MADE A NEW RECORD

Bald of Buffalo Went a Mile on a Quarter Track in 2:04.

FLIERS ON THE WHEELS.

Successful Opening of the Three-Days' Meet at Los Angeles.

KISER CAUSED A BAD "MIX."

Wells Was Tangled Up With the Riders, but He Secured Third Place.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., Nov. 21.—The great three-days' meet of the L. A. W. opened most auspiciously to-day, a large and fashionable audience being in attendance.

Bald of Buffalo captured another world's record, winning from Murphy of New York the mile open on a quarter mile track in 2:04. This is the world's record for a four-lap track.

The starters in the big event were Bald, Murphy, Kiser, Wells, Randall and Cooper, and the pacing was by Ulbricht and Hatton. On the second lap Kiser, trying to jump the tandem, fell on the bank, Cooper went over his wheel, and big Wells, the San Francisco giant, rode over Cooper's back, while Randall of Rochester in dodging the other three went clear over the bank. Wells secured another wheel and won third place.

Murphy and Bald raced for the tandem at the start, but the Buffalo man got it and Murphy fell right in behind him. The way Ulbricht and Hatton sent the Rambler tandem over the track was wonderful to behold. Several times Bald and Murphy had all they could do to stay with it. On the last lap Murphy started his usual spurt and went past Bald, but after running neck and neck in the home stretch Bald passed him and finished half a wheel to the good in the wonderful time of 2:04.

The only other class B race was the two-mile lap, which was won by Emil Ulbricht, the "Flying Dutchman," in 4:56 with seventeen points. W. Hatton was second with thirteen points, and Campbell of Spokane third with six points.

First heat, one mile, novice, won by E. G. Kuster, W. W. Imbler second, Guy Rodgers third, Jacob Olsen, R. R. C., fourth. Time, 2:29 1-5.

Second heat, mile, novice, won by W. P. Bennett, M. A. Cassanave second, A. Arvizu, Roamers R. C., third, L. Lawton fourth. Time, 2:32 1-5.

First heat, mile, open, class B, won by E. C. Bald, Buffalo Press C. C.; Charles M. Murphy, Brooklyn, second; Emil Ulbricht, Los Angeles, third. Time, 2:18 4-5.

Second heat, won by Earl Kiser, Dayton, Ohio; Tom Cooper, Detroit, Mich., second; W. A. Burke, Los Angeles, third. Time, 2:29 1-5.

Third heat, won by W. M. Randall, Rochester, N. Y.; C. S. Wells, San Francisco, second; H. E. McCrea, Los Angeles, third; J. M. Campbell, Spokane, fourth. Time, 2:34 1-5.

Final, mile novice, won by W. P. Bennett E. G. Kuster, R. R. C., second. Time, 2:25 1-5.

First heat, mile post, won by W. A. Taylor, H. Freeman second. Time, 2:35 1-5.

Second heat, won by Hardy Downing of San Jose; C. Hewett, Pasadena, second; W. Yeoman, Los Angeles, third. Time, 2:36 2-5.

Third heat, won by F. McFarland of San Jose; W. E. Delay, R. R. C., Los Angeles, second; E. L. Weaver, R. R. C., third. Time, 2:35 2-5.

Final mile post race, won by H. Freeman, B. C. W.; final lap, won by F. McFarland, S. J. R. C. Time, 2:23 2-5.

Final of mile open, class B, won by E. C. Bald of Buffalo; Charles M. Murphy, Brooklyn, second. Time, 2:04, the world's record for a quarter of a mile track.

Quarter-mile juvenile for five-year-olds, won by "Little Spot" Spooner of Chicago; "Little Crimson Rim" Knippenberg, Los Angeles, second. Time, 1:23, the world's record for five-year-olds.

Two-mile lap race, class B—First heat: W. W. Hatton and H. E. McCrea tied for first, J. M. Campbell third. Time, 2:19 1-5.

Second heat: Ulbricht and Terrill tied for first, F. G. Lacy third. Time, 2:26 3-5.

Third heat: Phil Kitchen, Los Angeles, and F. E. Shefski, Zion Wheel Club, Salt Lake City, tie for first; H. Slater, R. R. C., third. Time, 2:24 1-5.

Final won by E. Ulbricht, with 17 points; W. W. Hatton second, with 13 points; J. M. Campbell, S. A. A. C., third, with 8 points. Time, 4:56.

First heat, handicap, class A, won by W. E. Delay, R. R. C., 25 yards; W. B. Vaughn, C. W., 25 yards, second; W. Yeoman, 35 yards, third; D. E. Whitman, 15 yards, fourth; F. McFarland, S. J. R. C., scratch, fifth. Time, 2:24.

Second heat won by H. Freeman, B. C. W., 15 yards; H. B. Cromwell, 50 yards, second; E. L. Weaver, R. R. C., 25 yards, third; W. H. Taylor, D. W., 25 yards, fourth; C. Hewett, C. C. C., 35 yards, fifth. Time, 2:23 1-5. Final won by W. Yeoman, E. S. C. C., H. Cromwell second, H. Freeman, B. C. W., third. The rest bunched. Time, 2:23.

