

OUTSIDERS ARE  
WHY ANXIOUS

WHY ANXIOUS  
TO HAVE A ZOO

Men Who Have No Residence in San Francisco Favor the Scheme of the Land Sellers.

MISSIONARIES DO NOT WANT IT.

They Feel No Crying Need for a Bear Garden and Play Ground.

TRYING HARD TO KILL THE JOB.

The Courts Will Be Asked to Enjoin the Supervisors if They Make the Appropriation.

Among the many strange things that have developed in the attempt to force a menagerie on the unwilling residents of the Mission is the anxiety of the people who live far away from that portion of the city, some even so far as Alameda and Oakland, to secure to the people of the South Side a monkey ranch at an expense to the taxpayer.

An evening paper, which is on the side of the land-sellers in this latest scheme to despoil the people, publishes a list of interviews with Federal employees who are raising their voices in loud demand for a park and zoological garden for the Mission. It does not appear to occur to the aforesaid paper that the residence of a majority of these is outside of the limits of the City and County of San Francisco, and in consequence that they will not themselves feel the additional burden of taxation should the scheme succeed.

Finding it impossible to obtain interviews from taxpayers living in the district to be affected by the foisting of a bear garden on the people, the schemers evidently feel, in the language of the street, that "any old thing will do," and they gather them in wherever any one can be found who desires to see his name in print.

The interviews printed in THE CALL are from men who are well known as San Francisco business men and taxpayers, men who believe that the people should not be made to pay for unnecessary luxuries so long as absolute necessities have not been supplied. The following interviews indicate clearly what the taxpayers living in the Mission think of the scheme:

**John D. Daly, proprietor of the San Mateo Dairy Company, 900 Guerrero street:** "If this zoological park scheme was in good faith and had selected a locality where it is possible for the people to get to it, I might give it some consideration. I have large real estate interests in the vicinity of Gum Tree Gulch, but I candidly say that gulch for a park would be a crime. Every dollar put into it would be wasted. The Mission does not want a zoo. They have never asked for one and are doing all they can to kill this job. We want good streets, well lighted. No more large parks. Golden Gate Park is enough at present. When the electric road is completed we can reach Golden Gate Park in fifteen minutes. If the Supervisors attempt to appropriate \$400,000, or even less, for the purchase of land to raise wild animals there, would be enjoying by the course. The tax rate is too high already, and this bold attempt to raid the City treasury for the benefit of a few land speculators must be stopped. THE CALL is entitled to the benefit of every property-owner in San Francisco for its bold stand and manly fight."

**Sherwood W. Fuller of George H. Fuller and of the Heywood Bros., furniture manufacturers at 659 Mission street, and 1000 Market street:** "I own considerable property in the Mission and have the interest of that section of the City very much at heart, and as a consequence would like very much to have a park such as we want. We would not oppose having a park, though small, if it might be located close to the new High School. Here our families could go at all hours of the day and enjoy a few hours of sunshine without the necessity of having to pay for it. This we consider we are entitled to, as we have no parks or squares for our children to play in. The cemetery lots were at first selected as the ideal spot for this purpose. We do not object to the request; we did not want to place a burden on the shoulders of the taxpayers by providing us with this small piece of park ground. One square could be bought this year and another next year, and by this means a little expense the whole put in for the purposes intended. This would make the site surrounding the High School attractive and at the same time answer all the purposes of giving the people in the central portion of the Mission a breathing spot. We have thought and still think that we are justly entitled to at least one small park in the Mission. We do not object to a park in the western portion of the City, but our pleasure in having an abundance of small and for that matter large parks. But we wish to be recognized in the distribution of the taxes that we cheerfully pay for the benefit of the whole City. So far as a park and a zoo goes, where it is proposed to place it I am most decidedly opposed to any such proposition. It is not a Mission park in any sense of the term, and the Mission people never considered it as such. It is much easier to go to the Golden Gate Park from any portion of the Mission than it would be to go to the gum tree site, and what is more it is a thousand times more pleasant when you get there. I don't know of a more objectionable site for a park within the limits of the City than is the same gum tree horizontal land. It is exposed to the full force of the west wind and fog that come in through the gap between the hills directly from the ocean. And what shall we say about the price? Why, to any man who knows anything about land valuations in this City, it is too high at one-third the price asked. In the language of the street it is the 'rawest' deal ever attempted to be foisted on the helpless taxpayers. The promoters of this gigantic job cunningly cover themselves up behind a Mission project. Wherever the Mission people are opposed to it. And

even, for the sake of argument, supposing they were in favor of it, this is no reason why the other taxpayers should be fleeced to make a few shrewd real estate agents wealthy at the expense of the general public. We want neither a gum tree park nor a wild animal collection foisted upon us by the promoters of this question. We speak the sentiments of every property-owner in the City, except those that expect to be immediately benefited by it."

