

**A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY
OF
CALIFORNIA'S STATE CAPITOL**

By

Lucinda Woodward

October 1981

California State Capitol Restoration Project

CHAPTER I

EARLY EFFORTS TO BUILD A STATE CAPITOL IN SACRAMENTO

It was not easy for California's newly established state government to find a home for itself. The problem came down to one of space and facilities for a fairly large group of state officials. In fact, this is one of the essential problems that has plagued our state government throughout its entire history. Despite the fact that the Legislature met for only a few weeks each year during its first sessions, the legislative contingent, plus the Constitutional, Judicial, and other state officers, made quite an impact on whichever town they were meeting in. Not only were ordinary offices needed, but halls had to be located to accommodate the Assembly and Senate bodies. In addition, bed and board had to be available, along with facilities to print the sometimes daily state documents, especially those from the Legislature.

Despite these requirements, cities vied for the honor of being the seat of government. The privilege offered prestige, economic incentives, and political advantages to enterprising persons in the private sector. At its first organizational session, which met on December 20, 1849, the government officials gathered at San Jose which had been declared to be the capital by the delegates to the Constitutional Convention at Monterey earlier in 1849. The legislators were not satisfied with the accommodations there, so they accepted Mariano Vallejo's invitation to meet at a new city laid out along the Carquinez Straits, named Vallejo. In June 1851, Governor John McDougal moved the government archives there. Accommodations were not suitable at Vallejo either, and the Legislature accepted Sacramento's offer of its county courthouse in which to spend the 1852 session. The spring of 1852 was a wet one in Sacramento, and this alone probably discouraged many legislators. In April 1852, Vallejo got a second chance and a bill was passed which declared that town to be the seat of government and ordered all state records to be moved back there. By early 1853, the Legislature apparently became impatient with Vallejo's yet incomplete facilities, and in February they passed a resolution establishing Benicia, a town farther up the Carquinez Straits, as a temporary capital. The quarters there were pleasant but cramped.

Lured by the offer of the Sacramento County Court of Sessions allowing the use of the courthouse for the next legislative session, and the Sacramento (City) Common Council's donation of the public square between I and J, 9th and 10th Streets for the construction of state buildings, the Legislature passed a bill on February 24, 1854 to provide for the permanent location of the seat of government of the State of California, at Sacramento City. Governor John Bigler approved the legislation the next day. A joint legislative resolution provided for adjournment from Benicia; the session was to meet again in Sacramento, Wednesday, March 1, 1854. The majority of the legislators, the Governor, state officials, and the state's archives steamed into Sacramento's waterfront the evening of February 28, aboard the Wilson G. Hunt, a vessel chartered for that purpose by the City of Sacramento.¹ In 1854, Sacramento was one of California's most populous cities. The state census of 1852 counted a population of 12,418. It was a mercantile, agricultural, and arts' center for the Sacramento Valley. And, because of its location as a gateway to the gold fields, the city had many fine restaurants and hotels to accommodate large numbers of people.

The California Supreme Court, however, was less enthusiastic than the Legislature about this change of the seat of government. Separate legislation had been passed which required that the court's sessions be held at the capital of the state. A majority of the justices, Solomon Heydenfelt and Alexander Wells, decided on March 27, 1854 that San Jose was the legal capital of the state, and the archives of the court were moved to San Jose three days later. Justice Murray, alone, dissented. For the next several months, political and judicial arguing and maneuvering occurred in the state over the question of removing to San Jose. Finally, in January of 1855, the Supreme Court reversed its earlier decision and declared Sacramento the legal and permanent seat of government for the state. This reversal was due, to a great extent, to the fact that Justice Wells had died and was replaced by Charles H. Bryan, an appointee of Governor Bigler, who was a supporter of the Sacramento location. Bryan concurred with Justice Murray's previously minority opinion and created a new majority opinion. The court adjourned to meet at Sacramento the next month.²

Meanwhile, the Legislature had taken up Sacramento County's offer to meet in their County Courthouse at 7th and I Streets, the same place where they had met during their 1852 session. Their stay there, however, was short-lived because the wooden building was destroyed by fire on July 13, 1854. No time was lost in rebuilding on the site. A contract was drawn up between Joseph Nougues and Sacramento County for construction of a new and larger building. The cornerstone was laid in September 1854, and the building was completed in time for the opening of the Legislature the following January 1.³

The new courthouse was a classical, temple-style building, popular in the nineteenth century for government buildings. The portico of the two-story brick building was decorated with eight Ionic columns. The building housed both the Senate and Assembly Chambers, offices for clerks and legislative officers, and offices and vaults for the State Controller and State Treasurer. The rest of the contingent of state officials was housed elsewhere in the city, including the Supreme Court in the Hastings Building at Second and J Streets and the Governor at the Latham Block.⁴ Although the courthouse quarters were new and comfortable, they were small and were intended to be temporary, from the point of view of both Sacramento County and the Legislature.

Despite some discussion in the Legislature during the 1855 session over removal to another city, that body moved ahead the next year to provide for the construction of a state capitol in Sacramento. On March 15, 1856, William J. Ferguson, Senator from Sacramento County, introduced "a Bill for an Act to provide for the Construction of the State Capitol in the City of Sacramento"; it passed the Senate on March 31.⁵ On the 3rd of April, the bill was introduced into the Assembly and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.⁶ The majority of the committee received the bill favorably and recommended its passage without amendment. They reported that,

The state of California has now an existence of over seven years, yet, to her shame be it spoken, she does not possess any claim to a building to hold the annual sessions of the Legislature in, or to afford apartments for any of her State officers.⁷

They further stated that since the price of building materials was greatly reduced since the days of the inflated Gold Rush times, the state could now stand a \$300,000 price tag for construction, financed by state bonds. The committee claimed that "the erection of a Capitol would save the State in thirty years the entire amount proposed to be appropriated...."⁸ James George, from San Francisco, was the lone dissenting voice on the committee. He expressed a fear that the building costs could easily exceed \$300,000 and put the state into an embarrassing indebtedness. Put to the question, the Assembly voted in the affirmative on April 15.⁹

The bill became law with Governor J. Neely Johnson's signature on April 18, 1856.¹⁰ The statute provided for a three-person Board of Commissioners (comprised of the Secretary of State, who was the ex officio Superintendent of Public Buildings; Gilbert Griswold of the City of Sacramento; and the Controller of the State) whose responsibility was to "contract for and superintend the work necessary to erect a State Capitol upon the public square in the City of Sacramento, donated to the state for that purpose."¹¹ The building was to include sufficient committee rooms (not exceeding twenty) and other appropriate rooms for use by state officers, the Supreme Court, and the State Library. Brick, granite, or stone was the designated building material. The capitol was to be ready for occupancy by January 1, 1858. The Commissioners were to advertise for and select a plan for the building, a contractor or contractors, and to employ a general superintendent for the construction.¹² The construction site was to be the public square between I and J, 9th and 10th Streets which the City of Sacramento had deeded to the state.¹³ Cost of the project was not to exceed \$300,000. Work moved ahead during 1856. On August 13, Reuben Clark's architectural plans were adopted by the Commissioners, and on November 1, Joseph Nougues, the same man who was awarded the contract to build the Sacramento County Courthouse and temporary capitol in 1854, was awarded the construction contract for \$200,000.¹⁴

It would seem that since the question of the permanent seat of government was settled and an act was approved for construction, the way was finally clear for a permanent capitol building in Sacramento. But that was not to be the case. Groundbreaking occurred December 4 and, only eleven days later, work came to a halt.¹⁵ In their October 1856 term, the State Supreme Court heard the case of the People vs. Johnson in which they interpreted Article VIII of the Constitution to mean that the Legislature needed to submit any state indebtedness in excess of \$300,000 to the people for ratification.¹⁶ State officials apparently felt they had no choice but to stop the capitol construction project since the Legislature had exceeded their constitutional authority by exceeding the legal limit of aggregate state indebtedness. The state refused to issue bonds to pay for the work. The state's decision was upheld by another decision of the State Supreme Court. In their January 1857 term, in the case of Nougues vs. Douglas et al., the act of April 18, 1856 providing for the erection of a state capitol was declared unconstitutional and void; any claims contracted on the project could only be legitimized by a vote of the people, and the case of the People vs. Johnson was affirmed.¹⁷ It was not until two and a half years later that Joseph Nougues was finally awarded the money (\$5,388.05) for the labor and materials he had used.¹⁸

The abandonment of the 1856 plan for a permanent capitol building in Sacramento prompted two different kinds of activity in the Legislature over the next several years: one was a continued effort to construct or acquire a permanent capitol building in Sacramento; the other involved various movements to remove the seat of government to another city. Obviously, Sacramento County had a vested interest in this issue. On April 1, 1857, Sacramento Assemblyman John H. McKune "introduced a bill for an Act to provide for the construction of the State Capitol in the City of Sacramento."¹⁹ The Committee on Public Grounds and Buildings recommended its passage, but on April 21, the act was indefinitely postponed.²⁰

As the state continued to grow, business within the government offices increased. This and the fact that many felt that the state deserved a "suitable" capitol kept the movement for a permanent building alive during the next session of the Legislature. At its opening in January 1858, Governor J. Neely Johnson addressed the Legislature and said, "After the frequent changes we have witnessed of the seat of government, at length a degree of permanency has been given to it which fully justifies speedy action being taken for the erection of public buildings suitable for the various departments of government." He "recommend[ed] the passage of a law at this session, making provision for the erection of such a building."²¹ Johnson further justified his position as being economically feasible, that the amount of rent paid by the state on the Sacramento County Courthouse equalled the interest the state would pay on \$300,000 in bonds, at seven percent.²²

The local press endorsed Johnson's position. In an editorial, the Sacramento Daily Union declared, "That the State ought to have a Capitol of her own, is a proposition which will not be disputed. It is discreditable not to have one;..."²³ Their recommendation was to take up Joseph Nougues' renewed offer to go ahead and build a capitol according to the 1856 plan and budget if the Legislature would pass the "necessary law to enable him so to do." He would deliver the building to the state by January 1, 1860. If the Legislature felt that the state could not really afford such an expenditure, the Union recommended "that arrangements, upon favorable terms, can be made with the County of Sacramento to purchase the house it now occupies. Although not such a building as would be erected for a state house, yet it can be made to answer all the ends of a Capitol for the next ten years. This view of the case is certainly worthy of consideration."²⁴

Sacramento's Senator Ferguson did feel it was "worthy of consideration", and on February 27, 1868 "introduced a bill for an act to provide for the purchase of the courthouse of Sacramento County for a capitol."²⁵ The bill, Senate Bill 146, was referred to the Committee on State Prison and Public Buildings; on March 13, a majority of that committee recommended its passage.²⁶ On the same day, the builder of the courthouse and then capitol building, Joseph Nougues, offered a compromise to the Legislature. He proposed that should the Legislature like the present building they then occupied, he would build them one nearly identical, with the interior custom designed for them, on the public square for \$125,000. It would be both a new custom-built building on their own lot, but it would be almost identical to the one they already occupied. Nougues claimed he could deliver the building to the Capitol Commissioners by December 1, 1858. A minority of the Committee on State Prison and Public Buildings, possibly influenced by Nougues' construction

offer, dissented from the majority on Senate Bill 146 for the following reasons: 1) the state owned a square block of ground in Sacramento, which would revert to the city if not used; 2) the state already had plans and specifications for a building, purchased in 1856, and had the capability of using convict labor to quarry granite, manufacture brick, and to construct the building for less than \$200,000; 3) the building now occupied by the Legislature was "unfit for the purposes of a Capitol" and could not be altered. They concluded, "deeming the foregoing reasons amply sufficient, we therefore recommend the indefinite postponement of the bill."²⁷ Eager to see some kind of positive movement toward construction of a state-owned capitol, the Sacramento Daily Union gave favorable press coverage of this minority viewpoint.²⁸ The Senate kept the bill under consideration until April 14, when it was "placed on file", along with Nougues' offer. This bill was not to be heard from again.²⁹

Meanwhile, while the Senate debated whether to purchase the temporary capitol quarters or to construct a new one, a movement was alive to remove the capital from Sacramento to Oakland. Assemblyman Hobart, of Alameda County, introduced such legislation.³⁰ Reflecting regional rivalry, the San Francisco Bulletin editorialized,

As the State owns no property in Sacramento, and as Oakland is nearer the great centre of travel and trade,...next to San Francisco, it is the best place for the State Capital to be permanently located.... A State house could be built cheaper at Oakland than in Sacramento, because no doubt the land would be donated by the citizens, labor is cheap, and the cost of laying the materials on the ground would be less.³¹

This Oakland offer and accompanying endorsement by a large Bay Area newspaper on March 16 were, no doubt, a reaction to both Senate Bill 146 to buy the present capitol building and Joseph Nougues' March 13 offer to construct a new building, both in Sacramento. The March 17 minority report of the Senate Committee on State Prison and Public Buildings to construct a capitol building in Sacramento using free state convict labor was, obviously, counter to the Oakland offer of the day before. The political maneuvers of constructing a new capitol building, purchasing the present temporary capitol building, or the removal of the capital to Oakland were all intertwined.

On March 23, a memorial, "praying for the removal of the State Capital", was received from the citizens of Oakland and read in the Senate. A joint resolution of the Legislature was passed, calling for a joint committee to visit Oakland "with the view of ascertaining its adaptation as a site for the permanent location of the capital of this state, and that said committee be empowered to confer with all parties concerned in such location, and to receive any proposals that may be made."³² The memorial and resolution were referred to the Senate Committee on State Prison and Public Buildings, which was the same committee considering Senate Bill 146 (the bill to purchase the Sacramento County Courthouse). On the 27th, the Assembly, having been presented an identical memorial, passed a similar resolution and assigned members to serve on the joint committee.³³ Predictably, in a strongly worded editorial, the Sacramento Daily Union penned its objections:

There are those in California who seem to consider that nothing in the State is settled. Among this class there has, of late, been some movements made towards again placing the Capital of the State in a moving condition. The initiatory step was the introduction of a proposition from citizens of Oakland, proposing to do something handsome for the State, if the Legislature would move the Capital from Sacramento to that locality. Under ordinary circumstances, this application from Oakland would have attracted no particular attention; but a proposition to have the State buy the Court House, for State purposes, brought the Capital subject prominently before the Legislature, and gave to the Oakland movement an importance which it would not otherwise have attained. The Yuba delegation, since the defeat of their railroad bill, have also taken an active part in favor of Oakland, to punish the Sacramento Senators for voting against the bill to grant the San Francisco and Marysville Railroad project a large quantity of swamp and overflowed land. But this has always been the policy of the delegation in the Legislature from Yuba, upon the Capital question. Under the ridiculous notion that a deadly rivalry exists between Sacramento and Marysville, the members from that county opposed and voted against locating the Capital at Sacramento. In this respect their delegation is maintaining its consistency. In 1854 the people of Marysville had the Benicia and Marysville Railroad project on hand, and the Yuba members worked with Benicia; this year they have on hand the San Francisco and Marysville Railroad project, and, because the Sacramento Senators voted against their bill to grant land to the road, they threaten to assist in removing the Capital of the State to Oakland, which is over one hundred and twenty miles away from their constituents....

Treating the matter, however, seriously, the people may look upon it as a second edition of the Vallejo scheme of 1851. Like agencies are at work, and probably like offers will be made to donate land and build a Capitol for the State. That scheme is known to have been bought through the Legislature with money, town lots, oyster suppers, etc., etc.; and if a law were now passed to remove the Capital, after it has been four years fixed in Sacramento, to Oakland, the people of the State would be perfectly convinced that it was forced through the Legislature by the rankest kind of corruption. And would they not be fully justified in this conclusion by the surrounding facts and circumstances?³⁴

After visiting Oakland, the three assemblymen on the joint committee, one of whom was from Yuba County and possibly may have been angered at Sacramento's legislators over their position in the Benicia and Marysville Railroad project, reported on April 6 that Oakland would furnish suitable buildings at a nominal cost until a capitol was erected; that Oakland wanted to donate twenty acres as a site for public buildings; and that the location was better than the one

at Sacramento. The committee recommended removal and introduced a bill into the Assembly to make Oakland the permanent seat of government. The Senate's two representatives on the committee agreed with the Assembly's findings on all items except for the removal recommendation. On the 21st of April, 1858, the bill to remove the capital to Oakland met defeat in the Assembly.³⁵

The 1859 session of the Legislature saw no less than three attempts, all in the Assembly, to pass bills aimed at either building a new capitol, establishing a new permanent seat of government at Oakland, or both. The Assembly Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had been directed, by resolution, to draft a bill "providing for the construction of a Capitol building for this State." On March 2, they reported the bill (Assembly Bill 222) and it was read the first and second times.³⁶ The provision unanimously recommended by the committee included the following: A commission, constituted of the Governor, State Treasurer, and a third yet unselected person, was to contract for and superintend the construction of a state capitol on the public square at Sacramento City; the plans and specifications of Reuben Clark submitted to the Capitol Commissioners in 1856 were to be adopted; the Commissioners were to appoint an architect and general superintendent; the Commissioners were to advertise for bids; brick and stone work were to be completed within one year; the contract was to be less than \$120,000; and the Commissioners could require the state prison to furnish the stone and brick, as needed.³⁷ That this sounded much like earlier proposed legislation to construct a capitol in Sacramento is not surprising since the Committee Chair, R. B. Ellis, represented Sacramento.

Less than two weeks later, on March 14, 1859, William P. Rodgers, of Alameda, offered a substitute for Assembly Bill 222, entitled "An Act to authorize the Common Council of the City of Oakland to levy a special tax, and the Board of Supervisors of Alameda County to levy a special tax, for certain purposes, and for the removal of the seat of government to the City of Oakland" (Assembly Bill 261).³⁸ Rodgers also offered the following resolution, which narrowly passed by a vote of 32 to 30: "That a committee of five be appointed by the Chair to proceed to Oakland to inquire into the expediency of locating the seat of government at that point, and to report to this House."³⁹ Having done so, the committee reported back favorably on March 22.

They concluded that, "In view of the great natural advantages of that point Oakland, its superior location, climate and scenery, centrality of position, proximity to the most extensive sources of information, and early communication with the foreign world, and especially in view of the economical considerations before suggested, your Committee would conclude by recommending the removal of the government of the state to the City of Oakland, under the provisions and conditions of Assembly Bill No. 261." Ogden Squires was the one dissenting vote on the committee, stating that he believed "a removal of the seat of government from its present location would be impolitic, and uncalled for by the people of the state."⁴⁰

While the Assembly, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, was presumably faced with a choice between Assembly Bill No. 222 or its substitute, Assembly Bill No. 261, Henry Hancock of Los Angeles introduced yet another related bill, on March 22: "An Act appropriating money for the purpose of commencing the building of a state capitol in the City of Oakland, Alameda County"

(Assembly Bill 286).⁴¹ One week later, all three bills were considered at one time by the Assembly after it had dissolved into the Committee of the Whole. After some debate votes were taken and both the bill for an act to build the state capitol in Sacramento (AB 222) and its substitute, to remove the seat of government to Oakland and to build the state capitol there (AB 261), failed.⁴² On April 9, 1859, AB 286, which appropriated money to construct a state capitol at Oakland, was laid on the table.⁴³ Like the Legislatures of 1856 and 1858, the Legislature of 1859 adjourned without resolving the state capitol issue.

FOOTNOTES

1. Mary Grace Kos, "California's Search for a Capital Site, 1846-1879" (Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1962), pp. 222-225; and Sacramento Daily Unit, March 1, 1854, p. 2.
2. Kos, "California's Search," pp. 228-231.
3. Ibid., p. 232.
4. Ibid., pp. 232-233.
5. Journal of the Senate, 7th session, March 15, 1856, p. 506 and March 31, 1856, pp. 697-699.
6. Journal of the Assembly, 7th session, April 13, 1856, pp. 674 and 675.
7. Ibid., April 15, 1856, pp. 769-770.
8. Ibid., p. 770.
9. Ibid., pp. 771 and 776.
10. Ibid., April 19, 1856, p. 850; and Statutes of California, 1856, Chapter 95, Approved April 18, 1856, pp. 110-113.
11. Ibid., p. 110.
12. Ibid., pp. 110-113.
13. Kos, "California's Search," pp. 231-232.
14. Ibid., p. 242.
15. Charles Forrest Curry, comp., California Blue Book or State Roster, 1909 (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1909), p. 714.
16. 6 Cal Reports, pp. 499-506.
17. 7 Cal Reports, pp. 65-81.
18. Statutes of California, 1859, Chapter 206, Approved April 11, 1859, pp. 215-216.
19. Journal of the Assembly, 8th session, Approved April 1, 1857, p. 659.
20. Ibid., Approved April 14, 1857, p. 732 and April 21, 1857, p. 784.
21. J. Neely Johnson, "Annual Message of the Governor," January 8, 1858 in Journal of the Assembly, 9th session, p. 44.
22. Ibid.