Following are the officers of the meet: Referee, H. C. F. Smith; clerk, J. A. Kelly; starter, Will Knippenberg; assistant clerks, Carl McStay, Frank Pitner, C. Cowan; umpires, D. C. McGarvin, C. E. Patterson, Ed Pauley, J. M. Russell; announcers, Wilbur F. Knapp, Fay Stephens; judges, E. A. Hornbrook, Dr. H. Bert Ellis, Dr. W. F. Kennedy, John E. Brink, C. C. Monaghan; surgeon, Dr. E. C. Manning; timers, W. E. Tyler, J. W. A. Off, E. E. Buckleton, L. E. Hickok; scorers, J. W. Lordbeer, Walter McStay, W. M. Jenkins, M. A. Baker, Phil Lyon.

HUNTINGTON AT SANTA MONICA.

Speaks Only Good Words for the Future Port of the South.

SANTA MONICA, CAL., Nov. 21.—C. P. Huntington and party reached here this evening at 5 o'clock in the special of the president, immediately going to Port Los Angeles, where they remained a few moments, returning here, where the train was sidetracked for the night.

Mr. Huntington is much pleased with the improvements here since his last visit, having only good words for the seaside city and future port of the southern part of the State. They will remain over night and part of to-morrow.

SUIT FOR SIXTEEN MILLION.

Order to Take Testimony in the Case Against the Alantic and Pacific.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M., Nov. 21.—The United States Trust Company of New York got an order from Judge Caldwell to-day against the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Company for reference to a master in chancery of the testimony and facts in the case.

The testimony will be largely taken in New York City. The claim of the bondholders amounts to $16,000,000.

Hale & Norcross Investigation.

CARSON, NEV., Nov. 21.—Attorneys in the Hale & Norcross case, who have been in this city several days investigating the relationship of the Bullion and Exchange Bank and the Mint with the Hale & Norcross mine, finished their labors last night and report everything all right and straight. Charges were made during the trial against the bank and its officials and they demanded an investigation, with the above result.

IRRIGATION COMPANY FAILED.

Citrus-Belt People Vote Themselves Out of Business.

SAN BERNARDINO, CAL., Nov. 21.—The Citrus-belt Irrigation district has voted itself out of existence by a vote of 14 to 1. The reason for the disorganization of this company is that it has no water and never voted bonds. But it has a debt of about $9000.

The San Francisco Savings Union has a mortgage on all the property, and for this reason will pay off all warrants which may be outstanding against the company on the basis of 50 cents on the dollar. But before the Savings Union will agree to pay any warrants all the creditors must agree to accept that percentage as full payment of their claims. The warrants are being placed in the San Bernardino National Bank to be held in escrow until all deposits are made.

AUBURN BOARD OF TRADE.

Organization Completed and Officers Elected.

AUBURN, CAL., Nov. 21.—A Board of Trade was organized here last night, with the following-named officers: President, Charles Van Norden; vice-presidents—S. M. Stevens, W. A. Freeman; secretary, W. A. Shepard; treasurer, D. W. Lubeck; executive committee—L. E. C. Jordan, James Borland, J. M. Lowell, George Allen, Fred Brye, J. C. Woodard, J. C. Safford.

The main object of the organization is the promotion of public enterprises.

THE DUCK-SHOOTING WAR

Cordelia Club Injunction Case Again on Trial at Suisun.

The Defense Offers No Evidence and Will Rely on the Plaintiffs' Weakness.

SUISUN, CAL., Nov. 21.—The case of the members of the Cordelia Shooting Club against forty-one defendants, which has been dragging along for a year in the Superior Court, came up again for further hearing before Judge Buckles to-day. It is of great importance to sportsmen, particularly those who shoot ducks over the marsh and overflowed lands about the bay.

In 1893 Kellogg, the president of the Cordelia Shooting Club, which is composed of ten wealthy San Franciscans, leased 4000 acres of the Chamberlain tract near Suisun, and last year fenced in 3000 acres. On this they posted notices forbidding trespassing or shooting over the land, but these warnings were not heeded.

When the Teal Club had its war with the Cordelia Club the former to spite the latter club invited all the local sportsmen down and told them that they could shoot all over any land about. The invitation was accepted and the visitors royally entertained. But when the two clubs patched up their differences the local sportsmen continued shooting over the preserves.

Last December Kellogg sued out a temporary injunction against all the trespassers whose names could be ascertained and asked that it be made permanent.

The trial of the case was begun several months ago and postponed on account of the sickness of one of the attorneys. At that time the direct evidence of Charles W. Kellogg (trustee) was introduced to show the facts alleged and the damage done.

On cross-examination to-day he was questioned as to what other parties had leases for other purposes on the Cordelia Club lands.

