and Augusta Herzog to Robert O. Baldwin of Oakland, lot on NE corner of Felton and Baker streets, N 80 by E 125, being lots 16 and 17, block 8, Herzog Tract, Golden Gate, quitclaim, Oakland Township; $5.

Gustave L. Bresse et al. of San Francisco to same, same, quitclaim deed, Oakland Township; $10.

John Fearn (executor estate of John W. Crawford) to same, lot on NE corner of Felton and Baker streets, E 125, N 80, W 80, W 46, S 69.16 to beginning, being lot 17 and portion of lot 16, block C, Herzog Tract, Oakland Township; $350.

Henry B. and Louise Berryman to Hugh H. Dobbins of Berkeley, lot on W line of Spruce street, 120 N of Rose, N 7, W 200, S 7, E to beginning, quitclaim deed, Berkeley; $75.

W. E. and Erminia Dargie of Oakland to T. F. Tracy of San Francisco, lot 241, Rose Tract, Brooklyn Township; $5.

Mrs. M. A. Hall of Oakland to Jacob A. Hall of Oakland, lot on E line of Bray avenue, 1310.90 S of old county road Oakland to San Leandro, S 56.69 by E 175, being portion of lot 47, Bray Tract, Brooklyn Township; gift.

Catherine O'Brien to Timothy M. and Ann Doyle, lot on S line of Ward street, 125 W of Watkins, W 50 by S 175, being lot H and portion of lot G, block 3, town of San Leandro, Eden Township; $10.

F. R. Frotcher of Alameda to Frank G. Brown of Alameda, undivided half interest in 1.50 acres on N line of Second avenue from which the SE corner lands of Sophia W. Bell and John Gilliland bears NW 2.27 chains distant, thence NE 5.98 chains, SE 2.50 chains, SW 5.98 chains, NW 2.52 chains to beginning, being portion of San Lorenzo Rancho, Eden Township; $10.

John L. and Johanna J. Shiman to county of Alameda, right of way over beginning at a stone monument, set at S corner lands of Shannon, thence NW 29.79 chains, NE 9.49 chains, SE 45.54 chains, SW 39.24 chains to beginning, containing 130.83 acres (for sewer purposes) Eden Township; $100.

William Gibbons to Frank Enos, lot on E line of Ellsworth street, where same is intercected by N line of an alleyway extending to Vallejo street, N 67, E 144, S 60, W 144 to beginning, block A, town of Mission San Jose, Washington Township; $5.

Builders' Contracts.

Mary Gallivey to J. Bucher, to erect a two-story building on S line of Jackson street, 82:6 W of Walnut; $2920.

Mrs. F. Held to Thomas Kinneal, to erect a two-story building on S line of Broadway, 137:6 W of Fillmore street; $5820.

Patrick Gartlend to James McConahey, to erect a one-story building on N line of Twenty-third street, 375 W of Douglass; $1325.