23. Sacramento Daily Union, February 3, 1858, 2/4.
24. Ibid.
25. Journal of the Senate, 9th session, February 27, 1858, p. 269.
26. Ibid., March 13, 1858, p. 352.
27. Ibid., March 17, 1858, pp. 376-377.
28. Sacramento Daily Union, March 17, 1858, 2/3.
29. Journal of the Senate, 9th session, April 14, 1858, p. 559.
30. San Francisco Bulletin, March 16, 1858, p. 2.
31. Ibid.
32. Journal of the Senate, 9th session, March 23, 1858, pp. 407-408.
33. Journal of the Assembly, 9th session, March 27, 1858, p. 447.
34. Sacramento Daily Union, March 30, 1858, p. 2.
35. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 715.
36. Journal of the Assembly, 10th session, March 2, 1859, p. 339; California State Archives, Sacramento, Legislative Material (unprocessed), "Report of Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds," March 2, 1859, Drawer 650-LP4.
37. Sacramento Daily Union, March 3, 1859, 1/4-5.
38. Journal of the Assembly, 10th session, March 14, 1859, p. 408.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., March 22, 1859, pp. 448-450.
41. Ibid., p. 448.
42. Ibid., March 29, 1859, pp. 486-487.
43. Ibid., April 9, 1859, p. 566.

CHAPTER II

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STATE CAPITOL IN SACRAMENTO (1860-1874)

It was in 1860 that legislation was finally passed which allowed for work to begin on a capitol building in Sacramento. Construction was not accomplished quickly; it took nearly fourteen years to complete the effort. To put that into perspective, the entire transcontinental railroad was begun and finished within the time that it took to build the capitol. And, in neighboring Nevada, a capitol was entirely completed while California's more ambitious project labored on. The California capitol project faced three recurring major obstacles which hindered a speedy completion. The first was continued political opposition by those in the Legislature who wished to see the permanent seat of government in another city. The second was the lack of a continuous and adequate funding source for the project. The third was the environment and climate of the Sacramento area; inclement weather often prevented work to continue during the winter months.

The Legislature of 1860 began its session on the second of January. The construction of a state capitol was, again, an issue. But as already mentioned, this session, unlike earlier ones, passed the legislation necessary to begin work on the building. However, this was not accomplished before that body debated the removal question still another time.

In his last annual message, on January 9, 1860, Governor John B. Weller urged the Legislature to act on the matter. He said,

If it is intended that Sacramento shall remain the seat of government, the time has arrived when we should have a Capitol. It is believed that one hundred thousand dollars will put up a wing sufficiently commodious to accommodate the Legislature and state officers, and judging from the number of persons seeking employment at this time, labor can be obtained at rates but little more than it commands in the East.¹

From a proposed \$300,000 building in 1856, the price tag had been reduced to \$200,000 in 1858, \$120,000 in 1859, to \$100,000 in 1860. While this may have reflected a scarcity of money, it may also have been an inducement to encourage the Legislature to make a commitment.

Weller's suggestion that the capitol might be built in Sacramento seemed to rekindle the removal movement in the Legislature. That idea had been kept alive in both Oakland and San Francisco since the adjournment of the 1859 Legislature and it was not surprising that it was brought up early in the 1860 session. R. A. Redman, of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, introduced an act into the Senate on January 20 entitled "An Act for the Permanent Location of the Seat of Government at the City of Oakland." The bill provided that Oakland would deed a parcel of land of not less than 10 acres to the state for state buildings within 60 days of passage and that the seat of government would be removed to that city the next July. It was referred to a select committee of five, but never came up for a floor vote.² Four days later, on

the 24th, William B. Maxson of San Mateo introduced "An act to repeal 'an act to provide for the permanent location of the seat of government of the State of California at Sacramento City', passed February twenty-fifth, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four, and to fix the same at the City and County of San Francisco." A provision of the bill was to relocate the capital by July 8. It was read and referred to a special committee of five. The majority of the committee, including Welty of Sacramento, recommended that the bill, Assembly Bill 87, not pass. The minority, led by Maxson, recommended the contrary. On March 23, 1860, just as the Assembly was close to voting on the capitol construction bill, this removal bill was tabled by a close vote of 35 to 33.³ The Sacramento Daily Union reacted to these most recent attempts by claiming that there was no public supported movement for removal from Sacramento; that all movements had been made by speculators and dissatisfied politicians. They urged that the question of the permanent seat of government be settled.⁴

On the 25th of January, F. K. Shattuck of Alameda introduced a resolution into the Assembly that a joint committee "be appointed to investigate the two propositions made for the removal of the Seat of Government, and report thereon." It was adopted and sent to the Senate. There, a substitute resolution was offered that appointed a joint committee of four each from the Assembly and the Senate to take into consideration the permanent location and, if deemed expedient, the removal of the seat of government, and to report thereon to the Senate and Assembly. The Assembly concurred with this substitute on February 7.⁵

Proposals had been received from San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, and Sacramento for capitol sites. Since other cities were offering convincing arguments, Sacramento felt the pressure to offer enough incentives for the Legislature to remain in town. The Sacramento City and County Board of Supervisors reminded the committee that they had already donated a public square to the state for a capitol site. They also offered "That the Board do now renew to the Legislature, the original tender of the free use of the present State House, without rent or charge of any kind, and that such free use be permanent, so long as in the pleasure of the Legislature the occupation of said building shall continue."⁶ A majority of the joint committee felt that,

the erection of a State House would prove the means, and the only means, of giving permanent location to the seat of government, and thus allaying the agitation which the claims of rival sections will keep constantly alive until the permanent location has been absolutely and unalterably fixed....It is capable of demonstration, that the frequent removals of the capital, and the discussions and delays which have resulted from agitation of this fruitful topic, have cost the state a larger sum than would have sufficed for the entire erection and completion of a State House....Having thus...arrived at a conviction that a permanent location, rendering effectual by an adequate appropriation for the building of a capitol is desirable, your committee recommended that proper action be taken by your Honorable Body for the immediate establishment of a permanent seat of government....⁷

Having concluded that a permanent capital was necessary, they next entertained the question of whether the capital should be removed from Sacramento. After considering the advantages of that city the committee concluded, "That the removal of the capital from Sacramento is inexpedient, and would be injurious to the public interests."⁸ A minority report was submitted on March 20 by three additional members of the committee. They vehemently stated, "While we freely agree with them that a permanent location of the capital of the State, and the erection of suitable buildings therefor, are matters of the first importance, yet we do not believe that Sacramento is the proper location therefor." They strongly recommended that the seat of government be removed to San Francisco. They argued that, at least for Northern Californians, a majority of legislators and other state and county officials normally went to San Francisco frequently for both business and pleasure purposes.⁹

Only three days after Senator Redman had introduced a bill to remove the capital to Oakland, Samuel A. Merritt "introduced a bill for an Act to provide for the construction of the State Capitol in the City of Sacramento" (Senate Bill 58). It was similar to other earlier legislation, and included the following provisions: a Board of Commissioners to contract for and superintend the work; the building to be constructed according to Reuben Clark's plans, purchased by the state in 1856; the appointment of an architect by the Commissioners; bids to be advertised, stone and brick work to be completed by December 1860, with no contract exceeding \$100,000; bids to be opened publicly in the Assembly; and contracts to be drawn up by the Attorney General and to contain specification of work, quality, time, etc. The bill was read twice and referred to the Committee on State Prison and Public Buildings. The committee, chaired by James M. McDonald of Sacramento, not surprisingly recommended passage of the bill with some minor amendments on March 12.¹⁰ Predictably, the Sacramento Daily Union urged that "it is a bill which ought not to be permitted to sleep, either in the Senate or Assembly."¹¹

On the 15th of March, the minority of the committee recommended the bill's indefinite postponement. One of the five minority members was Samuel H. Parker, representing San Francisco and San Mateo.¹² A regional split in the committee was apparent. The minority of the committee voiced their opinion that they did not believe Sacramento to be the "proper" location for the capital and they recommended removal to San Francisco.¹³ On the 21st of March, the bill was again heard in the Senate and further amended: the capitol was to be built according to Reuben Clark's 1856 plans and specifications and not to exceed \$500,000, although an amendment was adopted which provided that the Capitol Commissioners might adopt new plans and specifications; the Supreme Court was to be held in San Francisco; the capitol was to be built west of 14th Street, south of H Street, and north of O Street in Sacramento on not less than two city blocks.¹⁴ On the 22nd of March, the Senate debated over two additional amendments: whether to locate the capitol on the public square in Sacramento with the acquisition of adjacent land to the north and south or to locate it on the parcel bounded by L, N, 10th, and 12th Streets. The second amendment was adopted with one provision that the Commissioners pay not more than \$40,000 for the land. The title of the bill was also amended to read "An Act to provide for the construction of Capitol Buildings in the City of Sacramento and for the permanent location of the Supreme Court at the City and County of San Francisco." On the 23rd of March, the Senate passed the amended bill by a vote of 26 to 7.¹⁵

In its final form, SB 58 included the following provisions:¹⁶

Section 1. The Governor was authorized to appoint three Commissioners to contract for and superintend the work necessary to build a state capitol on the parcel of land lying between L and N, 10th and 12th Streets. The Commissioners were to take possession of that land.

Section 2. Before taking possession of the land, the Commissioners were to ascertain and describe the property and note the name and residence of each owner, then apply to the District Court Judge for the appointment of Commissioners to determine the compensation to be made to each owner. Interested parties were to appear before the District Court Judge to hear the Commission's findings. A procedure was included for resolving disagreements. After a valuation was fixed, the commission was to pay into the court that amount, taking possession of the land. All the proceedings of the commission and District Court were to be filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, upon receipt of the money. The State of California would then be the owner of the lands, in fee simple. The Commissioners were limited to expending \$40,000 in awards. The City of Sacramento was authorized and required to vacate the street running through the property.

Section 3. The capitol was to be constructed according to the plans and specifications submitted by Reuben Clark in 1856, with the provision that the Commissioners might, at their discretion, make modifications to the plan or might adopt new plans and specifications, provided the cost of the project did not increase beyond \$500,000. The building was to be fireproof.

Section 4. The Commissioners were authorized to hire an architect to supervise the construction of the capitol.

Section 5. The Commissioners were to advertise for bids.

Section 6. The contracts were to be given to the lowest bidder, who could also give sufficient security; Commissioners could reject all bids.

Section 7. The bids were to be opened publicly in the Assembly.

Section 8. All contracts were to be drawn under the supervision of the Attorney General and were to include detailed specifications of the work to be done, how it was to be executed, the quality of the material to be used, and the time frame of the contract.

Section 9. All signed contracts and the plans and specifications of the work to be done were to be filed with the Secretary of State.

Section 10. Payment to contractors was to be no more than 75 percent of the value of the labor or materials until the contract was completed.

Section 11. The Commissioners and architect were not to have any interest in any contract let.

Section 12. \$100,000 was to be appropriated out of the Treasury to carry the act into effect.

Section 13. The Governor was to fill any vacancy on the Board of Commissioners by appointment.

Section 14. The terms of the Supreme Court were to be held thereafter in San Francisco.

Section 15. The law library was to be removed to San Francisco, at a place convenient to the Supreme Court.

Section 16. All acts in conflict with this act were to be repealed.

Section 17. After the amount necessary for the payment of the lands had been ascertained, no further proceeding was to take place under this act, until the City of Sacramento had paid into the Treasury of the State, an amount sufficient to pay the owners of the land.

On February 20, John Conness, Assemblyman from El Dorado, introduced a bill for "An act to provide for the construction of the State Capitol in the City of Sacramento." It was similar to the bill introduced earlier in the Senate by Merritt, but two major differences were that Conness' bill, Assembly Bill 224, called for using the public square in the City of Sacramento for the capitol site and for a five-person commission comprised of the Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, and private citizens A. C. Monson and Alfred Redington.¹⁷ The majority of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds recommended the bill's passage on March 14.¹⁸ This was not surprising since D. W. Welty, the Committee's Chair, was from Sacramento. That same day, the minority of the committee reported adversely for the following reasons: the title of the land donated to the State (the public square) was not clear; the donated land was not large enough; the state could not afford the appropriation set forth in the bill; and "a great diversity of opinion exists in all portions of the state as to the proper place to locate the State Capital." Mr. Shattuck, speaker for the minority viewpoint, further suggested "...the Capital should not be located in the manner provided in the said bill, but that the question should be submitted to the people at the ballot box at the next general election, and that the place designated at that time should be considered as the permanent location of the State Capital...." He offered a substitute bill which would bring the question of the location of the state capital to the people for a vote.¹⁹ Shattuck's opinions were predictable since he represented Alameda, a long-time rival of Sacramento's for the state capital. Over the next few days, the bill was debated in the Assembly. Of some question was whether the state had clear title to the Sacramento City Public Square.

On March 23, a substitute for Conness' original bill was adopted.²⁰ In content, it read more like Merritt's bill: the capitol was to be built on the property located between L and N, 10th and 12th Streets, to be acquired by a procedure outlined in the bill, and Reuben Clark's plans and specifications would have to compete with others for adoption. It differed from Merritt's bill in that it did not provide for the removal of the Supreme Court to San Francisco and it called for a five-person Board of Commissioners comprised of the Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, A. C. Monson, and Alfred Redington.²¹ On March 24, it passed the Assembly by a vote of 46 to 24. Two days later, the bill was introduced into the Senate and passed that house. The next day, on the 27th of March, a motion to reconsider the vote lost by a vote of 25 to 5. On March 29, 1860, Governor John G. Downey signed the bill and notified the Assembly, "I have to inform your Honorable Body, that I have approved Assembly Bill No. 224, An Act to provide for the Construction of the State Capitol in the City of Sacramento." It became Chapter CLXI of the Statutes of California for 1860.²²

Finally, after a struggle of four years, legislation was passed which provided for the construction of a state capitol in the City of Sacramento. Californians, and especially Sacramentans, were jubilant that the state would at last have a capitol "suitable" for California. The reason for such determined efforts by both Sacramentans to keep their city the capital city and by citizens of other communities to relocate the seat of government are fairly obvious and based on common sense. Being the capital of the state offered a city much prestige. But, perhaps, more importantly, it offered the

city economic advantages. Businesses of all kinds benefitted from, what was at that time, a yearly influx of legislators, their staffs, and associated lobbyists, as well as the year-round government officials.

It is obvious from the above discussion of all the legislation, both successful and unsuccessful, devoted to the capitol construction and the related issue of determining the seat of government, that there was much political maneuvering going on. For example, it was surely not by accident that a Sacramento legislator and a Bay Area legislator were nearly always sitting on the committees hearing these bills. It is also apparent that over these issues politicians were divided more by geography than party. Throughout these years a split existed in the Legislature reflecting regional rivalries for this political plum.

The first tasks to which the Board of State Capitol Commissioners addressed themselves were the acquisition of the property for the capitol site, the selection of plans for the building, the appointment of a superintending architect, and the selection of a contractor. These activities occupied the Commissioners' time through the summer of 1860, before actual groundbreaking on September 24.

Land acquisition was the Commissioners' first priority for without clear title to the property the project could not proceed. In 1860, the parcel was on the southeast edge of the city. A bird's-eye view of the city entitled "City of the Plain", published by George H. Baker in 1857, shows a few scattered buildings in the area. The Sacramento City Assessor's Map Book of 1860 shows the owners of the property and indicates a number of improvements on the site. The large size of the parcels attests to the semi-rural character of the neighborhood. The fact of the matter was that the property would have to be condemned and people would have to be removed from their homes.²³

State law carefully prescribed the procedure for acquiring this property. After getting a description of the property and a list of the names and residences of each owner or interested party, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners was to apply, by presenting a petition, to the judge of the District Court in Sacramento for the appointment of special Commissioners to determine the amount of compensation to be made to people having land on the site. The judge was then to order all persons with an interest in the property to appear before him for a hearing of the findings of the special Commissioners. Differences were to be worked out by a commission of three disinterested citizens in meetings with the claimants. After a valuation was finally fixed by the court, the special Commissioners would pay that amount to the court and take possession of the land. The Commissioners were to file copies of all the court records related to the land transactions with the Secretary of State. The State of California would then be the owner of the land in fee-simple, provided that the City of Sacramento vacated the streets and alleys on the property and that the Commissioners received deeds of voluntary conveyances for land agreed upon between them and the owners.²⁴

On April 4, 1860, less than a week after the state law was approved, the Sacramento Board of Supervisors unanimously voted to vacate the streets and alleys at the capitol site.²⁵ The stage was set for the acquisition of the property. The Board of State Capitol Commissioners hired Daniel St. C. Stevens

on April 6 "to ascertain and determine the name and residence of each owner or interested party of ground required for use by the capitol building." By the 21st of April, he had prepared this list and he presented it to the Board at their May 9 meeting.²⁶ On June 2, the Board selected Levi Hermance, B. B. Redding, and Harvey Houghton as the Commissioners to appraise the land condemned for the capitol site. The land appraisal Commissioners met and resolved, on June 8, that the property owners were to be notified in the newspapers and that they were to file their claims with the secretary of the land Commissioners. Their claims were to be for the land only and not the improvements.²⁷

An advertisement appeared in the Sacramento Daily Union from June 11 to June 19, advising interested property owners of the condemned land to file a petition with the secretary of the commission, B. B. Redding, setting forth their claims by June 19, 1860. These Commissioners met periodically and read the petitions accepted to date. By June 13, the Sacramento Daily Union had criticisms of both the claimants and the land appraisal Commissioners. The newspaper felt that the property owners were asking exorbitant prices for their land and that the Commissioners were using a procedure to ascertain values that was complicated and which would delay the project. They also felt that the resolution of conflicting claims to property should be made in the District Court, rather than by the Commissioners. The land appraisal Commissioners resolved that beginning on June 19, six cases per day would be heard in the District Court. By July 5, the Commissioners were ready to make a report to the District Court of their recommended monetary awards. Their estimate of the value of the the city lots and the improvements was \$65,517. Again, the Sacramento Daily Union criticized that this was \$25,000 too high.²⁸

Part of the inducement offered by Sacramentans to keep the seat of government in their city was their offer to raise the money to pay for the capitol site. On April 28, 1860, "an Act to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Sacramento to Levy a Special Tax", was approved by Governor Downey. The law stated:

Section 1. For the purpose of enabling the city and county of Sacramento to pay for the ground selected as a site for the State capitol, the Board of Supervisors of the said city and county of Sacramento is hereby authorized and empowered to levy, immediately after the passage of this act, upon all the taxable property within the limits of the city of Sacramento, as assessed for the year A.D. one thousand eight hundred and fifty-nine, a special tax, not exceeding three-quarters of one per cent; and said tax when so levied shall be a lien upon all property in said assessment for said year.

After the money was collected by the City and County Tax Collector, it was to be turned over to the State Treasurer who, in turn, was to pay it out on the order of the land appraisal Commissioners to the Sixth District Court for the benefit of the property owners.²⁹

On August 24, 1860, the Board ordered that the \$41,671.67 collected to date by the City and County of Sacramento and turned over to the State Treasurer be paid into the Sixth District Court so that payment to landowners could begin. A schedule for payment was also issued by the Board. Improvements on the property purchased by the state were to be sold on September 1, 1860 by C. H. Grimm and A. K. Grim, auctioneers. The money collected was to be credited toward the State Capitol Fund.³⁰

The auction took place as ordered. Houses, out-buildings, fences, and even fruit trees were sold. The sale was not without its dramatic moments, as indicated by the following account:

When the auctioneer, C. H. Grimm, offered for sale the house of Mrs. Hanks, she appeared on the front steps and entered into the bidding with tears and exclamations of grief that her home was being sold without her consent. The excitement, by this little interlude in the dull monotony of the auctioneer's cry, was not, however, of long duration, as the house was immediately struck off to the proprietress without contest at \$117, and which had been assessed by the Commission at \$800.³¹

The State Capitol Commissioners, themselves, purchased a brick house on M Street between 11th and 12th for \$240, to be used by the superintendent of the state capitol building. Presumably this was for a work area for Supervising Architect Reuben Clark because three months later he billed the state for \$138.91 for outfitting an office.³² The total amount of the sale of improvements brought the state \$6,151.35, for which, a local newspaper claimed, the state had paid \$22,665. By the thirteenth of September, there was still a deficit of \$10,000 in the amount needed to pay the owners of condemned property. Subscriptions were being solicited from private sources to meet that amount, with \$6,000 already being subscribed. On September 18, 1860, the Board ordered that an additional \$16,368.33 be paid into the Sixth District Court for the owners of land and improvements, according to an attached schedule. Another auction was scheduled for September 29 to sell more improvements with the profit to be credited to the State Capitol Fund.³³

Even after the auctions there was an \$8,500 deficit in the last \$16,368.33 owed the property owners. This money was raised by contributions from the following Sacramento merchants and businesses:³⁴

B. F. Hastings	--	\$750
D. O. Mills	--	750
A. C. Monson (as trustee)	--	500
A. C. Monson	--	175
Haggin and Tevis	--	375
Boyd and Davis	--	375
H. E. Robinson	--	350
E. P. Figg	--	350
J. H. Carroll & Co.	--	350
Booth & Co.	--	350
L. B. Harris	--	350
Hull and Lohman	--	350

Charles Crocker	--	350
T. M. Lindley	--	175
Huntington & Hopkins	--	175
Sneath & Arnold	--	175
James Bailey	--	175
I. D. Thompson	--	175
Burton & McCarty	--	175
R. H. McDonald	--	175
Lord, Holbrook & Co.	--	175
J. C. Jonghaus	--	175
William Weston	--	175
L. Sloss & Co.	--	175
Lady Adams Co.	--	175
Greenbaum & Bro.	--	175
C. H. Swift	--	175
C. H. Grimm	--	175
Heuston, Hastings & Co.	--	175

On November 13, 1860, the two auctioneers, Grimm and Grim, were authorized to sell the remaining improvements on the capitol site, and on November 22, they sold all remaining buildings, improvements, and shrubbery on the grounds.³⁵ On December 12, Sacramento District Attorney Cole paid into the City and County Treasury an additional \$696.28.³⁶ At the end of December, after a final accounting was made of the purchase of condemned land and improvements and the subsequent sale of improvements on behalf of the State Capitol Fund, there was a balance of \$1,000. Commissioner A. C. Monson offered the following Preamble and Resolution:³⁷

Whereas, D. O. Mills for himself and others advanced the sum of \$8,500 to enable the City of Sacramento to pay for the ground selected as a site for the State Capitol; and whereas, after paying for the Same, there is now in the hands of the State Treasurer the sum of (\$1,000.00) one thousand dollars, the same having been collected and paid into the hands of the State Treasurer to pay for said Capitol grounds. Therefore, be it resolved that the State Treasurer be requested pay said D. O. Mills the said sum of (\$1,000.00) one thousand dollars.