This indicated a point that will be made by the defense that while the Cordelia Club had the right under their lease to shoot on the grounds they had no right to prevent others; that, in fact, they were wanting in authority under the lease to prevent trespassing. It transpired from Mr. Kellogg's evidence that the bag of four members of the club on the first day's shooting this year was 120 birds, of which forty-two fell before the president's gun.

Captain Chittenden, gamekeeper of the Cordelia Club since 1881, testified as to the duties he and his several assistants had to perform, one of which was to keep people from trespassing, "poachers," he called them. Judge Gregory, for the defendants, objected to the use of the word poacher as an English importation. "That is what this whole concern is," he said, "an importation of English customs, and that is why we are fighting it."

Witness testified as to the particular defendants he had seen shooting on the grounds and as to the damage they did.

J. A. Johnson, one of the men employed by the Cordelia Club, testified, on cross-examination, that in many places the sloughs were navigable for yachts of considerable size. Similar questions were asked of the other witnesses.

The point to be made is that if a slough is navigable any one has a right to go on it and shoot, even if he has not the right to go on the adjacent land.

When the plaintiffs rested the action as to defendant, F. Prother, was dismissed.

The defense then stated that the only evidence they desired to offer was a lease for pasturage purpose of the Cordelia Club land to other parties. They are willing to rely upon the weakness of plaintiffs' evidence and the law.

Arguments were postponed till next Wednesday.

The defense will claim that the plaintiffs failed to prove a conspiracy between the defendants and that each was acting individually. They will also claim that while the Cordelia Club had a right to shoot over the ground, they had not acquired any right to prevent others under the lease.

Fatal Accident Near Guerneville.

SANTA ROSA, CAL., Nov. 21.—A peculiar fatal accident occurred near Guerneville yesterday. An Italian lumberman named Bassolti was cutting down a big tree. In falling the tree struck a stump that stood near. A piece of the stump was thrown up, striking Bassolti on the head, causing instant death. Bassolti was about 35 years of age and unmarried.

Robbers Traced at Redwood.

REDWOOD CITY, CAL., Nov. 21.—Sheriff McEvoy has traced the persons who robbed the Southern Pacific depot. They came up the creek in a boat and live across the bay. Arrests will be made.

An Echo From Humboldt.

Here is a brief letter that will show the opinion of one of George E. White's acquaintances:

BLOCKSBURG, Humboldt County, Cal., November 14, 1895.

To the Editor of the San Francisco Call—SIR: You are exposing one of the biggest murderers and robbers in this State. He keeps a band of assassins and perjurers around him all the time. Those who oppose you in this matter I have heard denounce him for everything they could lay their tongues to, and I was surprised to see their names signed to a paper exonerating him in a measure. There is plenty of material yet for you to write up on G. E. White of Covelo. He owns or controls nearly every one in Round Valley. Those he cannot buy are afraid of him, with a few exceptions, and none will oppose him. If they do he will do them up in some way. My flag floats at the masthead and I will never haul it down. Will you please send me THE CALL of the 21st of October, or the paper in which you published a piece about him. I would like a copy of all the papers that contain anything about him, for in self-defense I will be compelled to publish a piece myself. Clarence White has published a piece about me that is untrue and is apt to do me an injury, and will have to be straightened out. If he does not I will, through your paper, with your permission. I have THE CALL of November 4. Very truly yours,

D. T. WOODMAN.

THE COVELO MURDERS

A Protest Received From Friends of George E. White.

DENY ALL ACCUSATIONS.

The Littlefield Outrage Not Particularly Dealt With.

PRESSURE BROUGHT TO BEAR.

The Cattle King Characterizes "The Call's" Expose as "Absurd" and "Slanderous."

Some time ago THE CALL published a report of the lynching of Jack Littlefield in Round Valley in this State. The circumstances were of an unusual nature, and investigations made by representatives of this journal indicated the existence of an organized band of desperadoes in the mountains adjacent to Round Valley. It was difficult to fix the responsibility in all the unlawful occurrences that have marred the history of that part of the State, yet some of the dastardly deeds that have been done in the dark were brought to light.

So far as the statements heretofore published in THE CALL are concerned no explanation has yet been offered by any one implicated except by G. E. White, the so-called cattle king. His denial was general, yet, unsupported as it was by trustworthy proof, it could not be accepted as a credible presentation of his side of the controversy. His own prejudices have been known to sway him for so long that it was not to be supposed that he would be entirely unbiased.

Within the past few days two communications have been received by THE CALL in regard to the subject of the disclosures made just after the lynching of Jack Littlefield. These communications do not deal with the Littlefield outrage, but in a general way touch upon the past history of Round Valley, by implication throwing the blame for all the crimes of the past upon the shoulders of cattle-thieves and others, whose names are not given.