**Dr. Louis Bush, dentist (Bush & Sons' Bakery street, residence 2105 Hester street):** "I have resided in the Mission for the last twenty-four years and have paid taxes on my property. I am therefore interested in anything and everything that would go to make the Mission attractive and increase its prosperity. But I fail to see how a pleasure ground and a so-called zoo, located away out on the Gum Tree Tract, could by any mathematical calculation be of any benefit to the Mission people any more than is the Golden Gate Park at the present time. It would be more difficult to get to it than it is to get to the greater park now. Of course the Mission residents cannot but be ever in mind the gentlemen who have so generously offered this unsought-for addition for their comfort. But I have noticed that they want the taxpayers to put their hands down in their pockets and pay for the section. And the price that is asked for the land is so reasonable—three times its value, as I have been informed—that we are at a loss to know how to thank them for their disinterestedness in our welfare. And in addition to all that they are going to erect a collection of wild animals. Just the thing we do not want thrown in as a gift. Nor do we want the park at the price it is offered as a gift to the people of the Mission. If those gentlemen are in earnest, and we will give them credit for good intention—why don't they offer some solution of repairing the streets and sewers of the City and a scheme by which we can reduce our taxes rather than add \$400,000 more to the annual levy, not to mention what it would cost to keep the animal show running year in and year out. Well, to be brief and to the point, I am most emphatically opposed to the scheme proposed. I do not believe that the Mission people do not want those interested gentlemen to pick out a park for us upon the terms set forth here."

**F. A. Hornblower, ex-Police Judge and a property-owner in the Mission, residing at Twenty-third and Hester streets:** "This is not a measure to benefit the Mission in any sense of the word. How can a park located out in the Horner section be considered as a benefit to the residents of the Mission any more than it would be a benefit to the people in the north end of San Francisco? Assuming that the park was located there, the Mission residents, if all others going there, would be compelled to pay the fare. What the Mission people would like to have, if they could get it, would be a park in the central portion of the Mission proper. But under no circumstances do we want a zoo located in the vicinity of land at the expense of the taxpayers at such an exorbitant figure as the one proposed by the philanthropists who have so suddenly sprung up in our midst. It is an old scheme to add a piece of worthless property on the people while they sleep, so to speak. But, thanks to THE CALL for its stand, this wholesale job will not be permitted to go unchallenged. We will oppose it first, last and all the time."

**I. J. Truman, President of the Civic Federation and Columbian Banking Company:** "I am totally opposed to the whole outfit. I have no objection to a park, but what has to do with this humbug of buying a piece of land away out on the outskirts of the City to do with the people in the Mission any more than it has with the people living in the Grand or San Rafael? The Mission residents have never asked for a park in this section of the City. If the people wish to give a park well and good; we will thank them for it; and we think we are entitled to one. But we do not want to have a piece of land asked to contribute to the purchase of an unprofitable piece of land that has been found for us by a lot of real estate schemers that do not reside in the Mission and who do not care for the comfort of the residents who do reside there and who pay taxes. I do not care to bother myself about the value of the land because I know that the people who have commissioned themselves to find this land for us really want to sell it at the highest possible figure that can be got from the gullible public. We have an excellent park now and one that demands the attention of the people. And when this park is fixed up to suit us, why we still have parks to improve and we still have our streets to look after and our sewers. I am against it all the way through."