In March 1861, an act was passed which authorized the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Sacramento to levy a special tax for 1861 in order to raise additional revenue for payment of the state capitol land. The rate was eleven cents per \$100 worth of property and the revenues were to be applied to the payment of monies advanced by D. O. Mills and the other Sacramento merchants. The following July, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners paid D. O. Mills \$676.58, it being described as the balance of monies paid into his hands for purchase of capitol grounds.³⁸

On February 7, 1861, the Sacramento Daily Union reported "the last act of the transfer of the Capitol grounds to the State, by this city, was consummated yesterday, by the Clerk of the Board of Commissioners filing in the Secretary of State's office the proceedings had in the Sixth District Court, relative to the purchase and donation, the law requiring the same to be done, after which

the State of California shall be the owner of the land...."³⁹ The state found itself in the property management business. To raise revenue the Board rented out parts of the capitol site: in September of 1860, the rate was \$7.50 per 30 feet per month for ground rent.⁴⁰ The state, as landlord, also had a perpetual problem with notifying certain owners of buildings on the capitol grounds to remove them. One of the most flagrant violators was Sacramento County, who was delinquent in removing the County Hospital from the area of 10th and L Streets. In 1866, when the hospital had still not been removed, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners took action on the matter by passing the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Secretary be instructed to transmit to the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento, a petition this day received from the Architect, Superintendent and others employed upon the State Capitol Building, asking for the removal of the County Hospital from the Capitol Grounds, and to urge upon the said Supervisors the necessity of the immediate removal of the Hospital to some other locality.

Three years later the building still stood on the site. In March 1869, the Commissioners realized that the county was ignoring their request and they resolved that the Board of Supervisors be notified to have the hospital removed within thirty days. Finally in August of that year, the Board of Capitol Commissioners resolved that the Attorney General be requested to begin ejectment action against the County of Sacramento.⁴¹ Presumably, it was shortly removed.

Another major effort that the Board of State Capitol Commissioners undertook before they turned to the actual construction process was the selection of a plan for the new building. Although the state already owned a set of plans and specifications for a capitol, purchased from Reuben Clark in 1856, by law the Board was authorized to select a plan from ones submitted to them in competition. The winner would receive a sum, not to exceed \$1,500, with the exception of Reuben Clark who would receive no further compensation if his 1856 plans were selected.⁴²

On April 6, 1860, the Board agreed to advertise for plans and beginning on April 20 and for four weeks following, the Board received plans. On the 19th of May, the Board met in the Governor's rooms in the Latham building to open and examine those which had been submitted. Seven plans, each "accompanied by full and explicit specifications and profiles, were opened and examined...." In addition to the plan designed by Reuben Clark in 1856, plans were submitted by "Atlantic" of San Francisco (submitted anonymously), W. F. Knox of Sacramento, M. F. Butler of Sacramento, P. J. O'Connor of San Francisco, James G. Plummer of Sacramento, S. Babson of Sacramento, and J. Mooney of Folsom. Beginning on the 21st, the Board heard presentations from all but the anonymous "Atlantic". Both M. F. Butler and P. J. O'Connor asked for and received permission to more fully explain their plans.⁴³ According to the following Sacramento Daily Union article, the Board seemed to take an interest in Butler's plan:⁴⁴

...the Board took up the drawings of M. F. Butler, who was present with Reuben L. Clark, architect and designer of the plans for a State Capitol which were purchased by the State in 1856 for \$3,000. Butler's plans, we believe, were mainly prepared by Clark, though presented in the former's name. They are, in many respects, similar to those which the State purchased, and the exterior design is very nearly the same. They are certainly very elegant and appropriate drawings, and they were examined further by the Board with a view to elicit information on the probable cost and requisite materials of a foundation for the proposed State Capitol. None of the plans have been passed upon yet.

On May 28, 1860, the Board resolved to give the architects who had submitted plans two weeks in additional time, from June 1, to perfect their plans and to furnish models, if needed. Butler, Mooney, O'Connor, and Plummer took advantage of the offer. The rest of the plans, including Clarks' old plan, remained under consideration.⁴⁵

Late in June, just as the Board was readying to make a decision, P. J. O'Connor appeared before that body and announced that in the second plan submitted by M. F. Butler (after he and others had two weeks additional time to perfect their plans), Butler had copied some elements of O'Connor's original plan. Following that accusation, the Board, upon the motion of A. Redington, "Resolved -- that at the next meeting of the Board we will hear the charges Mr. O'Connor desires to prefer against Mr. Butler." Mr. O'Connor appeared before the Board on July 12 and "presented a communication in writing charging Mr. M. F. Butler with having committed plagiarisms from the first submitted by him (O'Connor)." He listed five different elements that had allegedly been copied. The next day, the Board went into the consideration of the charges. Both Butler and O'Connor produced witnesses to substantiate their cases. After a lengthy consideration of the matter, the Board seemed to have dropped the matter.⁴⁶

On July 14, the Board called for a vote on the selection of a plan. After the fifth ballot, Butler's second plan won, receiving four out of the five votes of the Commissioners. (Butler had also left his first plan in the competition.) This was news, indeed, and the Commissioners wasted little time in announcing their selection. At three o'clock in the afternoon on the day of the vote (Saturday, July 14), they telegraphed a dispatch to the Daily Alta California in San Francisco, where it appeared in the Sunday edition, scooping the Sacramento papers. In a somewhat conciliatory tone, the Sacramento Daily Union announced the news and explained that they may have given a somewhat wrong impression of Butler earlier. They wrote,

It is due to him that we should state in this connection, that a former mention of his plans before the State Capitol Commissioners may have placed him in a wrong light, from our ascribing a principal part of their execution to another architect. The architect in question, did, it is true, design and draw the chief plan presented by Mr. Butler, but it was done, we are informed, by the latter gentleman, under his direction and by his employment....

Thus, according to this newspaper, Clark did design the building, but under Butler's employ. The Board voted to pay Butler the maximum allowed (\$1,500) for his plan.⁴⁷

Once a plan for the capitol was decided upon, the Board selected a superintending architect to supervise the construction process. As early as May, and throughout June, letters were received from architects asking for an appointment to the position. Aspirants included A. P. Petit and M. F. Butler but, on July 17, 1860, Reuben Clark was named on a second ballot.

Clark's position as superintending architect was under the direction and control of the Board of Capitol Commissioners. His duties, as prescribed by law, were "to judge of the quality and durability of materials that may be furnished for the erection of said capitol, and to take special care that all work be done in a neat, workmanlike manner, and in accordance with the specifications made."⁴⁸ Not only were his responsibilities to the construction great, but he was in the delicate political position of being the liaison between the Board of Capitol Commissioners (who were in a position to react to the political climate) and the pressures of the construction process.

No time was wasted. On the same day that he was elected, Clark appeared before the Capitol Commissioners and "explained his views as to the proper foundation for the State Capitol." They, in turn, directed Clark to formally examine the capitol site and to determine the necessary foundations for the building and its estimated cost. On July 23, Clark reported back to the Board,

I have made approximate estimates based upon the cheapest mode of constructing the Basement of the Capitol building, which is to build the entire walls of brick, face the exterior walls with granite ashlar from the established ground line to the top of the Basement floor ["basement floor" refers to what is now commonly called the first floor or ground floor], forming the Base story cornice, architrave mouldings, and exterior columns of cast iron, plastering the plain surface with cement mortar, and painting and sanding the cement and iron work in the usual manner, and find that built in this mode it would cost \$76,000. This estimate is exclusive of exterior steps, which it is not proposed to build until the entire building is up, and of carpenters' work or interior finish of any description. It however, includes all other rough work from the foundation to the top of the basement story cornice.... I am now preparing my drawings and specifications for facing with granite....

He also estimated that to face all the exterior walls with granite ashlar would cost an additional \$38,000; marble would be an additional \$33,000.⁴⁹ The first steps toward the actual construction of the state capitol had been taken. A week later, the specifications for the construction of the foundation and basement story wall were adopted. A "Notice to Contractors" was published for 30 days beginning August 1.⁵⁰

While awaiting the submission of bids, Reuben Clark visited granite quarries near Folsom to begin lining up construction materials for the building. He reported back to the Commissioners "...giving as his opinion that he found a great quantity of the best granite, ample for all future wants of the State."⁵¹ Other preparations were arranged for by the Board. They resolved that the Sacramento City surveyor should officially locate the grounds to be used as the capitol site, to run the center lines of M and Eleventh Streets and to give the established city grade at the intersection (which would be the center of the proposed building).⁵²

On September 3, 1860, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners met in the Assembly Chamber and opened the bids for the construction of the foundation and basement (first or ground floor) walls. At \$80,000, Michael Fennell's was the lowest of the seven bids submitted. Over the next few days Commissioners Monson and Findley examined Fennell's bondsmen and, on September 18, the Board adopted a resolution which provided that Michael Fennell be awarded the contract; work was to commence by October 1, 1860, and was to be completed within eight months. On September 20, the Board approved the bond of Michael Fennell and the contract was signed. In its final form, the contractor was allowed ten rather than eight months from October 1.⁵³ A local paper reported,

Fennell agrees to have done at his own expense all the labor, freighting, cartage, mechanical workmanship, and necessary excavations, and furnish all the materials of every kind necessary to the construction and building of, and will build and completely finish upon the Capitol lot, the foundation and basement walls of the Capitol building to the heights [sic] specified in the plans adopted by the Board of Commissioners, and according to the samples of materials furnished to him; to commence on or before October 1st, 1860, and to be finished in ten months thereafter. Conditions are inserted in the contract providing against delay or default of work. The payments are to be made on the certificate of the architect, after the work is accepted by the Commissioners, on the first day of each month (excepting Sunday), which are to be relative proportions of the work done and cost of materials, to the extent of 75 per cent of the amount of certificates and estimated value, until the amount shall reach the full sum of \$80,000, deducting all damages. Conditions are inserted in the contract for the State taking possession of the land, work done and materials furnished, in case of default in work.⁵⁴

No general and overall set of specifications were drawn up, nor was a general contract for the building issued. As evident in Michael Fennell's contract, the work was planned out in a piecemeal fashion. Specifications were drawn up for only the next section that would be contracted for.

Work commenced on September 24, 1860, when Fennell began excavating for the basement wall. Groundbreaking was reported to have taken place at the intersection of M and Tenth Streets.⁵⁵ (This seems an unlikely spot to begin excavation; the report probably meant M and Eleventh.) In order to

facilitate the transportation of the stone and material for the concrete foundation, Fennell planned to lay a lateral track from the Sacramento Valley Railroad to the building site. The material for the track was to be taken from a branch railroad line which ran to the Centerville race course. The new line was expected to come off the Sacramento Valley Railroad line on R Street, somewhere near Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets, "and run to the Capitol grounds on such line as shall be of the most convenient grade." (Although this track was planned, it is not certain whether it was ever constructed. Fennell did, however, receive freight bills from the Sacramento Valley Railroad from October 24, 1860 - March 22, 1861 for freight going to the capitol.)⁵⁶

Fennell's progress was slow. One month after groundbreaking he was informed that unless he had lime and material on the capitol grounds and the laying of the concrete foundation began by November 1, the Commissioners would consider the work not being diligently prosecuted as required by the contract. Under pressure, excavations for the basement foundation walls were completed on October 25 and Fennell began laying the concrete the next day. With almost a sigh of relief, the Sacramento Daily Union reported the progress:⁵⁷

The work at the Capitol progresses finely [sic], Fennell, the contractor, having yesterday laid the base cobble through all the trenches, and which are in condition to be covered with the concrete rock and cement.... This concrete basement is to be laid as a foundation, to the depth of three feet, about six feet from the surface.

Fennell erected a large frame shed, forty-two feet square, on the grounds east of the capitol site to house the operation of manufacturing and mixing the mortar for the brick basement story walls. A circular trench was constructed of brick, two feet wide, two feet deep, and twenty-eight feet in diameter. The lime, sand, and water were placed in the trench and "mixed by means of a revolving wooden wheel seven feet in diameter, drawn by a horse walking around the outside of a circle." In addition, an artesian well had been sunk under the shed. The horsepowered wheel also drove the pump, which elevated water from this well for use on the job.⁵⁸

Towards the end of November 1860, the work of filling up the trenches, the bottom of which had already been lined with a stratum of concrete, began. The proposed use of Benicia cement remained controversial since Reuben Clark was not yet satisfied that it would not decay or otherwise react over a period of time. Samples had been forwarded to Professor Whitney, the State Geologist, to analyze. The concrete that was eventually selected was composed of Hoffman's Rosendale cement, from New York, mixed with broken granite and "gravel from Folsom carefully screened, the size varying from that of a pigeon's to that of a hen's egg." Fennell purchased the cement from C. Adolph Low Co., through A. K. Grim, a Sacramento agent. After being mixed in a mortar bed, the mixture was poured in on the cobbles at the bottom of the trenches, to a depth of about one foot. This continued, layer by layer, until the trenches were filled up to the grade of the ground. The job for the entire building was expected to take several weeks.⁵⁹

While the newspapers were enthusiastic about seeing some progress on the job, the Capitol Commissioners and Reuben Clark were considerably less so. While Fennell's work was progressing, it apparently was not progressing quickly enough. On December 13, 1860, the Capitol Commissioners again warned Fennell by adopting the following resolution:⁶⁰

Resolved -- That Mr. Fennell be notified by the Secretary that he is not progressing with the construction of the foundation of the Capitol according to the assurances he has given the Board, and that unless he resumes the work upon the concrete by the 18th instant and prosecutes it with more efficiency than heretofore, the Board will feel they have just grounds of complaint and that said Fennell is not fulfilling the requirements of the contract.

Reuben Clark reported to the Board, "All ready one half the time specified for the completion of the contract has passed, with but a small portion of the work done; in case the work had been prosecuted with ordinary diligence near one half should have been completed." One of Clark's major concerns was that a stone quarry had not yet been selected for the building. Clark felt that this was fairly important to do, because granite facing would be needed for the basement story (first story) walls and it would need to be of a uniform color and quality.⁶¹

Work continued intermittently and, by the end of February 1861, the brick work was started. A local newspaper, eager to report any and all progress on the capitol, reported that "a visitor to the grounds is able to take in from an elevated point, the outline of the noble edifice to be reared."⁶²

By February 27, the Assembly had taken an active interest in the project by requesting an investigation. They resolved "That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, be instructed to inquire into and report to the Assembly, what progress has been made in the erection of a State Capitol."⁶³ The Board, no doubt, was feeling pressure from the Legislature and on March 15 they adamantly expressed their concern by passing the following resolution:⁶⁴

That the Secretary of this Board be directed to notify Mr. Fennell and his sureties that in the opinion of the Board Mr. Fennell has failed and neglected to diligently prosecute the work upon the Capitol Building in accordance with his contract and that unless said work is immediately proceeded with and prosecuted more diligently, this Board will proceed to cause said work to be finished and completed at the expense of said Fennell and his sureties."

Less than two weeks later, on March 26, 1861, the Senate passed a resolution directing the Capitol Commissioners and the Superintending Architect to

report by Friday next how much work has been performed on the State Capitol by Michael Fennell, the Contractor, how much money has been paid by the State to the Contractor, what amount of material there is on the ground belonging to

the State; also, the amount of money paid by the State for the superintendence of the work performed, including the Commissioners' salaries; and also, if the said Contractor has complied with the terms of his contract, and if not, what action has been taken in the premises.

At the time of this request, the work had been "nearly suspended" for ten days. The brick walls of the north wing had been carried up in places to a height of four or five feet above the ground.⁶⁵ Obviously, the Senate was very concerned and wanted answers quickly. Politically and fiscally, the Legislature had committed themselves to getting a state capitol built; understandably, they were impatient with delays.

On April 4 (the Friday next), the Commissioners read their report in response to the Senate's request for information on the project's progress. It was not optimistic.

With regard to the progress of the work the Commissioners regret that they cannot make a favorable report; the contractor has not progressed with this work according to the requirements of his contract or with verbal assurances made by him to the Board.... The Commissioners have repeatedly...notified the contractor that he must proceed most diligently with his work; after each notification, the contractor would appear before the Board offer excuses and promises to progress more rapidly -- for a few days he would do so, and then the Board would have to complain.⁶⁶

The Board was clearly unhappy with Fennell's performance and, no doubt, somewhat embarrassed at the attention from both houses of the Legislature. The Board did not accuse Fennell of any willful wrongdoing and went so far as to say,

In justice to the contractor...they believe he is desirous to perform his contract, and that he has made every effort in his power to do so, that all his verbal assurances to the Board have been made in good faith and under the belief at the time that he could fulfill them, but his difficulty has been, and is, the want of the necessary pecuniary ability.⁶⁷

They attached a copy of their resolution of March 15, in which they had chastised Fennell, to their report to the Senate. They also included a brief review of the work completed to date, and reported that the contract value of the work done and material delivered by Fennell was estimated at \$18,790.50, seventy-five percent of which had already been paid. The actual value of the work and material was estimated at \$23,432.85.⁶⁸

On April 23, 1861, the Assembly Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported back the findings from their investigation. They learned that the excavations for the whole foundation were nearly complete; that over one-half, or thirteen yards, of the concrete foundation had been finished, and that there was enough material on hand to complete it; and that three hundred

thousand of the one million bricks received had been laid. The contractor had testified to the committee that he had "expended large sums of money in purchasing interests in quarries of granite, lime, and cement rock, so that he may no longer be delayed in procuring the necessary material for the successful completion of his contract." In spite of some evidence to the contrary, the committee had a favorable impression of the construction project:

The work thus far completed appears to have been performed in a thorough and substantial manner; and while there does not appear to have been the progress that was anticipated, yet it is in part to be attributed to the inherent difficulties attending the inauguration of so great an enterprise, and in part to the delays consequent upon the inclement weather during the months of December, January, and March.

Their recommendation was that the Board of State Capitol Commissioners be authorized to extend the completion date of Fennell's contract from August 1, 1861 to January 1, 1862.⁶⁹

Compared to the Capitol Commissioners, the Assembly had taken an extremely lenient position. This may be explained by the fact that, unlike the Commissioners, the Assembly was not charged with the direct responsibility of seeing the contract completed. They could afford to be more merciful in their evaluation. The Commissioners, on the other hand, were in the position of being severely criticized if the contract did not proceed in a timely manner. Another consideration is that Joseph Powell, the chairman of the Assembly Committee, represented Sacramento. Eager to keep the job moving, he may have felt more progress would be made by extending Fennell's time rather than bidding for a new contractor.