The most impressive document is from Carter Rohrbough, attorney-at-law, at Covelo. It is altogether a type-written paper, the letter transmitting the same being as follows:

CARTER ROHRBOUGH,
Attorney-at-Law, Covelo, Cal.
November 12, 1895.

To the Editor of the San Francisco Call—SIR: I have been requested by numerous parties to forward to you for publication the inclosed protest, which speaks for itself. It is hoped that you will publish it. If not it will be forwarded to other papers. Respectfully,

CARTER ROHRBOUGH.

Although the "protest" contains allegations unjustly reflecting on THE CALL'S representative who visited Round Valley and obtained from residents there the particulars that were given to the public, yet the "protest" is here printed exactly as written in order that those who wish to go on record in this matter may have an opportunity to do so. As THE CALL speaks for all it cannot be said that these signers have been denied a hearing, however discourteous they have been in wording their protest. In fact, some of the signers are not to be held accountable for the sentiments there expressed, as from them THE CALL has obtained some of the facts heretofore published in these columns. It is probable that very few of them would have written such a diatribe, yet when urged to sign it by influential citizens they have not had the courage to refuse. It is a frequent saying in Round Valley that it is good policy to follow the old rule, namely, "When in Rome act as Romans would act." Following is the document sent by Mr. Rohrbough.

It may be mentioned, in passing, that the Rohrboughs, who appear to be plentifully sprinkled through the document, are near relatives of George E. White, and that they have never failed to do everything in their power to advance his material interests.

COVELO, Cal., October 29, 1895.

To the Editor of the San Francisco Call—SIR: There has appeared in THE CALL issue of the 20th to the 24th inst. a series of articles purporting to be a true history of the troubles in Round Valley, and the issue of the 22d editorially stamps it as a true statement. We ask space in your columns to say a more false and slanderous mass of stuff has never appeared in the press of this State than you have published to the world.

You say that you sent a special correspondent up here to get the facts of the matter. If so, he, being a stranger to these people, why did he not call on Judge McGarvey, Sam Wheeler, Mart Beatchtel, Senator Seawell, J. A. Cooper, John Buckingham and others, who are known to be among the best men in the State, and get the names of men living here of standing and unimpeachable veracity if you wished to get a true statement of the facts of the matter? But, no: your reporter came up here, called on a saloon-keeper, who has only been here a short time, and whose place is the resort of the parties whom the good citizens have been trying to punish, for information in regard to our troubles, and his actions demonstrated that he did not look for the truth, but to forward some ulterior purpose which you impute to the citizens of Round Valley. Would the people and stockmen have paid hundreds of dollars out of their pockets and spent their time to benefit one man? No, sir.

Fifty-nine citizens and ranchers signed a statement, which appeared in the Dispatch of Ukiah, which you did not publish; but you attempt to make heroes out of men who have committed every crime in the decalogue. Every attempt that has been made to punish them has been met by the vile slanders you have indorsed, and the Ukiah Press has circulated reports that are false about this section and which they knew to be false, and they have upheld the thieves and used every effort to break down the prosecution.

You well know that there are large stock-ranges in this and adjoining States; that stockmen have trouble with organized bands of stockthieves. Now any man who is well acquainted with this section and is not either a liar or a fool will tell you that we have such a band here and all attempts to exterminate them so far have failed.

We hardly think that you would give so much space to misrepresent the truth, and ask you to make an effort to get at the truth of the matter. All we ask is the truth and when an honest effort is made to get at it we are sure that you will withdraw the statements you have made and which have done incalculable damage to this section of the State if you wish to do us justice.

Joel Eveland, H. R. Spaulding, Justices of the Peace; G. W. Cummings, G. R. Redwine, constables; J. H. Rohrbough, assistant postmaster; J. S. Redwine, attorney; F. M. Thomson, David Thomson, W. Henley, J. S. Rohrbough, Thomas B. Henley, stock-raisers; J. Wattenberger, Supervisor; L. J. Welch, liveryman; O. A. Dingman, Peter Petore, stock-raisers; A. C. Perry, butcher; Louis Lobree, merchant; Frank Hauck, clerk; C. H. English, B. F. Hall, H. T. Thomson, James Riffe, R. F. Bainbridge, Thomas E. Long, Charles Hurt, William H. Grist, stock-raisers; C. M. Brown, manager of United States sawmill; H. M. Hall, J. J. Quarner, farmers; J. W. Grist, Joseph Bennett, stock-raisers; J. M. Smith, pastor Presbyterian church; T. L. Young, schoolteacher; Ed Gibson, Lindley Williamson, George O. Grist, P. A. Reuf, stock-raisers and farmers; P. B. Westerman, teacher; Dryden Lacock, stock-raiser; Perry C. Hall, P. K. O'Ferrall, Jacob Updegraff, D. P. English, William H. Card, farmers; John T. Ham, stock-raiser; Charles E. Brown, farmer; J. G. Carner, shoemaker.

State of California, County of Mendocino, } ss.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the written matter and the names of persons appended thereto which was submitted to me for inspection so that I could make this certificate.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 12th day of November, 1895.