**M. H. Levy, secretary of the Mission Five-mile Improvement Club:** "I have an objection to this question. The idea of any man who claims to have the interest of the City at heart to advocate the purchase of a park, when we are in such a condition as we are at this time, is in the happiness or comfort of the residents who do reside there and who pay taxes. I do not care to bother myself about the value of the land because I know that the people who have commissioned themselves to find this land for us really want to sell it at the highest possible figure that can be got from the gullible public. We have an excellent park now and one that demands the attention of the people. And when this park is fixed up to suit us, why we still have parks to improve and we still have our streets to look after and our sewers. I am against it all the way through."

**B. F. Holbrook of the White House (dry goods), 37 Liberty street:** "Never in the history of San Francisco has there been attempted a worse raid on the City treasury than this zoological grab. It seems incredible that any honest man should advocate the squandering of nearly half a million dollars on a thing so needless, extravagant and impractical. The people will support THE CALL in its battle for economy and public honesty."

**Judge John A. Spinetti, prosecuting attorney of the City:** "I have not given the matter much consideration. I don't know what I have said in THE CALL. I am not in favor of it, while we have an excellent park as it is, although I would like to see a zoological garden in this City. It would add to the expense of the taxpayers already very high and our streets need looking after."

**George T. Bohon, who was present while Engineer Sullivan was giving his views, said:** "I have said in every word the Chief clerk has said, and would add that it is nothing short of an attempt to dispose of a piece of land, by the sale of which a few shrewd real-estate sharks would make a pile of money."

**James A. Dyer, builder, 829 Broadway:** "THE CALL expresses my sentiments on this question. I am opposed to the purchase of land for a zoo, and so are all my neighbors. The taxes are too high now. No more parks until we have good streets and clean sewers and street lights."

**Blonde hair is the finest and red the coarsest.**

WANT TO TALK  
BY EVICTOR RULE

Eloquence Burst Out Frequently at the Carriers' Convention.

The Members in Doubt as to Whether the Meeting Was a Legal One.

Many Letters of Regret Received and Reports In From the Committees on Preliminaries.

The eighth annual convention of the National Letter-Carriers' Association opened yesterday morning in Old Fellows' Hall. Owing to an unavoidable delay in the transmission of credentials from Washington to this City and the fact that many members who had attempted to "do" Chinatown the night previous, found themselves slightly done up and used a couple of hours which rightfully belonged to the convention in sleeping up. It was after 11 o'clock when President Parsons called the meeting to order.

The first business on hand was the appointment of a committee on credentials, and the following were selected: B. F. Newell, Denver, chairman; John C. Keller, Cleveland; W. H. Geis, Baltimore; O. J. Burson, Kalamazoo; J. E. Havens, Brooklyn.

A committee consisting of Thomas Smith, Barney Curtin and Thomas Farmer was appointed to draft a set of rules for the convention. The committee reported the report of these committees. George King of Washington, the legal representative of the letter-carriers, was granted the floor, and spoke at some length on the subject of the law, free delivery and the proposition by the Government to settle all just claims for overtime due the letter-carriers.

Mr. King stated that his law firm was waiting on the behalf of the carriers some chance to prove their overtime claims and have them considered on their merits by the Court of Claims. The carriers have already received as the result of the firm's litigation some \$1,000,000 by appropriation from Congress. The speaker asserted that nearly all the free delivery cities of this country except the Pacific Coast States have been paid on their claims. He extended hope to the San Francisco letter-carriers, who have a big claim against the Government, with the statement that the contract to which they affixed their names, signing away their statutory rights, would not hold good in a court of law.

The afternoon session opened at about 3 o'clock, and throughout the session the chief feature was the discussion of the proposed amendment to the constitution to put themselves on record as parliamentarians and speech-makers, and President Parsons displayed his excellent abilities as a presiding officer by his coolness and the fairness of his decisions.

The first business of the afternoon was the reading of responses to the numerous letters of invitation which had been sent out. Letters of regret as being unable to attend were received from John W. Sperry, Thomas McEwan, Congressman Charles J. Faulkner, Senator Mark A. Hanna, Governor Budd and many others.

President Parsons then made a brief review of his work during the year as National president, which was in part as follows: "My work for the year commenced by making a trip to Washington, where I met the various leaders of the carriers together the leaders of the carriers themselves, feeling confident that by bringing about friendly relations more good can be accomplished by petitioning those in power than in any other way. I think that the carriers should be in the officers of the association to successfully administer its own affairs without any outside assistance whatever. During the year I have visited many of the branches in my jurisdiction, in my official capacity and as a personal visitor, and I think I have accomplished much good in this way, as I have brought the individual branches into closer touch with the National association."