As well as recommending an extension for Fennell, the Assembly Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds urged that additional work be done on the building, but under a separate contract. Reuben Clark had recommended that the walls of the Senate and Assembly chambers, the Supreme Court room, and the halls be lined on the inside, as high as the window sills, with marble facing, provided the Commissioners could contract for it at a fair price. He felt it would protect the walls. There was expected to be an unexpended balance of \$25,000 of the initial appropriation, and the Assembly Committee proposed to use that for the marble, which Clark estimated to cost from \$20,000 to \$25,000.⁷⁰

The two recommendations of the Assembly Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were put to a vote on April 25, 1861. The first, to extend Fennell's contract, passed; the second, to contract for marble facings on the walls, failed.⁷¹ Despite these efforts on his behalf, Michael Fennell decided to withdraw from further involvement with the construction of the capitol. On May 4, 1861, the Board received a letter from him demanding settlement and a sum of money according to the terms of his contract. On May 14, a bill (Senate Bill 409) was introduced into the Senate to release Fennell from "the further prosecution of the work, and the payment for the labor and materials already expended under the contract." It passed both houses and was approved by Governor Downey six days later.⁷²

Per the specifications in the law, Fennell presented the Board with a written cancellation of the contract, a bill of sale of all materials furnished and delivered on the capitol grounds and all buildings erected by him for the prosecution of the work, and his written release of all claims and demands against the state.⁷³ Reuben Clark was appointed by the state to give an estimate of the work done and materials furnished by Fennell. Fennell appointed William B. Carr, on his behalf, to make such an estimate. Clark and Carr agreed on William Furton as the third arbitrator. All the parties did not agree. Carr and Furton assessed the amount due Fennell to be \$34,714.55; Clark felt \$27,443.82 was fair. As of June 22, 1861, Fennell claimed to have paid out a total of \$34,624.55; some as yet unpaid claims were made directly to the state, by Coffroth and Spaulding, the firm handling the claims. Although the state felt Clark's estimate was correct, after a long standstill they were compelled to pay the additional \$7,270.73, since the third arbitrator sided with Fennell.⁷⁴ With that final payment, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners' first experience with a contractor for construction ended. It was an unpleasant experience for the Commissioners and Fennell, alike, and was perhaps prophetic of the many years of both construction and political problems that were to follow before the building was completed.

While the conflicts with Michael Fennell were occurring, work continued on the project. Reuben Clark conducted tests on the soil on which the foundation of the state capitol was being laid. On April 1, 1861, he reported to the Board that under the surface alluvial soil, there was a bed of "firm, yellow clay", which extended down to a depth of 25 feet, below which were boulders and a stratum of gravel. Clark assured the Board that the winter rains had not produced any "material change" in the consistency of the clay where the foundation trenches were opened, and that "it is now quite as firm as it was before the rains set in."⁷⁵

One of the major and more festive events that happened during the early construction years was the laying of the capitol's cornerstone. Over the years this functional aspect of building construction had given way to the ceremonial, often presided over by a Masonic Lodge. This was the case with the state capitol. Reuben Clark, the Superintending Architect, was the Past Master of a Masonic Lodge in San Francisco and was well aware of the cornerstone-laying tradition.⁷⁶

Preparation began for the cornerstone-laying ceremony on April 20, 1861, with a request from Clark to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners to determine the cost of a cornerstone. Two stones were located by Albert Ross at a quarry in Folsom belonging to E. O. Dana and were shipped down to the site on May 2. The Board was responsible for organizing the program. They invited the California Grand Lodge of Masons to participate and Mr. S. W. Wilson of San Francisco to deliver the oration. Even a band was hired to lend a festive atmosphere to the occasion. A platform was built to provide seating for the distinguished guests. As late as two days before the ceremony, "Judge Monson was appointed to confer with different parties as to the deposits to be placed in the cornerstone."⁷⁷ One of the items placed in the cornerstone was an unframed, colored rendering of the capitol. Since the capitol was in its initial construction phase, the view had to be a prospective rather than completed view of the building. The following description, made two months before the ceremony, is probably of the rendering in the cornerstone.⁷⁸

NEW STATE CAPITOL -- In the Governor's office, there is suspended in an elegant frame, a drawing of the State House of California, as it will appear when finished. The drawing is by Mr. Clark, the architect, and it presents a building of noble design and proportions, wearing a grand and imposing exterior. If this building look like the drawing, the new Capitol will be a credit not only to the El Dorado State, but to the Republic.

By the thirteenth of May, out-of-town guests began to arrive in Sacramento. Many were Masons who came up from San Francisco on the steamer Antelope.

On May 15th, the day of the cornerstone laying, the ceremony began with a procession at 1:00 in the afternoon from the corner of 2nd and J Streets, near Sacramento's Masonic Lodge Hall. The crowds along the streets were deep and flags flew from flagstuffs, awning posts, and in the windows of stores and homes. About an hour later, the procession arrived on the capitol grounds and joined the crowd of 3,000 people which had gathered at the north side of the capitol building site, "where the stone, a huge block of granite, hung suspended from a derrick, ready to be fitted to its place." The officers of the Grand Lodge of Masons presided over the cornerstone laying. A list of the articles gathered for inclusion in the copper casket was read by the Grand Secretary. Assisted by Reuben Clark, the Grand Officers, led by Grant Master N. Green Curtiss, sealed the casket inside the cornerstone with cement and conducted the appropriate Masonic ritual. The event closed with an oration by Samuel Wilson of San Francisco.⁷⁹

The cornerstone was set at the northeast corner of the capitol, the traditional location for cornerstones placed by Masonic Lodges. Contents of the cornerstone were sealed inside a copper casket, which in turn was sealed inside the granite cornerstone. The cornerstone was actually made up of two stones: one, 4 feet long, 3 feet 4 inches wide, and 18 inches thick; the other was the same length and breadth. The cornerstone was set so that its top was two inches below the established ground level. Later, the ground level would be raised an additional 6 feet due to flooding problems, and the cornerstone was buried another 6 feet deeper in the ground.⁸⁰

By today's standards, this important ceremony was arranged very quickly. Preparation only began on April 20, some three weeks before the event. For such a widely attended celebration, the expenses were amazingly few. The total bill for the cornerstone and the ceremony amounted to \$735.00. While this was a festive occasion and was, indeed, a celebration, the local Sacramento Daily Union, long a supporter of Sacramento as the permanent seat of government, gave the event a great deal of serious importance. They wrote,

The cornerstone of the future State Capitol of California rests securely in its place, cemented by the art of the builder, and consecrated by Masonic rites. It is to be hoped we shall hear no more of the "removal of the State Capitol," [sic] or of the unfitness of its locality; but that, in the language of the Grand Master, who performed the ceremony, we shall only hear "may this building be speedily completed; may symmetry and order rest upon each line and curve; may strength and beauty characterize each arch and pillar."⁸¹

In April, Clark completed the final working plans and specifications for the completion of the foundation and basement story walls. In mid-June, the Board advertised for bids, which were opened on July 24, 1861. Of the eight participants J. Nougues was low, with a bid of \$88,329. However, since the time when Fennell's contract was signed, state law had been amended so that the Commissioners were not compelled to accept the lowest bidder. On the 25th of July, the Board accepted the bid of G. W. Blake of San Francisco and P. Edward Conner of Stockton for \$99,250. The statute which had provided for the cancellation of Michael Fennell's contract appropriated \$50,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of the previous appropriation, for use by the Capitol Commissioners in carrying out the basement and foundation contracts.⁸²

Blake and Conner were well known builders in the area and had constructed part of the State Asylum at Stockton. On August 3, 1861, their contract was signed. Their obligation was to complete the foundation and to erect the basement (first) story walls of the capitol to a height of the "springing line of the arch", which would carry the height of the walls, with the exception of the rotunda, to 23 feet 9 inches above the line of the concrete foundation. The rotunda walls were to rise to 34 feet 6 inches. The work was to commence by the 12th of August and be completed within eight months.⁸³ Although on schedule, work proceeded slowly after its resumption on the 12th. The new contractors were immediately faced with the problem of a scarcity of cement in the local market. It was not until the very end of the month that the arrival of two ships carrying the material in demand relieved the situation.⁸⁴

Sacramentans were elated to see progress on the building, once again, after a delay of several months. One of the major tasks facing the contractors was to acquire and cut the granite for the facings of the basement (first) story. A local newspaper happily reported,

A gang of forty stone cutters are engaged under M. Heverin for the granite work, and the ring of their hammers is an agreeable relief from the monotony and dullness which have reigned upon the premises during the past Summer months.⁸⁵

Almost immediately after commencing the work in August a question arose over the amount of the freight rate the Sacramento Valley Railroad was charging the contractor to have granite hauled from the quarries at Folsom to Sacramento. In an editorial, the Sacramento Daily Union revealed what they called "the unfriendly spirit exhibited by the Sacramento Valley Railroad Company towards the builders of our State House. Whether justly chargeable to the company or to its agents here, matters not, nor does it matter whether the conduct complained of springs from ill-will or is dictated by 'sharp' business policy; in either case the company are [sic] responsible...."⁸⁶ They cited as an example the fact that the railroad refused to deliver granite to Sacramento unless the freight bill was paid on the spot. More seriously, the newspaper charged the railroad with discrimination against the capitol contractors over the price of freight. The freight on granite intended for San Francisco was \$1.50 per ton, while the capitol contractors were charged \$3.00. This discrimination was apparently made against the City of Sacramento as a whole. The reason offered by the railroad was that in San Francisco they had to

compete with a supply of dressed building stone arriving as ballast in vessels from China; in Sacramento, there was no incentive to give favors. Furthermore, the railroad added, they charged all contractors for Sacramento-bound granite the same price, and that they had the legal right to charge anyone double rates. The newspaper was outraged that the railroad would blatantly and frankly charge the state double, despite the fact that it was "a common practice". The Union was fearful that

The effect of such dealing with the State will be unfavorable upon the company and unfortunate for Sacramento. It will be used by the enemies of the city in the next Legislature in connection with any attempt which may be made to agitate the removal of the Capital.⁸⁷

The matter came before the Board of State Capitol Commissioners. Even though the rate was strictly a concern between the railroad and the contractor, the Board felt it was a matter of public interest and decided to pursue the issue. In reply to the Board's inquiry about the usual rates of transportation over the Sacramento Valley Railroad, J. P. Robinson, Superintendent, simply replied, "that it depends a great degree upon the circumstances and the nature or value of freight -- whether we transport rates or at the maximum allowed by the statutes." Robinson also added that Reuben Clark had visited the Sacramento Valley Railroad and was satisfied so long as the same rate was charged to anyone who might bid on the capitol granite contract. The Board decided to indefinitely postpone the subject.⁸⁸

On October 19, 1861, M. Heverin set the first granite stone in the building. Throughout that fall, the masonry and stone work continued on the basement story. Then, beginning in December and continuing into January, Sacramento was subjected to heavy rains and flooding from breaks in the south levee of the American River. The Legislature convened January 6, 1862, in the midst of this inundation. Four days later, the fourth in this series of floods hit. The next day, on the 11th, the Senate passed a resolution by a vote of 20 to 13 to adjourn to San Francisco for the remainder of the session. Their resolution was considered by the Assembly that same day, but that body refused to concur. What the Assembly did support, however, was a resolution authorizing its Sergeant-at-Arms to hire boats to convey its members to and from the capitol at 7th and I Streets. Finally, on the 22nd, the Assembly passed its own adjournment resolution; the Senate concurred the same day. The resolution called for an adjournment until January 24, 1862, when the Legislature would meet in San Francisco in the hall of the "Exchange Building" for the remainder of the session. A committee was appointed by both houses whose duty was to procure and fix up the "proper apartments" for the Legislature and their attaches and to remove all the "property and appurtenances" of the Legislature.⁸⁹

The proposal to temporarily remove the Legislature to San Francisco rekindled the whole subject of permanently removing the seat of government to another city. Proponents of this proposed action had the weather on their side. The suitability of Sacramento, a site subjected to heavy flooding, as the seat of government was seriously questioned. The fact that members of the Legislature had been required to travel to work in boats emphasized the problem. Those who feared permanent removal argued that the Legislature had to meet in the

current permanent seat of government, which was Sacramento, but Attorney General Pixley determined that it was legal for the Legislature to adjourn to a place other than the permanent seat of government by concurrent resolution of both houses. As scheduled, the Legislature met in San Francisco for the first time on January 24, 1862. A few days later, that body resolved to hoist the American flag over the Merchant's Exchange building, where they were meeting, signaling their arrival.⁹⁰

The Legislature remained in San Francisco until May 15, 1862, the last day of the thirteenth session. On May 9, a bill for an act to provide for the removal of the furniture, books, and stationery, to the capitol at Sacramento, was introduced in the Senate. It passed both the Senate and the Assembly on the 14th, and was approved on May 15. After agreeing to pay their rent on the Merchant's Exchange (\$4,047.00) and taking care of last minute details, the Legislature adjourned to reconvene in Sacramento the following January.⁹¹

The floods of December 1861 and January 1862 did more than just inconvenience the Legislature; it disrupted the entire construction schedule of the capitol, involved the Board of State Capitol Commissioners in another contract dissolution problem, and kept the entire removal issue alive. By the first of January, 1862, G. W. Blake and P. Edward Conner were forced to stop work on the capitol foundation and basement walls due to the severe flooding.⁹² Members of the Legislature reacted by introducing a variety of legislation: extension of the contractors' time; suspension of work on the building until the next legislative session; and provision "for the relief" of the contractors. The first of this legislation, introduced in the Senate on January 30, 1862 by B. W. Hathaway of San Francisco and San Mateo, was an act for extending the time for completing the foundation and basement walls of the state capitol building in the City of Sacramento.⁹³ Later that same day, Samuel Soule, also of San Francisco, introduced an act to suspend, until the ensuing session of the Legislature, the construction of the state capitol now in progress of construction in the City of Sacramento.⁹⁴ Neither of these bills passed the Senate. Hathaway's bill (Senate Bill 53) was recommended for passage by the Committee on Public Buildings; however, on March 5, 1862, it was tabled.⁹⁵ The Soule bill (Senate Bill 61) was also heard by the Committee on Public Buildings, but that body, chaired by E. H. Heacock of Sacramento, recommended that it be indefinitely postponed. The bill was enormously controversial. While on the surface it seemed to address simply a problem in the construction schedule, it had serious political overtones: the whole removal issue was again revived. The fear existed that the suspension of work would be permanent. Accusations were made that certain Senators were using the recent calamity as an excuse for removal. Soule, however, denied that he had introduced the bill "as an entering wedge for the removal of the Capitol [sic] to this place [San Francisco]." A long debate ensued which included arguments over whether the state would save much money by stopping the contract at that point, if Sacramento should be the capital of the state, and if the site under construction in Sacramento was fit. Senator De Long presented his view that the present circumstances of the Civil War, expenses, and the floods made for an entirely different set of circumstances than when the former Legislature voted to build the capitol in Sacramento.⁹⁶

The Sacramento Daily Union reacted predictably to Soule's bill. They were furious and expressed their opinion in an editorial. They felt that the Senate debate

exhibited a disposition on the part of several Senators to pave the way for permanent removal. The pretended object was economy, though the argument in favor of said economy was formed upon the belief of the speaker that Sacramento was not exactly the place for the Capital. Now if those Senators honestly desire to economize for the State, they will permit the present contractors to go forward with their contract, allowing them in settlement a reasonable compensation for any real loss they may have suffered by the water. But the fact is they have been prevented from going on with the work, but otherwise have not been very seriously injured.

The Union writers reminded their readers that Reuben Clark had stated that the foundations were in good shape and that "all statements about the bad foundations in Sacramento are by men who are ignorant of what they say, or they willfully misrepresent." They chided those who favored a San Francisco location by reminding them of the frequent earthquakes in that city. They claimed "it is therefore a piece of barefaced impudence for the Senators of a city liable to such a terrible visitation to be talking about other cities being unsafe." After the lively debate on March 3, the bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee where it was again recommended for indefinite postponement.⁹⁷

Senate Bill 53 and Senate Bill 61 called for either prolonging or temporarily suspending work on the capitol. Their failure to pass may have been due, somewhat, to Reuben Clark's report in mid-February in which he was fairly optimistic about the prospect of continuing work. On February 14, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners had requested a report from Clark regarding the foundation, walls, and materials; damage caused by the flood; when the construction could proceed; and general suggestions.⁹⁸ Next, the Board inspected the capitol grounds with Clark. Clark reported that work on the site must resume immediately so that the masonry work could begin again. He felt that laborers should be hired at once to open drains, to clear the site of standing water, to make mortar, and to clear the walls and materials of mud and rubbish. The 1,100 barrels of lime that were subjected to water on the site could be salvaged, he felt, if the lime was immediately mixed with sand and made into mortar. Clark stated that once the drains were opened, work could begin in one week. The Board reacted by passing a resolution directing the contractors, Blake and Edwards, to recommence work as the Superintendent, Reuben Clark, may direct, on or before February 19. Two weeks later, Clark submitted the rest of his findings. He reported that the foundations were secure and that they were not affected by the water. The total loss of materials by flooding amounted to \$4,705.00, however, 60 percent of the lime could be made into mortar before it dried, reducing the loss to \$3,286.50.⁹⁹

Despite Clark's optimism about the preparation of the site for resumption of work, Blake and Conner wrote the Board stating they could not continue to work. They reported that one foot of mud and water was standing around the walls and that materials, including 1,000 barrels of lime, 200 barrels of cement, and a large quantity of lumber, had been swept away or destroyed. The Sacramento Valley Railroad, which transported the granite from Folsom, was inoperable. Blake and Conner asked the Board for an extension of time on their contract so that the walls would have time to dry and the ground time to become firm.¹⁰⁰

In less than two years, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners was again in the position of resolving a defaulting contractor, although it was widely recognized and accepted that Blake and Conner's problems were not their fault. Based on these experiences, Clark decided that the construction of public buildings by general contract was neither economical nor judicious, especially when limited to small yearly apportionments. Whether the contracts with the state were complied with or not, contractors often ended up receiving relief from the Legislature or in litigation. Clark felt that the first contracted job at the capitol, which lasted a year, could have been done in ten weeks; he felt the present contract would likely be as unprofitable. Clark felt an improvement could be made by acquiring all materials by contract and hiring all mechanics and laborers by the day. This would produce the best work, prevent delays, and save controversy. Clark predicted that the building could be completed on one-third less time than under the small contract system. Several months later, when work resumed again on the building, the Board did use his suggested "day's labor" system.¹⁰¹

While Senator Hathaway's and Senator Soule's bills did not meet with the approval of the Senate, a feeling still existed that the contractors, Blake and Conner, needed some type of financial relief. On February 26, 1862, Benjamin Shurtleff introduced "An Act for the relief of the contractors upon the foundations and basement walls of the State Capitol building at Sacramento."¹⁰² At the time Shurtleff's bill was introduced, the Hathaway and Soule bills had not yet been defeated. There was an underlying insinuation made by those who opposed Sacramento as the permanent seat of government that there was foot dragging on the part of those favoring Sacramento in getting those bills through the Senate. Mr. Heacock, of Sacramento, denied any detaining efforts.¹⁰³

Shurtleff's bill (Senate Bill 218) was referred to a special committee consisting of Charles H. Chamberlain, Charles De Long, and F. M. Warmcastle. They refused to make any recommendation and asked that the bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee so that it would be considered in connection with Soule's bill for suspension of work, already before that committee. After consideration, the Judiciary Committee reported the bill back with a substitute and recommended its passage. The substitute provided that no further construction contract should be made until authorized by the Legislature. They also recommended a one year moratorium on further construction, depending on the condition of Sacramento's levees. Senator Heacock, who favored continuation of the work, offered an amendment which provided that the Capitol Commissioners could make further contracts, if advisable. Both the substitute bill and its amended version provided relief for Blake and Conner.¹⁰⁴

A lengthy and heated debate ensued and the floor of the Senate was turned into a forum for all sorts of expressions about the fitness of Sacramento as the Capital City, the amount of salaries the Commissioners were receiving, whether to resume work and when, and the expenses involved. Very little of the debate was actually over relief for the contractors; it focused mostly on whether Sacramento was an inhabitable place to live. When the debate ended, the Senate voted to refer the bill to the Committee on Claims.¹⁰⁵ The Committee on Claims reviewed the entire budget history of the capitol construction and the proposed relief measures sought by Blake and Conner. On the first of April, they made their report:¹⁰⁶

The Committee find as follows:

Amount appropriated by Act of March 29, 1860.....		\$100,000.00
Amount appropriated by Act of May 20, 1861.....		50,000.00
Total appropriation.....		<u>\$150,000.00</u>
Amount paid Michael Fennell.....	\$34,614.55	
Amount paid Blake & Conner.....	34,177.70	
Amount due Blake & Conner.....	<u>11,392.56</u>	
Total amount in building and material.....	<u>\$80,184.81</u>	
Salary of Architect.....	\$5,840.00	
Salary of Commissioners.....	9,421.85	
Salary of Secretary.....	<u>2,000.00</u>	
Total amount of officers' salaries.....	17,361.85	
Plan and specifications of building.....	\$1,500.00	
Abstract of title to land.....	350.00	
Building for office and tool house.....	240.00	
Laying corner-stone, filling wells, etc.....	<u>365.00</u>	
Total preliminary expenses.....	<u>2,455.00</u>	
Total amount of appropriation expended.....		<u>100,001.66</u>
Balance of appropriation not expended.....		<u>\$49,998.34</u>

Messrs. Blake and Conner, the present contractors, whom this bill proposes to release from their contract, claim that the State should pay them the following sums, as the condition of such release:

Damage and loss by the several floods, to sheds, tools, derricks, etc.....		\$2,000.00
Material furnished and labor performed since January 1, 1862.....		1,006.75
T. P. Roach, for release of sub-contract.....		2,000.00
E. O. Dana, for release of sub-contract.....		1,200.00
Nutting & Kittredge, (contract for iron work.).....		565.00
Interest paid on audited accounts against the State, for the purpose of raising money to prosecute the work.....		715.38
Anticipated interest to January 1, 1863, on balance due and unpaid audited accounts of Blake & Conner.....		<u>5,520.36</u>
Total.....		\$13,007.49
From which amount Messrs. Blake & Conner propose to deduct...		<u>3,007.49</u>
Making a net loss to the State on the contract, of.....		\$10,000.00

If we add to this sum the total amount of appropriation expended as above, one hundred thousand and one dollars and sixty-six cents, the total amount expended will be one hundred and then thousand and one dollars and sixty-six cents, of which sum seventy-five thousand four hundred and sixty-nine dollars and eight cents had gone towards the construction of the Capitol building, and thirty-four thousand five hundred and thirty-two dollars and fifty-eight cents to pay salaries of officers, and damages sustained by contractors on account of abrogation of contracts.