[Seal] C. W. ROHRBOUGH, Notary Public.

Soon after the receipt of the document from Mr. Rohrbough another epistle of similar import was delivered at this office. It has the appearance of being written by a careful, honest man, who evidently believes what he writes, and it is therefore entitled to respectful consideration. The author of this letter is mistaken in some of his opinions, and in nothing more conspicuously than in jumping at the conclusion that an earnest letter authenticated by an honest signature would be unheeded by THE CALL. He need have no fear, either, that his identity will be revealed, though from current reports it would apparently be to his advantage for that fact to be published.

Several anonymous communications have been received from Round Valley, but they have been consigned to the waste basket, where all such nameless abominations belong. The letter to which reference is made reads as follows:

COVELO, Nov. 12.

To the Editor of the San Francisco Call—SIR: As an old subscriber and well wisher of your endeavors to make THE CALL an ideal and especially clean paper for the benefit of the people, and fully appreciating your success so far, and believing you would not willingly do any community an injustice, but realizing that you are liable like all human agencies to be misled and misinformed, I take the liberty of writing you in relation to the terrible articles published concerning Round Valley matters. I am a quiet citizen and have no part or interest in the matter only to have our citizens have their just dues, and no person is dictating or knowing of my writing.

The articles published go back thirty or forty years and relate all the reports and rumors of atrocities that have been related usually in as many ways as the number of narrators, and extend over Trinity and Mendocino counties. To go back and prove the truth in most instances has become an impossibility, and the citizens now protest against being held responsible for these crimes and rumors of crimes any more than San Francisco citizens are to be held for the misdeeds and rumors of misdeeds during and previous to the Vigilance Committee down to the crime of a century.

That unfortunate divorce suit, equally scandalous for both sides, has been a great annoyance to the people, nearly all being unwilling witnesses, and now the effort is being made to appear that all the citizens who protest against such injustice are terrorized by one man, the Goliath of the county. If he or anybody else is in the habit of hiring people to kill others, why are they not arrested? And what kind of people could be approached in that manner? It is perfectly evident all this outrageous matter is being rehashed and revamped in order to influence public opinion, and the courts, if possible, to get the alimony and money for lawyers, receivers and attaches of the divorce suit, they being indifferent entirely to the harm they are doing entire communities.

The sisters of this divorced woman have been more fortunate in getting their divorces without trouble or expense.

I am not on speaking terms with this Goliath, not on account of business transactions, but from a personal matter in which the public is not interested, and would willingly give my name only for a dislike to any public notoriety.

I do not expect you will heed this letter, but I hope you will stop and reflect whether you are doing a public good or unintentionally helping one side of the divorce suit and also helping the thieving part of the community to keep an entirely false impression before the country.

A number of law-abiding citizens have been endeavoring to detect and bring to justice cattle-thieves and are astonished to find they are stigmatized as White's men by those calling themselves anti-White. This is an utterly false impression, and the reason many do not join with the honest endeavor is the fear of antagonizing the thieving band and either losing their stock or their votes. CITY OF COVELO.

P. S.—Whether you heed in the least this communication I trust to your honor to withhold my name from any person. * * *

Another letter from Round Valley gives a somewhat different view of the situation, and corroborates explicitly the accounts published in these columns touching the doings of George E. White and his henchmen. It is as follows:

COVELO, Nov. 8, 1895.

Editor Call—SIR: The respectable people of Round Valley and vicinity are grateful to you for the service you are doing in publishing the truth about George E. White and companions in lawlessness. * * * Fortunately, there is not so much of this crooked work going on in the valley as in days gone by, but in the mountains it is as bad as ever. The killing of Jack Littlefield was only a sample of the work carried to the extreme. Some men are only bulldozed because that is enough for White's men to carry their point, but if they have to commit murder they do not hesitate to do so. * * * I think your correspondent has overdrawn the picture so far as it concerns the valley, but when it comes to the wild and wicked carryings on in the mountains it would be almost an impossibility to exaggerate. I think after this a decent, independent man will have a better chance for his life even in the mountains, because of THE CALL'S exposure. You can understand why I don't want George A. White and his buckaroos to know who I am, so, while I give you in confidence my full and true name and address, I will sign myself incognito. ROUND VALLEYITE.

Now, after giving full and free publication to the presentation of every substantial allegation offered by the friends of George E. White, it is fair to draw attention to these facts:

1. THE CALL'S account of the lynching of Jack Littlefield, and the evident attempt of the first Coroner's jury in Round Valley to cover up the facts and condone the murder, has not been explained nor denied.

2. THE CALL'S theory of that dreadful outrage was entirely borne out and established by the verdict of the second Coroner's jury, now on file in the office of the County Clerk of Trinity County. It was shown that White was down on Littlefield and that White's men murdered him.