On motion the report was accepted and the recommendations embodied in it were turned over to the proper committee for consideration. The report was read and the members of the committee had made no mention or explanation of some of his official actions during the year in his report, and would not consent to its adoption until he received the report of the committee. Mr. Parsons had made no mention or explanation of some of his official actions during the year in his report, and would not consent to its adoption until he received the report of the committee.

This point was decided as well taken, and resolutions, points of order to show that the report had not been accepted, were made. The report was read and the members of the committee had made no mention or explanation of some of his official actions during the year in his report, and would not consent to its adoption until he received the report of the committee.

Mr. Morrison, secretary of the law and legislative committee, then made a lengthy report of the doings of that body during the past year, relating mainly to the efforts to have made a law based providing that the salary of letter-carriers be not less than \$1200 per annum, out which was riddled out by Speaker Reed. The convention then adjourned till 8 o'clock this morning.

The convention adjourned many presses my sentiments on this question. I am opposed to the purchase of land for a zoo, and so are all my neighbors. The taxes are too high now. No more parks until we have good streets and clean sewers and street lights."

**More Estate Litigation.** Mrs. Eliza More Miller has been appointed administratrix of the estate of A. P. More, deceased, with bonds fixed at \$200,000.

WASH HOUSES  
NOT NUISANCES

That Is, When They Are Conducted Neatly, as They Should Be.

Judge de Haven Renders an Opinion on the Rights of Property.

A San Mateo Ordinance in Conflict With the Fourteenth Amendment.

United States District Judge de Haven rendered an opinion yesterday morning in the matter of Hon. Wah, convicted in San Mateo City for maintaining a Chinese laundry in that place, and the matter was taken before Judge de Haven to determine the constitutionality of the San Mateo ordinance against washhouses.

Judge de Haven decided that Hong Wah or any other man, irrespective of color or race, had a right to operate a laundry in San Mateo or any other city, so long as his business was not detrimental to the health of the neighbors. A mere arbitrary declaration in a city ordinance that such and such a thing is a nuisance and that it should be suppressed amounts to a confiscation of property and prevents the citizen from enjoying his rights under the constitution of the United States.

In reply to the proposition that the Supreme Court in ex-parte Hang Kie, 69 California, 149, had decided constitutional an ordinance of the city of Modesto, prohibiting the carrying on of any public laundry in that city, except within certain prescribed boundaries, Judge de Haven said: "The opinion in the case referred to undoubtedly supports the contention of respondent that the ordinance of the city of San Mateo is unconstitutional. It is valid, but that case has been virtually, although not expressly, overruled by the Supreme Court of the State of California, and I do not think would now be regarded as authoritative precedent."

A law or ordinance the effect of which is to deny to the owner of property the right to conduct thereon a lawful business is invalid unless the business to which it relates is of such a noxious or offensive character that the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires its exclusion. "It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"A moment's reflection will show that any rule less broad would fail to give effect to the principle that the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion. The right to use property in the prosecution of any business which is not dangerous to others, nor injurious, nor offensive to persons within its vicinity, is one of the legal attributes of the ownership of property of which the owners cannot be deprived by the arbitrary declaration of any law of the State or municipal ordinance, nor can the right of any person to engage in any useful occupation, not a nuisance per se, at any place he may select, without infringing upon the legal rights of others, be denied by any law or ordinance."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

"It is certain," added Judge de Haven, "that the decision of the court rests upon the broad proposition that the ownership of property, no matter where situated, carries with it the right to use, and to permit the use of such property in the prosecution of any legitimate business which is not a nuisance in itself, and that the exclusion of any such lawful business from a particular locality can only be justified if the health, safety or comfort of the surrounding community requires such exclusion."

IT WAS NOT  
LOVE'S DREAM

Colonel Dickenson Is Rudely Awakened by His Spouse.

Mixes Reveries and Rhapsodies, Betraying a Musical Deficit.

Fun at the Seventh Annual Convention of the Women's Press Association.