The Committee therefore recommend the passage of the substitute as amended.

PARKS, Chairman.

The next day, it came before the floor of the Senate again. The amendment of the Committee on Claims was read which included:

Section 1, provided for the release of Blake and Conner, paying them \$10,000 for damages.

Section 2, provided that the architect shall modify the plans to bring the total cost of the building within \$500,000.

Sections 3, 4, and 5, provided that the Commissioners be authorized to sell material not needed for the modified plan and to contract for needed material, not to exceed the total of the unexpended appropriation.

The Claims Committee amendment was the catalyst for yet another heated debate which was much like the earlier debate on the bill. The questions of removal and the financial aspects of the bill were the cause of most of the discussion. Finally, the amendment of the Committee on Claims passed the Senate by a majority of 23 votes. The bill in its amended form came to a vote and passed 22 to 10.¹⁰⁷ Apparently, the San Francisco Alta was quite critical of the report and amendment by the Committee on Claims, especially the amount paid for the Capitol Commissioners' salaries. They expressed the opinion "that there has been gross incompetency or gross dishonesty in the management." The Sacramento Daily Union, expressing regional loyalty, defended the Commissioners.¹⁰⁸

Senate Bill 218 went to the Assembly where it passed on April 9 by a vote of 54 to 4. On April 11, the bill was delivered to Governor Leland Stanford who approved it on April 19, 1862. The law released Blake and Conner from their contract with the state, if they filed the following items with the Board of Commissioners within ten days of the approval of the act:¹⁰⁹

Their written consent to the cancellation of the contract.

A bill of sale of all materials furnished.

Their written release of all claims for damages against the State.

They would be paid a total of \$45,570.26, plus \$10,000 in damages.

The future construction of the capitol was also considered in this act. The plans, estimates, and specifications of the building were to be modified so that its total cost would not exceed \$500,000. Provisions were also made for acquiring materials by contract and hiring laborers and mechanics by the day. This was a significant change in the way the construction would be approached on the building. Another change that the act made was that the Capitol Commissioners and their secretary would no longer receive salaries. This had been a sore point for many people, who felt that the citizen members of the commission should willingly serve as part of their civic duties; the Governor, Secretary of State, and State Treasurer were already salaried by the state.

The Sacramento Daily Union reflected the pleasure of probably most Sacramentans when they reported the bill's passage. They were especially happy that work would continue on the capitol building -- this was some insurance against further removal efforts. They acknowledged that failure to pass "would have been a severe blow to this city", and credited its success to Sacramento's Senator Heacock.¹¹⁰ Acting according to the terms in the law, Blake and Conner presented a written agreement to the Board within the ten day limit. The Board adopted their agreement and resolved that Blake and Conner deliver to them all materials, tools, sheds, a derrick on the R Street levee, and the lot of rubble on Front Street. On May 2, 1862, Reuben Clark reported that they had complied and that they had filed requests for releasing all subcontractors.¹¹¹

Once the contract problem was resolved, attention returned to actual construction concerns. The recent legislative debates focused concern on the effects of future flooding on the site, modifications to the plans to keep costs down, and financing for the construction. On April 29, 1862, the Board took the following position:¹¹²

Resolved. That the architect of the State Capitol be required to modify the plan of the State Capitol so as to raise the established height and to make sure further modifications as will reduce the whole cost including the amount already expended to the sum of \$500,000. Such changes to be made in such places as will, in the opinion of the architect, render the building susceptible of future improvement without injury to the building.

Clark immediately began modifying the plans and specifications so that costs would conform to the act approved April 19, 1862. The Board also requested Clark to make an estimate of the kinds and amounts of material and labor required to finish the project. Clark presented his proposed modifications to the Board in mid-May. To ensure against potential future flooding problems, the ground line was to be raised 6 feet so that it would be 13 feet above the adjacent streets. The basement (first) floor was to be 3 feet above the established ground line and from the line of the basement floor to the line of the principal (second) story, 21 feet 6 inches. (Some ten years later, near the completion of the building, the grounds around the capitol were filled to a height of approximately ten feet with dirt hauled onto the site. During the construction phases the first story floor was about 13 feet above grade.) According to these specifications, the entire exterior of the building was to be faced with granite. Reuben Clark signed a statement that the building could be built according to his specifications for \$500,000 and the Board gave their approval. In order to carry out this new construction program, Clark was authorized to employ brick masons, stonecutters, carpenters, and laborers as they were required.¹¹³

The Board advertised for bids for furnishing material to proceed with the work. On June 6, 1862, the following contracts were awarded:

John Tansman, of Sacramento, 1,800,000 bricks, \$7.50 per thousand;

C. W. Hayden, of Benicia, 1,500 barrels of Benicia cement, \$3.50 per barrel;

E. O. Dana, of Folsom, 120 tons granite chips, \$3.50 per ton; granite for base course, \$1.08 per foot; 600 sq. ft. granite ashlar at \$1.50 per foot;
M. Lynch, 200 tons gravel, \$2.75 per ton; and
M. Lynch, 500 cubic yards sand, 75 cents per yard.

In August, a contract was made with J. H. Culver and H. T. Holmes to deliver 600 barrels of lime. On all of these contracts, and the ones to follow which furnished materials, 20 percent payment was retained by the state until the contracts were completed.¹¹⁴

Before construction could begin, Clark and one of the brickmakers set upon a project to drain the lower part of the city of standing water, which, no doubt, affected the capitol construction project. According to the Sacramento Bee,

So far as we can make out, Messrs. Hubbard and Baker have given up all ideas of making another attempt to stop the water from running through Burns' Slough. After hearing of this conclusion, Reuben Clark, architect of the new Capitol, with a gang of men assisted by John Tansman and other brickmakers, commenced to build a piece of levee in the southeastern part of the city, the object being by this means to send the water which comes through the slough across the low land east of the city cemetery and thus drain the lower part of the city. It is generally conceded that the work, when completed, will bring about the desired result.¹¹⁵

Work must have resumed in August 1862, because that is the first month that the state hired laborers, including brick layers, by the day. Brick masons were assigned to C. H. Grimm. Each worker and his rate of payment was listed in the Commissioners' records; many were Irish names. During that same month, water was supplied from the City Water Works at the rate of \$50 per month, indicating activity at the construction site.¹¹⁶

The system of contracting for materials and hiring labor by the day seemed to work out to everyone's satisfaction. In their annual report to the Governor in December 1862, the Capitol Commissioners wrote,

The Commissioners are fairly satisfied that the system of contracting for material and doing the work by daily labor, is the most beneficial to the State. The State can have the material furnished and labor performed as cheap, if not cheaper, than any contractor who might undertake the construction of the work, and the building will be more substantial and better built than by any contractor would be done.¹¹⁷

In October 1862, Clark was requested to draw up two cash estimates for the completion of the basement (first) story up to and including the floor of the main (second) level; one was to be by the original plans and specifications, the other by the modified specifications required by the act of the

Legislature approved April 19, 1862. In early December, Clark reported his estimates to the Board. The estimated "cost of the completion of the Basement Story walls to the line of the principal Floor (the Rotunda to be built to the height of ten feet above the floor line,) also, the Arches forming the principal Floors of the Porticos included" was \$121,056.50. He offered two alternatives for the construction of the floors of the basement and principal stories. The cost of constructing the floors with fireproof materials, as originally planned, amounted to \$30,450.00; according to the modified specifications, using wood, \$11,216.00. Depending on the type of flooring materials, Clark's total estimates were \$132,282.50 and \$142,516.50.¹¹⁸

As work resumed on the capitol in late summer 1862, it became apparent that the system of appropriating money from the state's General Fund was inadequate and slowed the construction process. Many felt that the necessity of developing new accommodations for state officials required a speedier completion of the new capitol. In his annual report for 1862, the State Treasurer, Delos R. Ashley, stated that the \$150,000 which had been appropriated to date was nearly expended. He praised the work performed on the building, but predicted that "so long as its progress depends upon appropriations from the General Fund -- which fund is greatly in arrears -- the process of construction must halt." He urged the levying of a small state tax, ten cents on each one hundred dollars of taxable property, the proceeds to be devoted exclusively to the construction of the capitol. He estimated this would raise \$150,000 annually, "which sum is none too much to expend annually until the capitol is completed."¹¹⁹

The Board of State Capitol Commissioners were also cognizant of the problem of financing the construction. In October, they appointed a committee of three to present a report to the Legislature during the next session and to draft a bill to be presented providing for the future execution of the state capitol.¹²⁰ In December, they elaborated on their reasons for wanting such legislation:

The Commissioners would respectfully recommend that a law be passed providing for the levying and collection of an ad valorem tax of one mill on every one dollar of assessable property in this State, and create a special fund, to be called the State Capitol Fund. This would permit the work to progress as rapidly as practicable, and not cause any hindrance or delay in its construction, as heretofore. The creation of a separate and express fund for this purpose would enable the Commissioners to effect more advantageous contracts for material, as the contracting parties could calculate the time when they would receive their pay, while under the present plan of appropriating moneys from the General Fund, the contractors cannot make an estimate of the time of payment under their contracts; hence, the contractor cannot estimate so closely for the furnishing of material as he could were a special fund created.¹²¹

The next spring, legislation entitled "An Act to provide a Special Fund for the construction of the State Capitol Building, at the City of Sacramento" was approved. It provided for an annual ad valorem tax of five cents on each one hundred dollars worth of taxable property in the state to create a Capitol

Fund, and was to remain in effect until the capitol building was finished and the grounds graded and fenced. The levy was to be made annually, on the first Monday in April.¹²² On April 20, additional legislation, "An Act to provide for the construction of the State Capitol Building, in the City of Sacramento", was approved which provided for the State Controller to estimate the amount of revenue that would be raised by the State Capitol Tax each year. It also authorized the Board of State Capitol Commissioners to expend that estimated revenue for materials and to employ day labor, provided they did not expend more than 80 percent of the revenue in advance of the collection of the tax in any one year. The Capitol Commissioners were also authorized to modify the current building plans to include fireproof floors if the architect felt it was advisable.¹²³

The very day after the act was approved, the Controller estimated that the Capitol Commissioners had \$62,000 to spend for the duration of 1863. The Commissioners wasted no time and the very same day asked Reuben Clark to make an estimate for the expenditure of the sum. He submitted his estimates of labor and materials on May 6. Contracts were let for granite, cement, sand, iron work, lime, and brick, and work resumed on the building in June 1863.¹²⁴ (Apparently, work had stopped due to both inclement weather during the winter season of 1862-63 and lack of money from the General Fund.) By the first of July, the foundation walls had been carried up an additional five to six feet, and the local press predicted that "no great length of time will be required to complete the walls up to the first course of granite." Sheds had been set up on the grounds in which to carry on the work of dressing the stone and a platform had been constructed at the junction of Eleventh Street and the Sacramento Valley Railroad, at R Street, to receive the granite from the railroad cars. By the beginning of December, the first course of granite was nearly completed around the entire basement (first) story wall; Clark planned to place the third course in position on the wall before stopping work for the winter season. By the first of January it was estimated that 13,500 square feet of granite had been delivered and that 13,000 square feet of that had already been put into the capitol. The average height of the exterior walls was 26 feet 6 inches; the interior averaged 32 feet 6 inches.¹²⁵ In the building's interior spaces, the iron frames for six vaults and an iron lining for the one in the Treasurer's office were being walled in.¹²⁶

At the end of 1863, the San Francisco Daily Alta California published their observations of the progress of the new building:

The foundation of the new Capitol is already capped with magnificent blocks of Folsom granite. The interior brick work rises above the outer walls. Thus far, the structure has been built in a durable manner, and when the original plan is fully carried out, it will be in grandeur and elegance with any State House in the land.

Lest they sound too enthusiastic about this project, of which they had been critical for many years, they added:

Meanwhile, the present Capitol is sufficiently commodious for the accommodation of the Legislature for a dozen years to come. There is, therefore, no immediate necessity for hurrying the new edifice to completion....¹²⁷

At about the same time that work was suspended for the winter of 1863-64, the new session of the Legislature convened in Sacramento. In his annual message to the Legislature, Governor Stanford summarized the expenditures made under the new State Capitol Tax. He expressed the opinion that since that system raised relatively small receipts,

the Commissioners were compelled to proceed cautiously, and were activated by a desire to keep within rather than go beyond the limits allowed. This method of constructing a State Capitol will be a long and tedious one, and, at best, the yearly advance it will make will not keep pace with the people's expectations. The building should be finished as early as possible, and the means provided to ensure that result.

To remedy that situation, Stanford recommended that "a law should be passed, and submitted to the people of the State, providing for the issuance of bonds for State Capitol purposes, sufficient to complete the work in the manner proposed." His suggestion was a radical change in concept of the financing of the capitol. General fund and special tax monies put the burden on the present population of the state. The payment of interest to those who might purchase bonds, when the bonds matured, fell to the future state population. His justification was that,

In all new countries the first generation has much to overcome, which inevitably results largely to the benefit of those that follow after; and the older a growing State becomes, the more ability it has to bear burdens that have been lightened by the sacrifices of its earlier years.¹²⁸

Shortly after his inauguration on December 10, 1863, newly elected Governor Frederick Low also urged a better system for financing the capitol. He stated that the 5 percent tax did not raise sufficient revenue. He pointed out that,

The expenses for salaries of architect &c are the same as if a much larger force were employed on the building. There has already been a large amount of money expended in this direction, and it seems to me it would be a matter of economy for the State to provide at least one hundred and fifty thousand dollars annually -- either by direct taxation or by the issuance of bonds -- to be used for this purpose until the Capitol is completed.¹²⁹

Early in that session of the Legislature, on January 5, 1864, Frederick Lux introduced an act into the Assembly for the completion of the state capitol, and to provide for the payment of the same. The bill allowed for the issuance of \$1,000,000 in state bonds for the completion of the capitol, payable in 20 years. The bill was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings which reported back passage, with an amendment, on January 15. On the 28th of January, the Assembly took up the legislation, Assembly Bill 79, as a Committee of the Whole. Debate ensued, much of it concerning the limit placed on the amount of bonds sold and whether the matter should go before the electorate. Some criticism was expressed regarding the cost of the project --

that in 1862, Reuben Clark testified under oath that the entire building would not exceed \$500,000 and that in 1863, a 5 percent tax was passed to raise revenue. Francis Tukey, of Sacramento, defended Clark by stating,

It was very true that the architect had made different estimates at different times, but always under instructions of the Legislature, and in accordance with its more or less violent spasms of economy. They could not find fault with him for doing what he was bid. When the Legislature wanted a wooden trap in which to burn up the archives, he estimated for a trap; and when they wanted a respectable fire-proof Capitol building, he estimated accordingly.

The Assembly voted to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Buildings with instructions to report detailed estimates. The committee, again, reported back favorably and recommended passage. They also presented specifications and costs of the various materials and mechanical workmanship, the number and dimensions of the rooms, and the purposes for which they were intended to be used, all prepared by Reuben Clark. The estimate totaled \$945,129.49. The bill continued to be debated on the Assembly floor.¹³⁰

In an editorial, the Sacramento Daily Union urged a favorable vote on the bill. They felt that the argument offered by some that the measure would add oppressively to the financial burdens of California was not valid. They pointed out that under the Lux bill, the sum required to be raised to meet the interest on the bonds would be \$70,000. That was only \$5,000 more than the approximately \$65,000 raised under the present 5 percent capitol tax.¹³¹ Despite the Union's endorsement, the bill went down to defeat by an indefinite postponement on March 16. Such debate and disagreement arose over the matter, especially over the method of repayment and the rate of interest on the bonds, that Lux, himself the author of the original bill, moved for postponement. The vote was 39 to 23.¹³² The Union, which had supported the bill, expressed its disappointment and irritation over this turn of events:

This measure was indefinitely postponed yesterday in the Assembly by a decisive vote. The Sacramento delegation gave the bill no support worth mentioning, and Lux, the author, who seemed to be under the impression that the erection of a suitable Capitol for the State is a matter of special and peculiar concern to this city, thereupon gave up the contest in disgust. It is true that if our delegation fairly represented their constituents, they would give all possible encouragement to any measure, consistent with the best interests of the State, that would increase the attractions of the Capital; but they are under no obligation to shoulder the responsibility of an Act of this kind which concerns all Californians, and therefore we do not think the author of the bill was justified in surrendering for the reason assigned. If the State Library or the Archives be destroyed by fire, the loss will fall upon the State. If the State officers and members of the Legislature be content with their present accommodations and can look with complacency upon the slow progress of the

new Capitol, Sacramento has no reason for complaint. The Legislature might have referred this question to the people of the State, who are interested in the decision, and who are not so easily swayed by alarming exaggerations of expense where there is real economy, as some of the members appear to imagine.¹³³

Governor Stanford's proposal to finance the capitol construction by issuing state bonds was dead for the present.

In early February 1864, another bill was introduced into the Assembly to provide financing for the capitol. Assembly Bill 243, "An Act to provide a Special Fund for the construction of the State Capitol Building at the City of Sacramento, and to submit the same to a vote of the people", was sent to the Committee on Public Buildings, but it was reported back without recommendation. On March 18, it was indefinitely postponed on a motion of its author, Seth Martin.¹³⁴ The fifteenth session of the Legislature (December 1863 - April 1864) closed with no action being taken relative to the new capitol building.

Beginning in late 1863, the major construction problem to which the Superintending Architect and the Board of State Capitol Commissioners addressed themselves was the exterior materials for the building. It came to the attention of the Board "that an inexhaustible quarry of freestone had been found at a point easily accessible, and that could be quarried at a cost that would render it a cheap, substantial, and beautiful material for the outside finish and decoration of the building." They asked Reuben Clark to estimate the comparative cost of using freestone versus cast iron and stucco on the building.¹³⁵ Clark reported back to the Board on December 5. He recalled that the original specifications called for the facade of the building above the basement story to have all cornices, architraves, caps, bases, balustrades, and window trimmings to be of cast iron, and all plain surfaces to be plastered with stucco, all to be covered with four coats of paint. He pointed out that that finish would be durable, but would require repainting every five years. Clark's opinion on the matter was that,

Free stone would be much more suitable for a Public Building of the class this is intended to be. There is Freestone of a superior quality and easily procured, and if such a material could be used, the facade of the building would require no repairs for many generations.

The estimate for freestone was \$250,000, opposed to \$94,000 for cast iron and stucco. The Board was not put off by the \$156,000 difference in cost. In fact, they felt that the subject was worth a thorough examination, that samples of the stone should be acquired, and that the cost of quarrying and delivering it should be ascertained.¹³⁶

After the first of the year, Commissioners Redding and Redington formed a committee to confer with the owners of the freestone quarry in Yolo County. On February 18, 1864, the Board contracted with H. T. Holmes for the use of the stone quarry on Putah Creek. The cost to the state was \$1.00. Almost as an afterthought, the Commissioners resolved to write to Professor Whitney,

State Geologist, requesting him to visit Putah Canon and evaluate the quarry, the quality and quantity of stone, and transportation facilities.¹³⁷ On the 27th of February, Whitney sent his report to the Board. He wrote,

After taking into consideration all the facts connected with the quarry of sandstone in Puta Canon, I have come to the conclusion that I cannot unequivocally recommend the adoption of the material for the Capitol at Sacramento. I admit that the rock furnishes a good building stone; but in a building as costly and extensive as the State Capitol, which is expected to endure for centuries, we need something more than good -- namely, something super-excellent, if it can be had.