3. THE CALL has not made any accusation against the honest men of Round Valley, but has sought to throw light upon the dark spots of Mendocino County, where crime has hitherto been rampant, but where henceforth, thanks to THE CALL'S timely expose, human life will be held somewhat dearer, on account of a wholesome dread of exposure that hitherto was unknown.

Upon this result THE CALL rests its case with the people of the State at large, as well as with the decent part of the community in Round Valley and vicinity.

A THREATENING LETTER.

A Man Who Was Talking Too Much About Jack Littlefield's Death.

Weaverville Journal.

Ex-Sheriff James Bowie returned this week from a trip through the southwestern part of the county, where he has been gathering up and selling some of his cattle. He extended his trip to Covelo, in Mendocino County. He says that the feeling in regard to the killing of Littlefield is very strong yet and may possibly result in more trouble. H. D. Willburn of Hettenshaw recently received a threatening letter from parties unknown, warning him to be quiet. As he had not been particularly active in the matter, he knew of no reason why he should have been singled out for anonymous threats. The letter is dated Bridgeville, but is supposed to have come from Mad River.

The letter may have been written and sent by some witless joker or may be what it purports to be. In the latter case we do not apprehend that Mr. Willburn has anything to fear, as the writer of an anonymous letter is either a coward or a fool, usually both. Following is a verbatim copy of the letter, with the exception that a picture of a skull and crossbones, rudely drawn on its back, is omitted:

BRIDGEVILLE, Humboldt County, Cal., October 5, 1895.

Mr. David Willburn—DEAR SIR: I hear of you doing a great deal of talking since Littlefield was hung, and hear you are making some threats Regarding some of the Settlers around your amediate Neighborhood. I will here warn you and your gang not to molest any one up that way, or there will be a Committee await upon you.

A word to the wise is sufficient.

This Note has been read to a committee of Ten men.

Veterans' Ball.

At the meeting of the Veterans held Wednesday evening, it was unanimously resolved that the ball to take place at Odd Fellows' Hall Thanksgiving evening be a genuine fireman's ball.

The programme will include the old dances, such as have not been seen in this City for many a day, and the "old boys" are determined to dance and sing till broad day light.

It is stated that a meeting will shortly be held to inaugurate the movement to raise a memorial, in the firm of a statue in Paddington to the late Lord Randolph Churchill.

MUST BRING SUIT IN THE HOME COURTS.

An Old Principle of Equity Reasserted Yesterday.

CLAUS SPRECKELS' FIGHT

A Suit Brought in Hawaii by Gus Spreckels and His Friends.

ENJOINED BY JUDGE BAHRS.

The Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company Cannot Go Abroad to Sue Americans.

There is now pending in the courts of Hawaii a suit brought by the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company against Claus Spreckels, involved in which is the ownership of 6000 acres of land on the island of Maui. The Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company is formed and incorporated under the laws of this State, the other plaintiffs, Russell J. Wilson, Mountford S. Wilson, Charles S. Wheeler, Rudolph Spreckels and B. J. Hoffacker, are citizens of this State, and the defendant, Claus Spreckels, is a citizen of this State. The defendant, under these circumstances, has a right to have a case against him tried in the State of which all parties are citizens, and Mr. Spreckels has invoked the aid of one of the principles of equity which guarantees this right. He has secured an injunction from the Superior courts of this City, enjoining the plaintiffs in the suit in the Hawaiian courts from bringing any proceedings against Mr. Spreckels in that far-away land, and compelling them, if they must sue, to sue in the courts here at home.

The principle of law and equity which forms the basis of the proceedings in court yesterday is that which gives the courts of equity in any country jurisdiction over the persons of the citizens of the land. The court here cannot prevent the Hawaiian court from trying the case, should it wish to do so, and if that were possible in the absence of the plaintiffs, but the courts of this City can enjoin any one of the citizens here from proceeding in such a suit; and if, in defiance of the court's injunction, they should continue on they would all be liable for contempt of the local tribunal.

The same principle was applied by Gus Spreckels, about a year and a half ago, in his suit against his father to prevent the foreclosing of some island mortgages. Claus Spreckels intended to foreclose through the island courts, but his son secured an injunction upon the very rule, and proceedings had to be transferred to here.

The suit being brought in Hawaii, although apparently only for the possession of 6000 acres of land, does in truth include the entire relations of Claus Spreckels to the company which he formed.

Prior to 1878 Claus Spreckels went to the islands to investigate the possibility of establishing a sugar plantation on the island of Maui. On his return here he formed the Hawaiian Commercial Company under the laws of this State, associating with himself Herman Schussler, ex-Governor Frederick F. Low, William Babcock and Herman Bendel. That company was succeeded in 1882 by the defendant in the suit filed yesterday.

As one of the laws of the Hawaiian kingdom was that no foreign corporation should hold lands in the islands, it was decided that whatever property the company procured should rest in the name of Claus Spreckels, he to hold it in trust for the corporation. One of the possessions of the company was at that time 16,000 acres of land in the Ahupuaa of Wailulu, held under lease from the crown. The entire tract, known as the Ahupuaa of Wailulu, consists of 24,000 acres.