A man blundered at the opening meeting of the seventh annual convention of the Pacific Coast Women's Press Association yesterday, and the superior sex, silently and smilelessly, overlooked his mistake, and were even superciliously indifferent when his wife terribly and sentimentally called attention to his errors and he accepted his correction with commendable dignity.

The faulty man was Colonel Dickenson, husband of Mrs. Hester A. Dickenson, the worthy president of the association, and one of a small army of five brave men who attended the convention at Naive Sons' Hall yesterday afternoon.

It all came about by reason of a faulty programme and the colonel's love of music, an unhappy mixing of reveries and rhapsodies and a deplorable deficit in musical knowledge.

Miss Alice Beach McComas, a charming and beautiful young woman and delightful pianist, was down on the programme for two numbers, "Love's Dream" and "Sixty Rhapsodies." She threw such soul and pathos into her execution of her first selection that the gallant colonel was compelled to rise and speak out right in meeting.

"It is a matter of regret to me," he said, "that encore is not allowed. This charming young pianist has touched my heart. Love's dream," mused he in tender accents. "I felt myself young again and was walking with my best girl in a moonlight flooded path, and then Mrs. Dickenson deliberately arose and calmly explained that it was not 'Love's Dream' at all, but the Sixth Rhapsodie. Of the two numbers present not one smiled and the colonel—his wife called.

At the morning session of the convention only members were present, with one notable exception, Dr. A. M. Beecher, who was admitted as an honored guest. But little business was transacted. A few important revisions of the constitution were made and it was arranged that the organization should affiliate with the International League of Press Clubs and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

In the afternoon the general public was invited and the following programme, under the direction of Miss Francis F. Victor, presented:

Address, Mrs. Dickenson, president of the association; paper, "The Colorado Canon," Mrs. Mary E. Hart; barytone solo, Dr. E. H. Bertrand; paper, "The Psychic or Poetic Temperament (Mrs. Marion Beatrice Foster), read by Miss Alice Perkins; piano solo, "Love's Dream" (Liszt), Miss Alice Beach McComas; poem, "The Mist of the West" (Liszt), Miss Alice Beach McComas; piano solo, "Sixty Rhapsodies" (Liszt), Mrs. E. O. Smith; poem, "The Weaver" (original), Mrs. Mary Clay Knapp; piano solo, "Polonaise, E major" (Liszt), Miss Alice Beach McComas.

At the conclusion of the exercises Mrs. Sara Rosemer, the city's delegate to the International Congress of Women in Paris, was called and responded entertainingly.

This morning there will be an election of officers and in the afternoon a programme of exercises.

To-morrow the members of the association go to Menlo Park, and on Friday will enjoy an excursion round the bay aboard the General McDowell.

At the conclusion of the exercises Mrs. Sara Rosemer, the city's delegate to the International Congress of Women in Paris, was called and responded entertainingly.

This morning there will be an election of officers and in the afternoon a programme of exercises.

To-morrow the members of the association go to Menlo Park, and on Friday will enjoy an excursion round the bay aboard the General McDowell.

NEW TO-DAY-DRY GOODS

OUR DOORS  
WILL SOON  
BE CLOSED!

WE ARE POSITIVELY RETIRING FROM BUSINESS.

Only a house retiring from business could afford to name prices like ours. None could do it and live. There would be nothing left for them to live on. With us it is different. We are going to get out, and want to get out as soon as possible--Hence such prices.

- 6c and 5c Embroideries ..... 3c
- 12c Damask Towels ..... 6c
- 15c German Flannels ..... 7c
- 20c Floor Matting ..... 11c
- 35c and 25c Dress Goods ..... 12c
- 25c Boys' Shirt Waists ..... 15c
- 75c and 50c Fancy Ribbons ..... 25c
- 65c and 50c Dress Goods ..... 25c
- 75c and 50c Ladies' Waists ..... 25c
- 60c Hemstitched Bed Sheets ..... 39c
- \$1 Camel's-Hair Blankets ..... 59c
- \$1.25 Lace Curtains ..... 66c
- \$1.25 and \$1 Silk Velvets ..... 75c
- \$2.25 Percale Wrappers ..... \$1.25
- \$5 Plush Capes ..... \$2.95

"Good-By" Is Close at Hand.

THE HAMBURGER CO.,  
MARKET ST., CORNER TAYLOR ST. AND GOLDEN GATE AVE.