Whitney's objections to the sandstone were two: the color was too dark and cold for that large of a building, and the mode of weathering was uneven and it would oxidize from a dark greenish-gray to a yellowish-brown. His final recommendation was granite. He believed that granite could be brought from the Sierras by rail cheaper than the sandstone could be transported from Yolo County. From an esthetic point of view, Whitney felt granite was preferable for a building the size and importance of the state capitol. Abiding by Whitney's recommendation, the Board abandoned the Putah Canon sandstone venture.¹³⁸

Up until 1864, the granite for the first story of the capitol was quarried at Folsom. In February of 1864, Reuben Clark reported to the Assembly that the quality of that granite was not good for cutting for the facade of the building. He felt that it was "of bad rift, with black knots, and by reason of which has caused us much expense, for often when a stone was about to be completed a black knot would be struck, which would cause the stone to be recut and often abandoned." This caused additional expenses to the project. Clark offered a remedy, however. He explained,

On the Pacific Railroad line there has been discovered a most excellent quality of granite. Through the kindness and courtesy of ex-Governor Stanford I was made acquainted of this, with whom I visited the quarries, and found it in quantity inexhaustible and in quality free from all black knots, stains or any defects, with a fine grain and excellent rift.

Reuben Clark also enthusiastically reported that there was a bill before the Legislature which would provide free transportation for construction materials for the state capitol, including the granite from the quarry on the railroad line. The prospect of reduced expenses due to better quality granite and from free transportation for construction materials allowed Clark to revise his cost estimates for the building. He felt that these savings would allow him to put better material and workmanship in the interior of the building than ordinarily could have been done. These proposed changes included using oak instead of pine in the doors, wainscoting, base, and other interior trim. The plastering could be upgraded and the ceiling of the dome could be changed from wood to brick.¹³⁹

The provisions of the bill that Clark mentioned became a reality on April 4, 1864, when "An Act to aid the construction of the Central Pacific Railroad, and to secure the use of the same to this State for military and other purposes, and other matters relating thereto" was passed. This act provided that California would assume the interest payments of 7 percent annual interest of some of the railroad's bonds for a period of 20 years. In return,

The said grant to said company is made upon the express condition and consideration that said company shall and do at all times when required from and after the passage of this Act, transport and convey over their said railroad... materials for the construction of the State Capitol Building....¹⁴⁰

At their April 8th meeting, the Commissioners,

Resolved, that Professor J. D. Whitney be invited to examine the granite quarry on the line of the Central Pacific Railroad and to report as to the character of the stone, its comparative durability in comparison with the Folsom granite, now being used on the Capitol Building, and the amount of iron contained in the stone, and its tendency to discolor on exposure to the air, as compared with the Folsom stone, and generally to report to its fitness for the State Capitol, as compared with the Folsom granite.¹⁴¹

The railroad was willing to cede the tract of land on their line which contained the granite quarry if the stone was suitable. Whitney's report was very favorable and he found from surface samples the stone to be "better adapted for use in the Capitol than any which can be procured in the State." He encouraged the Board to get a quarry opened up so that subterranean samples could be taken.¹⁴²

The Capitol Commissioners lost little time in pursuing the matter. They wrote up a proposal for bids for removing the granite from the quarry on the Central Pacific Railroad line to complete the building according to the approved plans and specifications. The granite was to be loaded on railroad cars by the contractor, who would have the privilege of quarrying all the stone he could dispose of, providing this did not interfere with furnishing the stone for the capitol. Reflecting patriotic sentiment during the Civil War, the Board added, "no bids will be entertained from persons suspected of disloyalty to the National or State governments."¹⁴³ On August 16, 1864, the Board accepted S. D. Smith's bid at 58 cents per foot and a contract was entered into with him the following September 12. By March 2, 1865, Smith had delivered the first granite from the Central Pacific Railroad Company quarries to the capitol, totaling 650 square feet. The Board was very happy with the new supply of granite. Not only was it free from knots and stains and was easily worked, it proved to be much cheaper than the Folsom granite. From the period between December 1, 1863 and September 1, 1864, the granite supplied by E. O. Dana from the Folsom quarry averaged \$1.12 per foot, while the supply taken from the Central Pacific Railroad quarry between February 1, 1865 and November 1, 1865 cost only about 63 cents per foot, including transportation costs from the railroad at Sixth Street to the capitol.¹⁴⁴

Meanwhile, during the summer and fall of 1864, stonecutters continued to work the Folsom granite which had already been supplied by E. O. Dana. Brick work on the walls also continued during this time, with bricks supplied by John Tansman and lime by H. T. Holmes. On the first of November, Clark reported to the Board that the workers would be finished the next day cutting the stone then on hand for the building. They had used all they could for the walls, the descent of stairs to the heating room, and around the windows of the cellar. The Board resolved that Clark should sell the refuse stone, discharge workmen, and discontinue work until the new supply of granite was delivered.¹⁴⁵ At the time of the work stoppage on the granite, in November 1864, the granite facade work was completed to a height of 9 feet above the brick foundation, a little less than half the first story height. Thus, it was desirable to attempt to match the color of the two sources of granite. Perhaps it was not matched as well as it could have been because three years later, the San Francisco Mining and Scientific Press observed that "the granite seems to have been experimented with, as there are two kinds, but both totally unfit to carry out the florid architecture of the building as a material in the upper parts."¹⁴⁶

In November of 1864, a controversy arose over the cost of the building. On the 24th, the San Francisco Alta California wrote a scathing article headlined "Great Fraud in the Construction of the State Capitol", in which they charged that the design of the building and the materials planned would cause expenditures to be beyond \$1 million. They put the blame squarely on the architect, Reuben Clark, who estimated that after February 24, 1864, \$945,129 would be expended on the building, where he had earlier sworn that he could build the capitol for \$500,000. The Sacramento Daily Union countered this attack by stating that there was really no fraud involved since Clark gave the Legislature fair notice and duly reported the increased expenditures to the Legislature under oath, and they seemed satisfied with it. The Union further defended Clark by pointing out that, while certain things had been added to the original plans, the Legislature was in control of the capitol project, that nothing was being done without their knowledge and approval. This included an exterior granite facade, dome, and fireproof floors.¹⁴⁷ This episode further illustrates the intense rivalry that existed between San Francisco and Sacramento over the issue of the location of the state capitol.

On December 1, 1864, the Capitol Commissioners passed a resolution "that all work on State Capitol Building, or in any way connected with it (except the quarrying of granite under the contract by S. D. Smith), shall be discontinued, until work upon the building is again resumed by order of the 'Board of Capitol Commissioners'." A copy was transmitted to Reuben Clark.¹⁴⁸ Apparently, little came of this furor and the project resumed, however slowly. At the first of the new year, the Sacramento Daily Union reported that,

The State Capitol building progresses slowly, work having been suspended owing to the inclemency of the weather and the deficiency of granite for building purposes. The work of quarrying from the new granite ledges just opened on the line of the Pacific Railroad has been commenced, and about the first of February the work of building will be resumed. The construction is under the immediate

superintendence of a Board of four Commissioners: F. F. Low, Governor; B. B. Redding, Secretary of State; Alfred Redington; and Edgar Mills, of Sacramento.¹⁴⁹

During 1865, construction activity focused on the delivery of granite, its cutting, and its placement on the capitol building. In January, the Capitol Commissioners resolved to petition the Board of Trustees of the City of Sacramento "asking them to grant permission to the Pacific Rail Road Co. to lay a side track on Sixth Street, for the delivery of stone for the State Capitol." Permission was granted, and, in June, the Board contracted with Furton and Knox for hauling granite from the railroad cars at Sixth Street to the capitol building at 70 cents per ton.¹⁵⁰ Anticipating the arrival of granite, the Commissioners made arrangements to once again begin stonecutting. They advertised for proposals for a contractor only; Clark was to employ the labor force directly. Finally, on March 2, the first load of granite arrived at the capitol from the railroad quarries and work began. In April, the Board authorized that the maximum number of stonecutters which could be hired totaled 35, each to receive \$2.00 per square foot of surface they cut. Peter Kennedy was hired as superintendent of the building under the supervision of the architect. His responsibilities included laying out work for the stonecutters and keeping an account of their work, as well as the time of the mechanics and laborers. Later, he was also instructed to present to the Board a detailed statement of the amount of stone cut during each month. By August of 1865, the granite facing had reached a height where moulding and other work considered "not plain" could begin on the basement (first) story. Stonecutters received a flat rate of \$5.00 per day for this work. From August through December, there was a great push to cut the stone trim for the building, including the keystones, frieze, arch stones, panel work, and window casings.¹⁵¹ The local press described this stepped-up activity:

On the grounds of the new State Capitol merry is the music from dozens of hammers in the hands of crafty stone-cutters. Huge blocks of excellent granite are being brought into shape -- loads of brick pass up by means of tall ladders, and the stupendous work is making fair and reliable progress. Long-armed derricks send up the granite after it is dressed, and place the blocks in the abiding places where they are to remain for centuries. We observed this morning, that at the northwest corner of the structure, the granite is being graced with its first molding.¹⁵²

During the first week in October 1865, the first block of the cornice on the basement story wall was placed. From the lower line of the first course of granite resting on the brick foundation to the top of the cornice course, the wall was 24 feet in height. The cornice, which marked the top of the first story, was the seventeenth course of granite in the building. The floor to ceiling height of the first floor was to be 21 feet. At this time there was a great push to complete the wall at the front of the building, especially at the northwest corner, the area most exposed to the downtown business district. This was probably due to a public relations effort to dramatically show progress on the building. At the same time, a few bricklayers were employed to arch over the rotunda at the center of the building. This was

expected to be completed by the first of December. A total of fifty-four men were employed on the job in October 1865, under the direct supervision of Peter Kennedy, and general supervision of Reuben Clark. Thirty-three were stonecutters, four were bricklayers, four were blacksmiths, and eleven were laborers, along with one stonemason and one carpenter. The Sacramento Daily Union credited the project with amazing success and rapidity considering the small number of men employed and the limited means of the State Capitol Fund. They urged the next Legislature to provide for an increase of the State Capitol Fund to enable the Commissioners to employ four or five times the current number of workmen.¹⁵³

Governor Frederick Low nudged the Legislature on the matter of funding in his Biennial Message on December 4, 1865. He reassured that body that the money already raised from the 5 percent tax had been spent judiciously. However, he noted, that method raised such a small amount of money that slow progress on the construction would be ensured. If it was decided to hasten the completion of the capitol, a much larger tax should be levied. He put the burden squarely on the shoulders of the Legislature.¹⁵⁴

The Sacramento Daily Union echoed Governor Low's sentiments and predicted "that, if the present tax be continued, it would require about ten years to complete the main body of the building. That would provide for posterity a noble edifice, of which the tax-paying builders would have little or no use." They recommended doubling the tax to ten percent, which would allow construction to be expedited. With an increase in financing, the Capitol Commissioners felt that the building would be ready for occupation by December 1869.¹⁵⁵

Within days, Assemblyman Thomas Hansbrow, of Sacramento, introduced legislation (Assembly Bill 43) entitled "An Act to provide for the speedy completion of the State Capitol Building." The Committee on Public Buildings, to which it was referred, recommended its passage. Mr. Bugbee, the chairman of that committee, examined both the building and the granite quarry and determined that three times the work force could be used. An increased financial base meant that the work could be completed sooner and the building occupied within four years, leaving some of the outside work unfinished.¹⁵⁶

While there seemed to have been general agreement about the necessity of increasing the capitol tax, the amount of increase was in question. The Sacramento Daily Union raised their earlier recommendation and lobbied for a tax triple the present rate of five percent. Their arguments were

...that the State needs a commodious, secure and creditable Capitol; that unless the work upon the building already commenced is hastened, this generation will get no return for the money expended; that the work which has already cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, is exposed to injury from the elements while left in its unfinished condition and but slowly progressing; that it would be better to have no tax at all than one which would promise the people nothing more than the pleasure of erecting a costly convenience for those who are to come after them.¹⁵⁷

On February 13, 1866, Assembly Bill 43 passed the Assembly; on the 21st, it passed the Senate. Low gave his approval. In its final form, the act called for an annual ad valorem tax of five cents on each \$100 value of the taxable property in the state, to be collected and paid into the Capitol Fund, in addition to the previous five percent tax levied.¹⁵⁸ The need for ready money to pay for materials and salaries was evident by the fact that the Legislature authorized the State Controller, on March 30, 1866, to transfer \$40,000 from the Swamp Land Fund into the Capitol Fund. A reimbursement was to be made out of the first money paid into the Capitol Fund after January 1, 1867.¹⁵⁹

During the fall of 1865, a major change occurred in the capitol personnel. On September 4, 1865, Reuben Clark was granted a leave of absence until January 1, 1866, by the Capitol Commissioners, "provided he employs G. Parker Cummings to superintend the work during his absence, without expense to the State."¹⁶⁰ The reason for his leave was not stated, but some obvious assumptions can be made. Over the past year, Clark had been subjected to the pressures of defending the increased cost estimates for the building. An even more personal attack came to Clark in May of 1865, when the Executive Committee of the Union League Association of Sacramento No. 2 wrote to the Capitol Commissioners and charged Clark with disloyalty to the United States because he was heard to have said "I don't care which side wins...", meaning the Civil War. They also accused him of employing "known secessionists" on the construction of the capitol. On October 3, Mrs. Clark wrote the Board that she was about the leave "this city with Mr. Clark for some time."¹⁶¹ Clark's leave of absence expired without any improvement in his health, which led the Commissioners to relieve Clark of his duties by means of the following resolution:

Whereas, the leave of absence heretofore granted to Mr. Reuben Clark, until January 1, 1866, has not resulted in his restoration to health; and whereas, by reason of his continued illness he is unable to perform the duties of Architect of the State Capitol Building; therefore, resolved that G. P. Cummings be and he is hereby appointed Architect of the State Capitol until the further order of this Board, and that the said Reuben Clark is hereby relieved of his duties as Architect and Superintendent of the State Capitol Building.¹⁶²

On February 2, 1866, Reuben Clark was committed to the Stockton Insane Asylum (now Stockton State Hospital) and was admitted on February 6. The cause of insanity is listed in hospital records as the continued and too close attention to the building of the state capitol. The diagnosis was menomania. Clark died at Stockton on July 4, 1866, of "general paralysis". Perhaps realizing that her husband would never return to the capitol project, Mrs. Clark sold Reuben's architectural equipment to the state in May of 1866. This included one surveyor's level, one drawing table, one small table, one large table and trestle, four drawing boards, three squares, angle boards, and a few small instruments.¹⁶³

Reflecting Reuben Clark's great commitment to the capitol project, Mrs. Clark wrote to the Commissioners that "during Mr. Clark's lifetime it was his main idea to finish the capitol, and then when his labors were done, he desired to

be buried in, or near, the Building. He often expressed this wish." Dr. John F. Morse, a prominent California physician, also sent a letter to the Board requesting that Reuben Clark be buried beneath the foundation of the state capitol with a tablet of recognition.¹⁶⁴ The Board essentially sidestepped the issue by passing the following:

Resolved, that while we consider the State Capitol grounds would be a most fitting and appropriate spot for the last resting place of the remains of Mr. Reuben Clark, late Architect of the Capitol Building, we deem it inexpedient and out of place, amidst the turmoil and confusion that attend the erection of so massive a structure that the transfer should not be made until the building and grounds are in a more forward state towards completion. And in our next report to the Legislature, we will urge upon that body the propriety of carrying out what appears to have been the earnest wish of the late Architect, that they may take such action in one premises, as his family may desire.¹⁶⁵

Clark was interred in a Masonic cemetery in San Francisco instead. Later, his body was moved to a Masonic cemetery in Colma, California.¹⁶⁶

Architect Gordon P. Cummings' supervision of the capitol project began on September 8, 1865. The state had already adopted the more costly building plan outlined by Reuben Clark in February 1864. However, in late fall of 1865, the Board also asked Cummings for his estimation of the materials and work required for the completion of the capitol. Cummings prepared several alternative plans, each differing in materials or style of the outside decoration, to be presented to the Legislature for their consideration. This new round of estimates and plans was, no doubt, partly in respect for the new architect's ideas, but also reflected the tight money situation in which the building was being built and the need to economize, if possible. Cummings reported to the Board on November 26, 1865, that the total estimate of the building according to the adopted design of Reuben Clark's would be \$1,012,838.28. This reflected the use of granite on the entire facade. Cummings also offered three other alternatives, all featuring a granite facade, but with minor modifications of the exterior decorative elements. His fifth estimate was perhaps his most significant because it was based on the completion of the building above the basement, or first story, with mastic covered brick, rather than granite ashlar, and the exterior decorative elements to be cast iron, all painted to imitate granite. This latter estimate came to \$819,419.42.¹⁶⁷ The Sacramento Daily Union reacted quite negatively to this last suggestion. Expressing a feeling of local pride, they wanted the best building possible and were not interested in what they considered to be false economy moves. The paper editorialized that,

The granite walls should be as firm and massive-looking at the end of a century as on the day of their completion. In the modification of this design, these ideas have been kept in view, the changes affecting only the amount of ornament, but saving on the aggregate cost about \$80,000. The low-priced plan proposes to build above the beautiful

basement of granite a huge pile of brick, cover it with mastic and paint that, in imitation of granite, and use considerable cast-iron in portions of the structure where stone would be used in pursuance of the other plans.

They felt that this plan would require such extensive maintenance that any initial savings would be eaten up over the long run.¹⁶⁸ Cummings' position over the matter was that the overall effect of the building would not be changed. He wrote,

In presenting, at your request, this elevation of the building with the alterations from the basement line, there is neither desire nor recommendation on my part that it should supplant or be substituted for the accurate and more elegant designs of Mr. Clark. There are no alterations in the dimensions or general effect, the principal difference being in the mouldings, uncut dental band, plain instead of enriched, consoles with close parapet; and more particularly the change in the capitals of the columns and pilasters, with a few minor reductions in cost that cannot be well explained in a miniature plan.... The estimate for the interior is, with few exceptions, based strictly on the details, so far as I can understand, having no interior sections of the building to guide me.¹⁶⁹

In his November report, Cummings also summarized the progress of the building. When he assumed supervision of the building in September 1865, "the first moulding course was just commenced at the northwest corner of the building." Since that time, he reported,

We have now so far progressed that the basement cornice is on as far as the front portico, one of the seven foot arches of the corridor turned, and a full sixth of the basement completed from the line designated, besides the amount of stone dressed as per schedule. With the exception of a few feet of the side piers, and a part of two back doors, the entire ashler of the basement story is completed. All the walls are up to within nine feet three inches of the second or principal floor, and the great vault of the rotunda is in fair progress, the most tedious part of the brick work being considerably advanced.