The crown lands of the Hawaiian kingdom, and they include valuable acres in every one of the islands, had two claimants. King Kalakaua claimed them by right of royal power, and as the successor to King Kamehameha; the Princess Keelikolani, daughter of one of the Kamehamehas, claimed by right of heirship. The Princess was deeply in debt, and in 1880 she sold her interest in these crown lands, wherever situated, to Claus Spreckels. He paid her $70,000, $10,000 of which was in cash and $60,000 in the nature of a loan. She had been paying 12 per cent interest on her debts, but as part of the consideration for the purchase Spreckels assumed the debts for 6 per cent per annum. This was a personal transaction between Claus Spreckels and the Princess Keelikolani.

Having purchased an interest in all of the crown lands, the titles of the crown and those of Spreckels were continually becoming entangled. So, two years after, it was agreed that Spreckels would release all claims upon the crown lands elsewhere if King Kalakaua would release the crown's interest in the Ahupuaa of Wailuku and transfer it to him. This was done by royal patent and by a special act of the Hawaiian Legislature in August, 1882. Spreckels then turned over to the company, on September 25, 1882, all property he held in trust for its benefit. The company had by that time been organized under the name of the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company. On February 27, 1885, Mr. Spreckels sold to the company 18,000 acres of the Ahupuaa of Wailuku, included in the tract being the 16,000 acres the company had originally secured by lease from the crown before the land itself came into Mr. Spreckels' possession. The deed to the 18,000 acres was made by Mr. Spreckels individually under the direction of the company's attorneys, and was accepted by it as wholly satisfactory. The remaining 6000 acres are the ones in dispute.

The claim is made that the transactions which finally led the Ahupuaa of Wailuku into Mr. Spreckels' possession were by him as agent for the company. At the time of the negotiations with the Princess Keehikolani and subsequently with King Kalakaua Mr. Spreckels was not a director in the company, nor did he act in any way as its agent. From 1882 until the time the suit was brought there was never any question as to first his ownership of the 24,000 acres of the Ahupuaa and afterward of the 6000 acres which the company did not buy.

The complaint in injunction concludes with the following statement of the events subsequent to the transfer of February 27, 1885, and of the points upon which the application for an injunction is based:

In 1894 the plaintiff sold and transferred to C. A. Spreckels his stock and all his interest in said Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, and said C. A. Spreckels thereupon became, and, as plaintiff believes, has hitherto continued to be the owner of said stock, and that from that time to the present the said C. A. Spreckels has been, in point of fact, the owner of the controlling interest in and power of said company, and the persons who have composed the boards of directors of the same have been named by him, and have, in every way, acted in subordination to the wishes and directions of said C. A. Spreckels. The composition of said board is as follows: Rudolph Spreckels, who is a brother, and B. J. Hoffacker, who is a brother-in-law of said C. A. Spreckels; Mountford S. Wilson, Russell J. Wilson and Charles S. Wheeler, who are and were attorneys-at-law in the employ of said C. A. Spreckels. Said board of directors have exercised and still exercise but nominal and titular functions, and have passed a resolution by which they practically, and in fact, if not in law, have delegated and surrendered all their powers and the whole management of the affairs of said corporation to C. A. Spreckels.

C. A. Spreckels is a son of the plaintiff, Claus Spreckels, and was from the year 1878 till the year 1893 perfectly familiar with all the affairs of said plaintiff, and with every fact and circumstance attending the acquisition by said plaintiff of the title in fee to the Ahupuaa of Wailuku, and with all the facts and things done in relation thereto by said plaintiff, including all transactions and relations between him and the Hawaiian Commercial Company and the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company. C. A. Spreckels well knows, and at all times has well known, that said 6000 acres of said Ahupuaa which are brought in dispute are the property of this plaintiff, and that the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company has not, and never has had any right or title thereto, either in law or in equity, and has never asserted or thought of asserting any claim thereto, until said C. A. Spreckels obtained control of said company.

Nevertheless, C. A. Spreckels, in pursuance of a systematic plan which he has followed for years past to harass and annoy the plaintiff, and for no other purpose, has instigated and caused the board of directors of said Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company to authorize the action to be prosecuted against the plaintiff, and has caused said action to be brought in the courts of the Hawaiian Islands, where neither he nor any member of the board of directors of said Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company resides, and where none of the members of the former boards of directors of said company who are still living reside, and where the said corporation has neither its office nor books nor records, instead of having the same brought in the courts of the State of California, in which all of said parties reside, and in which said corporation has its office, books and records, in further pursuance of said plan to annoy said plaintiff and to place him at a disadvantage in the maintenance of his defense to said action and the production of witnesses to support the same.