STATEMENT  
OF THE  
NORWICH UNION  
Fire Insurance Society  
OF NORWICH, ENG.  
JANUARY 1, 1897.

Amount of Capital Stock Paid up in Cash - - -	\$660,000 00
<b>ASSETS.</b>	
Real Estate owned by Company.....	152,000 00
Loans on Bonds and Mortgages.....	40,000 00
Cash Market Value of all Stocks and Bonds owned by company.....	4,381,412 22
Cash in Company's Office.....	500 00
Loans on Accounts.....	948,935 29
Interest due and accrued on all Stocks and Loans.....	52,027 93
Mortgages.....	150 00
Premiums in Advance.....	709,653 37
Bills Receivable, not Maturity, taken for loss for profit on sale of Stock.....	70,012 12
Total Assets.....	\$6,365,535 93
<b>LIABILITIES.</b>	
Losses Adjusted and Unpaid.....	420,316 22
Losses in process of Adjustment or in Suspense.....	920,000 00
Losses Resolved, including expenses.....	1,634,882 60
Gross Premiums on Fire Risks running one year or less; re-ins. 50 per cent.....	755,561 60
Cash Dividends Remained Unpaid.....	28 46
Due and accrued for salaries, rents, etc.....	15,000 00
Accepted Bills, not due.....	77,750 63
Total Liabilities.....	\$2,945,536 57
Surplus.....	2,620,000 36
Net Surplus.....	2,750,969 26
Total Assets.....	\$6,365,535 93

Real Estate owned by Company.....	\$78,902 12
Loans on Bonds and Mortgages.....	1,811,258 49
Cash Market Value of all Stocks and Bonds owned by company.....	2,432,234 89
Cash in Company's Office.....	42,768 30
Cash in Banks.....	316,647 27
Interest due and accrued on all Stocks and Loans.....	13,993 00
Premiums in Advance.....	250,059 91
Losses in process of Adjustment or in Suspense.....	485,484 49
Gross Premiums on Fire Risks running one year or less; re-insurance 50 per cent.....	1,451,008 11
Gross Premiums on Fire Risks running more than one year; re-insurance per cent.....	236,213 06
Cash dividends remaining unpaid.....	60 00
Due and accrued for salaries, rents, etc.....	326,166 06
Total Liabilities.....	\$2,470,552 22

Net Cash actually received for Fire Premiums.....	\$3,742,298 31
Received for interest on Bonds and Mortgages.....	45,867 77
Received for interest and dividends on Bonds, stocks, Loans, and from other sources.....	99,392 17
Received from all other sources.....	50,116 73
Total Income.....	\$3,942,646 98
<b>EXPENDITURES.</b>	
Net amount paid for Fire Losses (including \$449,288 89 losses of previous years).....	\$2,253,934 83
Dividends to Stockholders.....	375,000 00
Expenses for Commission or Brokerage.....	616,498 10
Paid for salaries, Fees, and other charges for officers, clerks, etc.....	232,825 45
Paid for State, National and local taxes.....	48,012 63
All other payments and expenditures.....	135,558 51
Total Expenditures.....	\$3,662,824 52

Losses incurred during the year (fire)..... \$2,253,934 83  
ROB TSMARKE, General Director.  
E. F. MERTHE, Director.  
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of March, 1897.  
T. B. HALLS, Notary Public.

W. H. LOWNEN, Manager.  
J. L. FULLER, Assistant Manager.  
SPECIAL AGENTS:  
R. H. DELAFIELD, A. W. GIESSE,  
F. C. STANFORD.

DR. MCNULTY.  
THIS WELL-KNOWN AND RELIABLE OLD  
Specialist cures Private, Nervous, Blood and Skin  
Diseases of Men, Women, and Children. Has 20  
years' experience. Send for Book free. Patients  
cured at Home. Terms reasonable. Hours, 9 to 3  
daily, 7:30 to 8:30 every Sunday, 10 to 12. Consultation  
free and strictly confidential. Call or address  
P. ROSCOE MCNULTY, M. D.,  
26 1/2 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Cal.

DUPEE HAMS.  
DODGE, SWEENEY & CO.  
DEWEE & CO.  
PATENTS  
220 MARKET ST. S.F.