Expressing almost a feeling of euphoria, Cummings concluded his description of the progress by saying, "Too much cannot be said of the excellent character of the entire work; it is the most perfect combination of stone, iron, brick, and mortar I have ever seen, and seems intended to last all time and ages."¹⁷⁰

Cummings' report pointed out that before long the Legislature would have to make decisions regarding details of the building's completion plan, materials to be used, and the amount to be expended. His report furnished information to enable the Legislature to reach a conclusion. While the Legislature had agreed to some increase in funding for the capitol, they did not make a decision among the various alternatives presented to them by Cummings. The

only significant change made in the plans during 1865 and 1866 was in the arrangement of the Supreme Court rooms. The Supreme Court judges had expressed some dissatisfaction with the plans as they existed. Cummings incorporated their suggestions into a plan change and forwarded the proposal to the Capitol Commissioners. Since the proposal involved no changes to the general layout of the building, the Board ordered that the proposed changes be made at once.¹⁷¹

Most of the work activity in 1866 was spent on the stone work of the basement (first) story and the interior brick walls. On March 1, Cummings was ordered to hire as many stonecutters as practicable at the same price as was paid per foot in 1865 for plain cutting work. By the end of 1866, Cummings reported the following stone work was completed:

The entire arcade of windows were finished to line of cornice. The two large and imposing doorways of the eastern front were completed; some additions were made to the piers; one arch of front and one at the side portico were turned; two hundred and sixty-six lineal feet of cornice; and about one fourth of the remaining arch stones were ready for setting. The brick work was brought up to the line of second floor in all the interior walls; all the vaults, closets, and about one hundred and forty lineal feet of the groined arching of the halls were finished by the middle of October.¹⁷²

All of this work did not go smoothly, however. Early in the year, anonymous letters critical of Cummings appeared in public. Since they were anonymous, the letters could not be officially noticed by the Capitol Commissioners. That body resolved "that it is inexpedient to make any change at present, in the Architect department of the State Capitol."¹⁷³

Controversy arose again later in 1866 which continued to put Cummings' reputation as an architect in question. During October and November, Cummings was forced to deal with the related problems of cracks in the north wall of the capitol and a subsequent strike by members of the Stonecutters' Association of Sacramento. Shortly after Cummings' appointment as Superintending Architect, cracks appeared on the north wall of the capitol, on each side of the portico. The problem came to the attention of the Capitol Commissioners in October 1866. According to Cummings, he had already "conceived and begun the preparation of a simple and certain remedy for this defect", but the Commissioners felt it was proper to submit the case to an outside committee. Selected as consultants were George F. Elliott, Major, United States Engineer, from Alcatraz, and H. Kenitzer, Architect and former partner of Reuben Clark. After examining the building they recommended, on October 30, the same remedy which Cummings had initiated: the buttressing of the northwest and northeast angles on the capitol foundation to relieve it of a part of its load. These buttresses would not mar the appearance of the capitol since they would be below grade after the grounds were landscaped. This plan was carried out. On March 1, 1867, all work on the building was suspended except for construction of the buttresses. A footing of 110 surface feet of granite and concrete was added to the two corners in question, and brick angle buttresses were built and tied into the walls. The same method was also applied to the north and south angles of the front portico.¹⁷⁴

Before the foundation problem was resolved, the stonecutters employed on the state capitol walked off the job on October 20, 1866. The press ascribed the principal reason for this action to the fact that Gordon Cummings had discharged one of the stonecutters, and that the rest of the workmen refused to work on the building until he was reinstated. However, John Kearney, President of the Stonecutters' Association of Sacramento, declared that that was definitely not the reason for the walkout. Rather, he said, they "could not allow the course of mismanagement which has been pursued in the construction of the State Capitol to proceed much farther." The association announced this reason, publicly, in a printed advertisement.¹⁷⁵ On November 1, 1866, a committee of stonecutters, composed of Charles McVicker, William Cranly, and C. C. Hickey, appeared before the Board and announced that they wanted to prefer charges against Cummings for incompetency. They also presented a copy of their public advertisement which gave at "great length" various examples and instances in which Gordon Cummings

had violated established principles of Architecture in giving directions about the work upon the building; charging him with so ordering the construction of masonry as to increase the cracks in the walls; calling attention to gross errors in the turning of arches; and the setting of keystones; and giving several reasons why the Stonecutters had felt called up to leave work in a body and submit their grievances to the public through advertisements in the newspapers.¹⁷⁶

Although the Commissioners were very unhappy that the workmen had chosen to air their grievances in public before bringing them to the Capitol Commissioners, they allowed a hearing to take place during which the stonecutters could examine workmen. The hearing lasted several days. A long list of charges was made, all aimed at Cummings' alleged incompetence in supervising stone cutting.¹⁷⁷ Cummings was frequently called upon to explain certain things, but he declined to examine anyone, stating he would rely on his work and plans which he would show to the Board. In his low-keyed defense,

He alluded to the various embarrassments to which he had been subjected, in his connection with Mr. Clark, late Architect, whose mind was seriously affected before he could impart to him (Cummings) the details of the work. He spoke of the death of Kennedy, Superintendent, whose illness and consequent absence had given him increased duties to perform, and finally exhibited his plans and drawings to the Board for their examination.¹⁷⁸

The Board of State Capitol Commissioners reached their decision on the matter on November 3. The Board did not accept the stonecutters' self-proclaimed reasons for their strike and instead assigned the cause of the walkout to the discharge of the workman. The Board resolved

...that from the best advice the Board have been able to obtain and after consulting two experienced and competent Architects and Engineers, they are of the opinion that the building has been constructed in strict accordance with the

original plans; that the work under the superintendence of the present Architect has been well done, and that the appropriation made by the start has been economically expended, and that, as far as the building has progressed, the Architect has faithfully carried out the original design, and complied strictly with the instruction of the Board of Capitol Commissioners.

Resolved, that the settling of the walls is chiefly attributed to a defect in the construction of the foundation, under the superintendence of the original Architect, for which the present Architect is in no respect responsible.

Resolved, that the Board concede to their architect full power to discharge any of the employees; and furthermore, they feel it is their duty to-day after hearing the testimony touching the discharge of the stone cutters alluded to, that they are of the opinion the architect was fully justified in the action taken by him, and that a failure to do so would have justly subjected him to censure.

Resolved, that the examination by experts justified the Board in saying that the defect in the foundation is not so serious as reported, and that the remedy proposed by Cummings, and endorsed by the Engineers and Architects employed by the Commissioners to examine it, will obviate the difficulty with little expense.¹⁷⁹

Thus, the Board absolved Gordon Cummings of any guilt in the charges brought against him by the Stonecutters' Association. Predictably, that association reacted with accusations of partiality on the part of the Board. John Kearney, the Association's President, wrote in a letter "To the People of the State of California",

Their minds were fully made up from the first, for it was a settled fact, and one not to be hidden by any veil of diplomacy with which they might try to conceal their real feelings on the subject, that a verdict of incompetency rendered on their part against Cummings would be an open declaration of neglect on their part as employers for keeping him fourteen months in a position of which he is so incapable of carrying out its important functions.

He also added that the acceptance of Elliott and Kenitzer's report essentially put "a stop to all further investigation of the matter", meaning the cause of the cracks in the foundation walls.¹⁸⁰

Although Gordon Cummings had presented estimates in November 1865 for the completion of the building, taking a granite facade into consideration, plus several alternative finish schedules which included one which called for mastic-covered brick above the basement story, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners did not make a decision on the matter for over a year. By

November 1866, the issue was finally being discussed. Commissioner Edgar Mills expressed his opinion shortly before leaving the state for a few months. He wrote,

I am fully convinced that it is bad policy to continue granite above the present story as I am satisfied that a very long time will be consumed at an enormous expense. I think the interest and desire of the people of this State is complete the building as soon as practical and I hope and trust that the Capitol Commissioners will adopt brick instead of granite.¹⁸¹

Early in December, the Commissioners agreed to communicate with Charles B. Grant of San Francisco to acquire an estimate of the cost of finishing the stone work of the capitol building above the basement story "in case it is decided to go on with the work in granite." On December 15, Grant estimated the cost of cutting, setting, and completing the stone work on the capitol from the top of the cornice on the basement (first) story to the top of the balustrade to be \$1,187,000.¹⁸²

By January 1867, the building had progressed to such a stage that it was imperative that a decision be made soon regarding the materials to be used on the upper stories. Cummings again presented his estimated of the alternative plans which could be followed. Finally, at a meeting of the Board on January 16, the Commissioners decided that the granite was very expensive and, even under the best conditions, would guarantee slow progress on the completion of the capitol. Feeling pressure to finish the building, they agreed to the following action:

Resolved, that the use of granite for the exterior walls of the State Capitol above the medallion course at the top of the basement story be discontinued.

Resolved, that all the exterior walls above the basement story be constructed of hand burned brick; that the monumental portions as shown upon the plan be of cast iron, securely built into the brick work, as the building progresses; that all the brick work of the exterior be covered with a substantial coat of mastic, and all the exterior be painted in such colors as may be hereafter determined; provided that contracts can be made for the materials required, at rates which may seem reasonable and just.¹⁸³

The Sacramento Daily Union reported that the capitol could be made ready for the Legislature within three years. Despite that newspaper's earlier objections to Cummings' suggestion of brick and cast iron, they now accepted this decision in the name of economy and expediency. They editorialized,

As a matter of pride, it would be gratifying to Californians to have this great edifice constructed of granite; but we think it will be more gratifying to have it completed at an early day, in order not only to accommodate

the legislators, but place beyond danger the important public records of State and the very valuable library, to which additions are being constantly made. Again, the prospect is very pleasing to have this noble edifice completed in our own day and generation, as we have been and will hereafter be subjected to some considerable expense in its construction.¹⁸⁴

One result of the change from granite to brick and iron was that S. D. Smith, the granite contractor, lost several thousand dollars. According to the Board, Smith was imposed with "all of the expenses and disadvantages of the contract without any of its advantages." The expenses came about by opening up a quarry at great cost and then not having any use for the granite. The present Board (when the claim was made in December 1871) referred the matter to their successors who would assume office in a few days, the results of a new administration.¹⁸⁵

The beginning of 1867 serves as a benchmark in the construction of the building. The exterior walls and interior partitions were completed as high as the top of the first story. Up through the end of 1866, \$351,835.96 had been raised through the special Capitol Tax. First levied in 1863 at a rate of 5 percent, it was increased to 10 percent in 1866. Through 1866, expenditures amounted to \$317,887.43, leaving only \$33,948.53 unexpended.¹⁸⁶ The Commissioners' decision in January set the project off on a new wave of construction.

Arranging contracts for materials -- wrought and cast iron, brick and lime -- was uppermost in Cummings' mind throughout 1866 and 1867. As early as March 1, 1866, the Capitol Commissioners sought information regarding the cost of iron bearers and girders to support the brick arches of the floors. On August 23, they accepted the proposal of the Phoenix Iron Company of Philadelphia to supply the iron bearers to support the second story floors of the building. Their proposal for the "circular portion of the building" was not accepted. In October 1866, bills arrived from the Phoenix Iron Co. for 111 wrought iron beams, ranging in length from 16'3" to 29'11". The beams were shipped from Philadelphia to San Francisco by the clipper ship Dove, at a cost of \$6,125.40. Once in San Francisco (May 1867), the beams were hauled up the Sacramento River to Sacramento. Apparently, the Capitol Fund could not finance the needed iron bearers and in June 1867, banker D. O. Mills advanced the money to freight them from Philadelphia to San Francisco. He was repaid in November after the special tax money was collected for 1867. Cummings telegraphed the order for the bearers in July 1867.¹⁸⁷ The iron for the "circular portion of the building" (the apse) was ordered from Kittredge and Co. (Pioneer Iron Works) of San Francisco, which arrived before the Phoenix Iron Company order. In July 1867, four huge girders, manufactured by Kittredge and Leavitt, were piled in front of the building. After an additional four arrived, they were to be placed and arched over the floor of the State Library. The library was located in the apse on the east side of the building. On the interior of the apse, the first three floors were arranged in a semi-circular mezzanine fashion; the fourth floor was solid. Iron for the rotunda, including a cast iron circle weighing 2,140 pounds, was ordered from the Union Foundry in Sacramento in May 1866. Other cast and wrought iron work, including that necessary to fasten the dome together and to the building, was ordered from the firm of Howland, Angell, and King in April 1867.¹⁸⁸

By the end of 1866, the interior brick walls were completed up to the second floor level (the floor of the second story) and, by November 1867, brick arches had been constructed over the iron beams on the second story floor which had arrived the previous May. Also, by November, "the whole network of walls" was carried up to the line of the third floor, which was ready to receive the iron beams which had been shipped in October and were on their way from Philadelphia. The beams ranged from 11' to 29'11" in length.¹⁸⁹ Cummings reported in November that

The circular Venetian arcade, the Mezanine, and part of the last story of pilasters -- in all about fifty feet -- have been added to the inner dome from the floor of the rotunda, which is now ready for the first bond course of iron and stone, and is within twenty-two feet of the springing line of the great arch. The walls of the outer circle are nearly high enough for the arching to support the tambour and peristyle of the upper dome.¹⁹⁰

In March 1868, Cummings forwarded drawings to and made contracts with Phoenix Iron Co. of Philadelphia for beams for halls, floors, and porticos. They were shipped in October. The twenty wrought iron beams were shipped by the ship General McClellan and ranged from 15' to 19'. The girders for the tambour of the dome were ordered from Kittridge and Leavitt of San Francisco.¹⁹¹

Much construction took place during 1867, including the entire second story of the building. On March 1, the proposal of Holmes and Bannan, of Sacramento, for lime was accepted. This was followed on the 26th by an accepted proposal from Walters and Bowers of Sacramento for brick. These contracts received final approval on May 1, 1867, and the renewed brick construction was to begin on June 1.¹⁹² The brick making operation was quite extensive and organized, as this newspaper story will testify.

Walters & Bowers, the contractors for furnishing brick for the State Capitol, commenced operations five or six weeks ago at their new yard at the southeast corner of Sixteenth and T streets. They are now running four gangs, employing about thirty men, and turning out about 29,000 brick from the mould per day. Their first kiln, of about 200,000 brick, was closed up some eight or nine days ago and the process of burning will be completed this evening. The second kiln, of about 300,000 brick, will be ready for burning in about a week. The contractors are not bound to furnish any brick until the 1st of June, but will be ready to supply them more than two weeks before that date. Walters & Bowers, like all other brickmakers, have been greatly annoyed by the superabundance of water, or rather would have been had they not devised a method of overcoming the difficulty. By sinking a hole and placing in it a Chinese pump, which they run by horse power day and night, they are able to effectively drain off the water. They are thereby enabled to dig down to the depth of 7 spades, while those who do not pump cannot go to a greater depth than

3 spades. In addition to the common brick which are being prepared, the contractors have commenced to mold the wedge-shaped brick for arches, of which about 800,000 will be required.¹⁹³

Walters and Bowers worked diligently through the summer and fall work season. In mid-July 1867, a local newspaper reported that,

...Since our last notice an immense amount of labor has been performed which can only be seen by a visit to the top of the building, although the rising of the dome about sixteen feet in its grand and solid proportions begins to be observed.... All the groined arching has been completed except the south portico, where the stonework is not sufficiently advanced, and the entire arching of the floors over the iron beams will be completed in two weeks.... The solid walls of the dome at its base and the outer walls of the building have been tunneled through and arched, and all the mortar is conveyed by a railroad from the place of its preparation. Then that, like all other material, is raised from the cellar by steam, and distributed by trucks above. The steam engine seems to have but little breathing time; during yesterday over thirty thousand brick, besides iron, lumber, etc., were raised by it, and sometimes the water for the bricks, also.¹⁹⁴

This steam engine was a Rawson Hoisting Engine, acquired from Baker and Hamilton for \$1,100.¹⁹⁵

By August 1, 1867, one-third of all the iron needed that year had been received and work commenced with that material. This included the ornamental iron work, such as the pilasters, bases, and windows, from the Miners Foundry in San Francisco. The Sacramento Daily Union reported that,

As castings they could not easily be exceeded, and as designs of art they are tasteful and elegant. Whether the change from granite to brick was wise or unwise, it is evident that the iron finish for the ornamental admit of an elaboration and style that could not have been attained in granite.¹⁹⁶

On September 23, 1867, the last stone was laid on the building under a contract with William Johnson, ending the four year stonework project. While this was expected to reduce expenses on the job, any savings were probably absorbed by the extensive brick and iron work.¹⁹⁷ Observations of the construction site by the San Francisco Mining and Scientific Press in October indicate the extensive nature of the project:

The progress and mode of operations on the building are very perfect and economical; every man has his place, and must be always there. The mortar is made in a horse-power machine and brought on railroads through the dome, and, like all the other material, hoisted through the rotunda by

a succession of stagings and spars, the upper one of which is seventy feet long. Two other derricks are in use, and the entire floor is covered over its massive archings with tramways, etc.¹⁹⁸

By the end of 1867, at the onset of the rainy season, the scope of the project was temporarily reduced. The labor force shrunk from a high of 132 men employed in July, to 87 in October. Cummings and the Commissioners took advantage of this slow time to prepare their biennial reports in which they reported that during 1867, a total of \$155,000 was collected in capitol taxes, and \$175,184.90 was expended. As of November 1, 1867, a balance of \$24,125.76 was unexpended in the total capitol construction project. They estimated \$160,000 and \$165,000 would be collected in 1868 and 1869, respectively, from the capitol tax.¹⁹⁹

In December 1867, Cummings proposed to reduce the labor force to its lowest possible number. With this reduction, he hoped that materials on hand would last until mid-April or the 1st of May 1868. Also in December, Walters & Bowers, the brick contractors, were severely hampered by the winter rains. On December 5, 1867, they petitioned the Capitol Commissioners for an extra allowance due to loss of bricks. Also, Cummings had originally estimated that 3,830,000 bricks would be needed, and later asked for an extra 500,000. This required extra wood for burning in the kilns, extra hauling, and it took them into the rainy season to finish those bricks. The contractors asked for \$1,720. The matter was taken up at the Board's December 21 meeting, and they allowed \$1,500 as extra compensation. Brick making stopped, not to be resumed until the spring of 1868.²⁰⁰

The winter season slow-down in 1867-68 was due to more than just the rainy weather and the small amount of materials on hand. Beginning in January 1868, certain members of the State Legislature turned their attention to the construction job itself and, again, to the question of removing the capital from Sacramento. Feeling a sense of uncertainty, the Capitol Commissioners instructed Cummings to proceed slowly.²⁰¹

On January 10, 1868, Francis Giltner introduced a resolution into the Assembly for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to examine the condition of the state capitol and various other aspects of the construction project. At first, Sacramentan Augustus Comte, Jr. moved to indefinitely postpone the resolution, then withdrew that motion and offered an amendment to examine the progress of the building as well. By a vote of 42 to 32, the amended resolution was adopted. It passed the Senate and in its final form the concurrent resolution called for the following investigation:

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, that the Committee on Public Buildings of the Assembly and the Committee on Public Buildings of the Senate are hereby instructed fully, carefully, and impartially to investigate and report upon the points following: The suitability of Sacramento City as a permanent location of the State Capital; the amount already expended upon the State Capitol building; the safety and stability of its foundations; the

manner in which the work upon said building has been done; the value of said building in its present condition; the amount of grading, if any, that will be required around said building and the cost of said grading; and the amount that will be required to finish said Capitol building according to the plan proposed.

Resolved, That to enable them to carry into effect the foregoing resolution, said Committees are hereby authorized to avail themselves of the aid of scientific men, practical mechanics and experts.

On March 21, 1868, the Joint Committee presented a lengthy report to the Assembly and Senate. Testimony was taken from the Capitol Commissioners, the supervising capitol architect, workmen on the job, and various "outside experts". For those who had hopes of abandoning the capitol construction project altogether and/or removing the seat of government from Sacramento, this report was a disappointment. The committee's conclusions were:

First - That the foundation of the present new Capitol building is safe and secure.

Second - That if, in the construction of the building, due care is observed in the distribution of the weight, resting upon the foundations, the building will be safe and secure.

Third - That the material that has been used in the construction of the building is of excellent character, and the workmanship thereon superior.

Fourth - That the cracks on fissures were caused by carrying up the building with unequal distribution of the weight, and that said cracks are not detrimental to the building.

Fifth - That there has been expended upon the building up to February first, eighteen hundred and sixty-eight, the sum of six hundred and eight thousand six hundred thirty-six dollars and thirty-one cents (\$680,636.31).

Sixth - To prepare the same so as to be ready for the accommodation of the Legislature at its session of eighteen hundred and sixty-nine, it will be necessary to expend the further sum of three hundred and sixty-seven thousand, six hundred and fifty-seven dollars and fifty-one cents (\$367,657.51).

Seventh - That to complete it entirely according to the present plan, not including the cost of sculpture and pictures, it will cost the still further sum of two hundred and fifty-nine thousand five hundred and ninety-five dollars and ninety-five cents (\$259,595.95); making the aggregate cost of the building one million three hundred and seven thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine dollars and seventy-seven cents (\$1,307,889.77).

Eighth - That the said building will be ready for the use of the Legislature of eighteen hundred and sixty-nine.

Ninth - Nothing has been elicited in evidence before the Committee which would beget any fear or suggest any reason that the State Capitol should be removed from this city on account of the insecurity of the Capitol building or the fear of inundation by reason of the want or security of the levee defences [sic], and that the water defences [sic] of the city are secure or can be made so.

Tenth - The Committee find, from the evidence, that if work upon the present new Capitol building is abandoned the building would be comparatively worthless to the State in its present condition.²⁰²

Less than two weeks after introducing the resolution to investigate the construction of the capitol, Giltner and others introduced three bills into the Assembly which called for the removal of the permanent seat of government from Sacramento. Unlike earlier removal efforts, this one was spearheaded by a Monterey-San Jose-Santa Cruz contingent. They, no doubt, hoped to take advantage of the confusing situation surrounding the investigation, to cast doubt on the credibility of Sacramento as the permanent seat of government.