The defendant ought not in equity and good conscience to be permitted to maintain and continue its aforesaid action in the courts of the republic of Hawaii for the following reasons among the many which might be suggested:

1. The plaintiff and the defendant, as well as the defendants, Russell J. Wilson, Mountford S. Wilson, Charles S. Wheeler, Rudolph Spreckels and B. J. Hoffacker, are citizens of the State of California.

2. The residence of all the parties who at any time have acted as directors or officers of the Hawaiian Commercial Company and the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, who are now living, is the State of California. Among these are Hermann Bendel, Hermann Schussler, H. L. Dodge, John D. Spreckels, A. B. Spreckels, William Babcock and Antoine Borel.

3. All books of account and records of said corporations and of the plaintiff and of the defendants and of all said persons are here in the State of California, and may here be compelled to be produced in court.

4. The testimony of all said persons is necessary and indispensable to prove some one or more essential facts of the defense of said plaintiff to said bill of complaint. The production in evidence of the records and books of account of said corporation, as well as those of said plaintiff, is also necessary and indispensable for the same purpose. But there is no process by which the attendance of such parties, or any of them, as witnesses can be secured before the courts of the republic of Hawaii, nor is there any process by which the production of said books or records, or any of them, can be enforced before the courts. The persons above named are all engaged in large and important affairs, and even if they could be persuaded to leave their business and homes in this State to go to the Hawaiian Islands they could only do so with great loss and inconvenience to themselves, and enormous cost to the plaintiff. And the said documentary evidence, books and records, would for a long time be kept out of the State, and the places in which it is required to be kept, and would be twice exposed to the perils of the sea, and the danger of loss and mutilation while so improperly without the jurisdiction of this State.

There is no process by which the said parties, or any of them, could be compelled to give their depositions in this State to be used in the courts of said republic of Hawaii, nor by which the production of said documentary evidence, books and records could be enforced before any officer of this State to be similarly used.

5. The bill of complaint alleges that certain agreements and contracts were entered into between plaintiff and other persons, to wit: Hermann Schussler, Hermann Bendel, F. F. Low and W. F. Babcock, and said bill of complaint is largely based upon the alleged duties and obligations springing from said alleged agreements and contracts. All of said alleged agreements and contracts, if made at all, were made within the State of California. The obligations, if any, arising under them, arise, if at all, and must be ascertained and measured by the laws of said State as interpreted by its courts; and the plaintiff has a clear, legal and equitable right to have said agreements and contracts, if they exist, ascertained and measured by this standard. Those laws, and the construction which the courts of this State have placed upon them, if defendant is permitted to proceed in his said action in the courts of the Hawaiian Islands, will have to be proved as facts before said courts, for said courts cannot take judicial cognizance thereof. To establish by competent evidence in such a foreign and distant tribunal, the laws and decisions of this State would be an undertaking involved in great doubt and uncertainty, jeopardizing the legal and equitable rights of said plaintiff.

6. The bill of complaint alleges that certain fiduciary relations existed between the plaintiff and the Hawaiian Commercial Company and the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, arising both from express trusts created by contract, and implied trusts arising from positions alleged to have been occupied by plaintiff toward said corporation, and said bill of complaint is largely based upon the alleged duties and obligations of said plaintiff springing from said fiduciary relations. The existence, nature and extent of said fiduciary relations, if any existed, are to be determined by the laws of this State as interpreted by its courts. The laws of the republic of Hawaii upon said matters are different from those of this State, and if defendant is permitted to proceed in such action in said republic, plaintiff's rights under the laws of this State will be impaired, if not wholly destroyed.

7. The prosecution of said action in the courts of the republic of Hawaii, a foreign State, is an effort on the part of the defendant to evade the laws of the State of its own creation and residence, to wit, of this State, and to deprive the plaintiff of the benefit of said laws, to which he is justly entitled.

8. By reason of their remoteness from the place of residence of the parties and the sources of evidence, both oral and documentary, it is impossible for the courts of the republic of Hawaii, learned, able and just though they are, to do complete justice between the parties, but the matters in controversy can be adjusted and the ends of justice fully attained in the courts of this State in a manner both just, economical and expeditious.

9. The action brought by the defendant here in the courts of the Hawaiian republic, as above stated, was brought under the instigation of one who for years has pursued a systematic plan of annoying, vexing and harassing the plaintiff, and has been instituted through his instigation for no other purpose than that of annoying, vexing and harassing him.

10. For more than twelve years last past the defendant has had full knowledge of all facts and circumstances upon which it now seeks to base its alleged equitable right; and during all of said years and at all times mentioned in its said bill of complaint the defendant has consented to and acquiesced in each and all the deeds of plaintiff in the premises, and if it ever had cause of complaint against the plaintiff, which the plaintiff denies, it has now in equity and good conscience, lost the right to enforce that right by reason of its staleness; and the plaintiff is entitled to have said lack of equity in the defendant enforced against it in accordance with the laws of this State as interpreted by its courts.

11. When plaintiff's conveyances and transfers were made to the defendant as herein alleged, resp