On January 23, 1868, Francis Giltner, of Mariposa, introduced "An Act for the removal and permanent location of the seat of government of the State of California" (A.B. 241). The bill called for removal to San Jose after the adjournment of the present session of the Legislature. That city was to furnish a building for six years, without cost to the state, by which time the state would have constructed their own structure.²⁰³

One week later, on the 30th of January, E. C. Tully, of Monterey, introduced "An Act to locate the State Capital " (A.B. 296) into the Assembly. The preamble to the bill stated that,

The completion of the capitol in Sacramento, the grading of the grounds and streets, the ornamenting and fencing of the same, will cost the State several hundred thousand dollars; and the location of the capital is a question of continued agitation by the Legislature; and serious doubts exist in the minds of a large portion of the people throughout the State as to the safety of Sacramento from floods; and that the people of the State are heavily burdened with taxation.²⁰⁴

Tully's version provided,

that whenever the local authorities of San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, or Benicia should notify the Governor that they would erect a capitol to cost not less than \$400,000, on a suitable lot within the corporate limits of the city they represented, and they would deed the lot and building to the State before December 1, 1869, then all further work on the Sacramento building should cease.²⁰⁵

Offers were immediately made to the Legislature by cities and counties eager to be made the permanent seat of government. The first to arrive was from the Dashaway Association No. 43 of Santa Cruz. At their January 26th meeting

(four days before the introduction of Tully's bill), they had resolved to offer their hall in Santa Cruz for ten years, free of charge to the state for use as the capitol. On February 4, George Pardee, from Santa Cruz, presented their offer in the Assembly. The offer was also presented to the Senate, but neither house took any action on the offer.²⁰⁶

Three days later, the Speaker of the Assembly presented a communication from the City of San Jose and the County of Santa Clara. San Jose generously offered "one of the public squares of this city for the erection thereon of public buildings for State Capitol uses, and that the Legislature be allowed to make the selection of the square." Santa Clara County offered the "free and entire use of the Court-house of said county for State purposes, until such time as a Capitol building may be erected in said county; provided, that said Capitol building shall be erected within five years." Additionally, both that city and county invited the Legislature to visit San Jose; San Jose even offered them the use of a special train, free of charge. The Senate accepted the invitation, but it was declined by the Assembly.²⁰⁷

On February 21, the last removal bill of that session was introduced by W. Z. Angney of Santa Clara. Entitled "An Act for the removal and permanent location of the seat of government of the State of California" (A.B. 473), it was similar to Tully's bill except that it specified San Jose as the site for the removal of the capital.²⁰⁸

On March 21, the same day that the Joint Committee on Public Buildings gave their rather favorable report after investigating the capitol construction, the three removal bills came up in the Assembly as a special order of the day. All three bills were indefinitely postponed. No doubt, once the Assembly received that report, members were less apt to support removal measures. In addition to the three removal bills, bills were introduced into both houses calling for the repeal of the special taxes to provide funds for the capitol construction (A.B. 547 and S.B. 550). Like the removal bills, they failed to pass.²⁰⁹

Finally, in April 1868, with the resumption of good weather, the availability of materials, and the defeat of the legislative maneuverings to remove the seat of government from Sacramento, work on the capitol building resumed. The Capitol Commissioners, feeling under pressure, urged Cummings to "...complete the building so far as was required for its occupancy by the coming Legislature and the State officers."²¹⁰ During the previous hiatus of 1867-1868, only a minimal amount of work had continued. Cummings had reduced the labor force throughout that winter until there were just enough men left to work with the small amount of brick on hand, which was expected to last until the middle of April. Cummings had spent much of his time preparing drawings of the outside columns, capitals, and entablature and by March 3, 1868, he had forwarded drawings to and made contracts with Phoenix Iron Co. of Philadelphia for additional beams for halls, floors, and porticos. As mentioned earlier, they were shipped from Philadelphia in October. He had also ordered fourteen wrought iron girders for the tambour of the dome from Kittredge and Leavitt of San Francisco. On the eve of the full resumption of work, there was an average of 25 feet, seven inches left to raise on all the outer walls, about one-fourth less on the interior walls. Besides the continued need for iron, acquiring roof timbers was high in priority.

Cummings predicted that if there were no delays in acquiring iron and timbers, the roof could go on before the next rainy season. By April 1, 1868, Cummings had increased the labor force by 20 men. The third floor wrought iron beams were on site and these men were at work preparing the floors. As soon as the iron beams were in place, Cummings planned to increase the brick masons' forces, so that the arched brick floors could be constructed.²¹¹

In his April 1868 report to the Commissioners, Cummings touched on two areas which would turn out to be problems over the next months. The first was the inability of the iron contractors to furnish more than a certain amount in a given time. Waiting for iron would slow the progress of the project. The second was labor relations. Cummings was in favor of giving the workmen some incentive, even at the cost of increasing the wages, "as it will require the utmost exertion and no delays for iron or timber, to get the roof on before the next rain sets in, and unless this is effected it will be almost impossible to finish the building partially next year."²¹² Despite his apparently progressive attitude toward workmen's wages, Cummings would have to deal with labor difficulties.

In early April 1868, Cummings was given the go-ahead to begin building up the construction crew for the 1868 work season. Cummings hired Mark Foster of Sacramento as engineer to take charge of the hoisting engine; Jeremiah Day as foreman of the blacksmith shop; and W. L. Herndon as foreman of the brick masons. On April 17, 1868, N. L. Drew & Co. received the contract to provide roofing timber.²¹³

In mid-April, a labor dispute which had been brewing resulted in a strike. A group, described by the Daily Bee as "The Committee of High Cockalorums", visited Governor Haight and demanded the removal of Gordon Cummings as state capitol architect. One man, named Voorhies, even refused to accept the position of master carpenter unless the architect was changed. Governor Haight, however, refused to be moved. The Daily Bee congratulated Haight and said "...to change that officer now, and under the circumstance, would be looked upon by thinking men everywhere as scarcely less than sacrilege and so the Governor views it, and we presume that all the Commissioners see the subject in a similar light."²¹⁴

The workmen's apparent displeasure with Cummings, coupled with their refusal to accept the Capitol Commissioners' proposition in regards to wages, led to a strike on April 20, with the exception of the carpenters, blacksmith, and a few laborers who handled the iron. In his report to the Commissioners on May 1, Cummings wrote,

I was willing to assume the responsibility of commencing with a few hands this week so as to clear up the present material and the wages so far as the bricklayers were concerned, but did not feel at liberty to make a precedent in the laborers' wages nor were they willing to wait for your decision.

Cummings informed the Commissioners that the workmen's wage request was unreasonable. He had applications from laborers and brickmasons who were willing to work at the old rates. The Board resolved that Cummings should employ enough brickmasons and laborers at the old wage rate to use up the

materials on hand. Although Cummings reported that work resumed on May 2, the materials were exhausted by the 23rd. A local newspaper observed at the end of May 1868, that "since then the strike very little has been visibly added to the hight [sic] of the walls, which are deserted by the workmen."²¹⁵

Although Cummings expected to get more brick by mid-June, the Sacramento Daily Union, long a promoter of the new capitol and loyal to the effort to keep Sacramento the permanent seat of government, clearly expressed their impatience over the work delays:

There is a complaint that the brick kilns do not turn out brick fast enough to meet the demand, and we do not know what other causes are not conspiring to retard the progress of the building. The Commissioner should give the matter a little attention at once, and if possible remedy the mismanagement wherever it exists.... Will not the Commissioners, a majority of whom are Sacramentans, take measures to hurry up the work?²¹⁶

Despite what seemed like long delays, brick production did resume. On August 8, 1868, construction of the barrel of the outer dome began. The barrel of the dome was constructed of brick, while the dome proper, which would be constructed later, was an iron and wood framework. By November 17, 1868, the brick arch of the inner dome was completed, along with all the other brickwork on the building except for parts of the outer dome, step foundations, and porticos. Responding, no doubt, to community inquiries and pressures, Cummings reported on June 2, 1868, that 25 men were engaged and that they could easily finish work by November 1, 1868. (Presumably, he meant the exterior of the building.) He predicted the only difficulties would be getting the roof over the building and acquiring iron. Cummings informed the Board that,

Besides the interior work over 900 lineal feet of the heavy cornice architrave, four large columns, all the caps of pilasters &c, &c should be delivered before September.

He explained that the delay had been with Miners Foundry in San Francisco.²¹⁷

"General operations" resumed on June 19, 1868, and on July 1, Cummings reported that since then work was progressing favorably. He had no fear of getting the building under a roof by the fall, except for the acquisition of the iron. The time had also come when the Commissioners would have to start thinking about decisions on finishes for the building. In June, Cummings reminded the Board that they would soon have to decide on the roof covering. With a choice between copper or lead, Cummings was inclined toward lead because it was one-half the price of copper. The Board requested Cummings to wire C. P. Huntington, in New York, to ascertain the relative merits and price of copper and lead. Cummings also asked the Board to begin thinking about the wood for the interior finishes of the building, such as doors, windows, staircases, and architrave. He felt that the best was Eastern white pine from Maine or Pennsylvania; the next best was Port Orford or Ginger pine. Cummings needed a decision soon so that the wood could be acquired and seasoned.²¹⁸

Beginning in August of 1868, Cummings and the Commissioners began to feel the effects of the failure of the iron order to arrive. The entire roofing program was delayed. During July, Cummings had been forced to reduce the work crew. In addition, the Board,

Ordered, that in view of the present danger of delay in the delivery of the iron work and the consequent risk of failure in being able to roof the Capitol building this fall which would render it impossible for the next session of the Legislature to be held in the new building, the Governor and the Secretary of State be authorized to offer Messrs. Howland, Angell & Co. twenty-five hundred (\$2,500.00) dollars in coin, provided that they will deliver the columns and iron work in time so that the building is roofed this fall, payable when the roof is on and provided that the roof is on this fall.²¹⁹

Finally, on September 30, 1868, Cummings was able to write the Commissioners, "We are commencing the roof...." One month later, the north section of the roof was nearly completed and ready for the copper sheathing, which they had decided on instead of the lead. The problem was that the copper could not be placed until the iron cornice was put on; however, the iron, as usual, was delayed. Cummings complained that the Miners Foundry sent iron in whatever sequence was convenient to them, not as it was needed at the capitol.²²⁰ Despite the delay in the iron, the Commissioners decided to proceed with advertising for bids for laying copper on the roof and for making and laying gutters. Thomas H. Selby & Co. received the roofing contract and the copper was in hand by January 6, 1869. Apparently, that company did not complete the job because the Commissioners contracted with Boehme and Lawson to complete the roof on December 14, 1868. The "front section" of the cornice was completed and the copper covering was expected to commence the next week. Despite Cummings' earlier hopes about completing the roof by November of 1868, it was not until April 1, 1869 that he could report that nearly all the iron was on the grounds. At that point he hoped that the iron and brick work would be done in early May. By the 24th of April, the last piece of cornice was set and on May 18, 1869, the roof was completed.²²¹

The end of 1868 and the beginning of 1869 marked a change in the emphasis of work on the building. While structural work was continuing, especially on the roof, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners and Gordon Cummings turned their attention to the task of finishing the interior of the capitol, readying it for the opening session of the Legislature in December of 1869. In a New Year's Day story, the Sacramento Daily Union described the progress of the capitol and the work remaining to be completed:

The State Capitol has advanced with great rapidity towards completion during the past year, or since the substitution of iron and brick for the stone used in the lower story. Such is the vigor with which every department of the work is pressed that nothing but an unlikely event can now prevent its completion for the Legislature of next Winter. The roof is ready for the copper and the last members of the iron cornice, and but for the delay of the arrival of

the iron from San Francisco would have been still further advanced. The skeleton work of the interior already gives evidence of its magnificent proportions and the promised elegance of its architectural finish, particularly the legislative halls and the State Library. The ceilings of the two former are sunk with deeply enriched panels and coffers and quadrantal arches. Over the Library, a highly enriched dome rests on the two orders of columns, and is surmounted by an ornamental skylight. Preparations for the gas fixtures are now being made in all the principal departments of the building. Electricity will be used in igniting the gas. We are informed by the architect, G. P. Cummings, that the past year has necessarily been the most expensive since the commencement of the building, owing to the large amount of iron and other costly material required; but, while the disbursements have been overrun the appropriation (this year about \$180,000), the requirements for the next year will be quite within the balance. There has already been spent within a fraction of \$700,000 since the money was raised by direct tax, and to entirely complete the building and grounds will require between \$400,000 and \$500,000 more. Besides those on the outside, there are sixty-three large iron columns in the interior, resting on the massive arching of the floors; and besides the elaborate iron work in the dome, there are over one hundred and twenty Corinthian iron pilaster caps. The interior finish is intended to be of California woods -- laurel, walnut, etc. From the present line of the dental band there is to be added seven feet of cornice and balustrade, making eighty-eight feet from the ground. The inner dome, as now seen, is one hundred and twenty-seven feet. This dome will be entirely covered by the upper one, which rises, with its colonnade and double portico, eighty feet above it. It is only contemplated to raise four of the large columns outside during the present year.²²²

Work proceeded much as outlined in the newspaper article. One change which was made to the building was to add restrooms. The area on both the second and third stories, north and south of the library, had originally been appropriated to the library and enclosure walls were left out. Cummings proposed to take half of the space on the north side and, after the building was completed or approaching completion, enclose it and fix it up for a series of water closets and washrooms. He also improvised four additional restrooms on the first floor under the stairs in the south hall.²²³

On December 1, 1868, Cummings had been authorized to advertise for bids for plastering the building and for furnishing white marble mantles. Bids were to include the completion of both the mantles and the grates. In early January, Cummings' designs for the marble mantles, with specifications, were adopted and on January 20, 1869, the proposal of P. J. Devine of Sacramento to produce them for \$5,000 was accepted. The specifications called for the following three designs:

No. 1--Four ft. 4 in. high; breast, 5 ft. 2 in.; shelf, 6 ft. 3 in. by 1.3; 3-in. thick enriched edge; 4 pilasters with sculptured heads, enriched caps and belt, flowered scroll centrepiece, containing crest and arms of the State; 6-in. moulded base, grate, 2 ft. 4 in.--eight in number.
No. 2--Four ft. high; shelf, 5.8 by 1 ft., 1-1/2 in. thick; breast, 4 ft. 6; enriched bed; moved and flowered keystone; 4 moulded and flowered panels, 1-1/4 in. deep, 6 in. base; and 2 foot grates--twenty in number. No. 3--Shelf, 3 ft. 8 in., 10 in. wide, 1 in. thick; breast, 3 ft. 3, 3.10 high; 2 small bed and belt mouldings; 2 sunk panels; plain jambs; 5-in. base; grates, 1 ft. 9 in.--twenty-seven in number.

On January 6, 1869, the plastering contract was awarded to J. M. Warren of San Francisco and the gas-fitting and plumbing contract to Middleton & Hobson, also of San Francisco. To prepare for the plastering, N. L. Drew & Co. was awarded the lath contract at \$6 per thousand board feet. The plastering began on January 25, 1869, and was completed late in October, literally within days of occupancy, with the exception of a few rooms in the third story, staircases, and rotunda which were finished later.²²⁴

The history of the capitol construction throughout 1869 is a recitation of many small items needed for the interior, either directly ordered or contracted for. In October 1868, the Board ordered Cummings to divide the purchase of small iron, hardware, and cordage equally as possible between Huntington, Hopkins & Co., Gibbs & Holmes, I. S. Van Winkle & Co., and J. Carolan. On January 20, 1869, Cummings was authorized to advertise for bids for making stairs in the State Library room. Langland and Cameron received that contract for \$3,425.00. Kittredge and Leavitt, who had supplied iron earlier in the project, were contracted to construct the iron doors to the Treasurer's and Comptroller's vaults. G. W. Parker provided the two marble dial clocks for the Senate and Assembly chambers.²²⁵

The progress of the interior finish continued smoothly throughout the spring of 1869 except for a brief episode in April. By the first of April, the Board had received a petition from the carpenters, plasterers, bricklayers, and laborers demanding an increase in wages. The Board moved that Cummings be authorized to grade the carpenters' wages according to the value of their service. The next day, on the second, all the mechanics, except the blacksmiths, refused to continue working unless they were given a raise. Cummings felt compelled to promise it to them or stop the work. The laborers followed their example the next day.²²⁶

In April 1869, Whilliter Fuller & Co. were given the contract to provide some of the window glass. Specifications called for it to be the best quality French plate glass. They were instructed that if it was not available they had to furnish temporary glass, taking it back without extra charge when the specified glass arrived. The glass did arrive, coming around Cape Horn in a sailing ship, twelve days inside the contract time. In August, their bid was also accepted for paints and oils. The firm of Gates & Brother was given a similar glass and paint contract and, in October, John Brewster and Assistants were hired to do the glazing.²²⁷

All of the interior items to date had been purchased by the Board of State Capitol Commissioners. Like many construction jobs today, the contractor, which in this case was the Commissioners, was responsible for most fixtures attached to the building. The Secretary of State, as ex-officio Superintendent of Public Buildings, was responsible for the unattached furnishings to go into the building. H. L. Nichols, Secretary of State at the time, pledged,

The State Capitol Commissioners have made great efforts to have the new Capitol building so far completed as to admit of its being occupied by the Legislature the coming session. I am, therefore, arranging to have the same furnished and ready for the reception of the Legislature and State officers before the first week in December next.²²⁸

As the building got closer to completion, the Secretary of State became more involved with purchasing. On June 1, 1869, the Board resolved that the Secretary of State be authorized to make contracts for carpets for the legislative chambers, court and library rooms, and other offices as necessary for occupancy.²²⁹ This delegation was only a formality since the Secretary of State was one of the Capitol Commissioners.

In July, the Commissioners decided to assess their financial situation and determine whether work should proceed. On July 15, 1869 they,

Resolved, that the State Capitol Architect be directed to proceed with the work on the Capitol Building until the last of the month, if in his opinion the entire expense for the parts contemplated to be finished does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars, from July 1869. If at the end of the period he considers this sum insufficient, he shall so report to the Board, who will then take further action in regard to the supervision of the work.²³⁰

Cummings must have felt comfortable with the available funds because he did not report otherwise to the Board.

In August, Cummings was directed to make arrangements with Hobson, of Middleton & Hobson who had the contract for the gas fixtures, to install an electrical apparatus to light the gas in the Senate and Assembly Chambers. The cost was not to exceed \$1,500. That same month, the Board accepted the estimate of James Easton to furnish desks for the President of the Senate and Speaker of the Assembly and clerks' desks for both the Senate and Assembly. The Secretary of State was made responsible to have a sample desk and chair made for the Chambers. Cummings contracted with Hunt and Anderson for window blinds of Eastern white pine.²³¹

Within two months prior to the occupancy of the building, potential labor problems brewed. At the end of September the blacksmiths, painters, and the watchman asked for an increase in wages; it was allowed by the Board. Cummings reported to the Board that he had to increase the carpenters' wages twenty-five cents per day or lose the best workers.

Luckily, the labor problem was averted; work proceeded and the building was completed enough to be occupied in late November 1869. On the 19th of that month, Cummings reported to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners the state of the building: yet to be completed were the front and side porticos, steps, upper dome, balustrade around the building, the inner dome and rotunda, outside cement and painting, and part of the third floor. At this time Cummings also felt it necessary to explain the discrepancy between an earlier estimate of his for the partial completion of the building, which was \$367,657.51, and actual expenses (between November 1, 1867 to November 1, 1869), which were \$580,008.74. His reasons for this difference were: 1) the eight-hour day which was passed in 1868 added 25 percent to the labor costs on the building and in preparation of building materials; 2) the building was completed much more thoroughly than anticipated when the estimate was made; and 3) the depreciation of the capitol warrants -- because of the nature of the funding, cash advances with interest payments were required. In a puzzling move, considering the urgency of the Legislature to finish the capitol, early in 1868 that body passed an act reducing a legal day's work from ten to eight hours on all state jobs. The act was apparently motivated to quiet the political activities of labor unions.²³²

At the time of Cummings' report, on November 19, 1869, the building was already occupied by some state officers. However, it was not until the evening of the 25th that the gas in the legislative chambers and most of the building was lighted for the first time. The Sacramento Daily Union reported,

The effect in the two chambers was very fine indeed. Middleton & Hobson, contractors for the gas-fitting and plumbing, celebrated the occasion by opening numerous bottles of champagne for the benefit of their corps of employees.²³³

The Governor's and Secretary of State's offices opened the morning of the 26th of November for business. On the 30th, a local newspaper, which gave almost daily progress, reported,

The books of the State Library will all be moved by this evening, as will also the documents and furniture belonging to the clerk of the Supreme Court.

The new Supreme Courtroom was used in the capitol for the first time on December 3, having moved there from the Hastings' Building at the corner of Second and J Streets. On December 6, the eighteenth session of the Legislature convened at their new chambers for the first time and two days later, Governor Haight presented his annual message to the newly assembled body. He felt it would cost \$381,280 to complete the building as planned, which would bring the total expenditures to \$1,447,377.04.²³⁴

To many people the opening of the capitol was synonymous with the ball given by the citizens of Sacramento in honor of the occupancy of the building. According to the Sacramento Daily Union, it

drew out several hundred ladies and gentlemen, representing the wealth, beauty and fashion of the State. The magnificent chambers had a most elegant appearance, lit up

as they were by hundreds of gas-burners, and further illuminated by the beauty and fine toilets of the fair ladies present. The Senate chamber, in which Sanders' Band of San Francisco furnished the music, with Sanders as "caller," was devoted more especially to the dancing of quadrielles, while the Assembly chamber was occupied by those delighting more especially in the various fancy dances of the day, for which the Sacramento Band, under the direction of J. P. Melchoir, played. As may naturally be inferred, the Assembly chamber, owing to the style of the dances, was the most popular. About twelve o'clock the supper-tables, located in the long corridor on the first floor, were visited. The tables were decorated beautifully with evergreens and flowers, and everything about them arranged in the most satisfactory manner, reflecting credit upon the caterer for the occasion, Thomas Guinean, of the Arcade Hotel. The bill of fare comprised luxuries and substantials in quantity profuse and in quality all that could be desired. The vivands having been done justice to, the party returned to the dancing halls and "tripped the light fantastic" until the hours of early morning, and then separated, feeling that through the admirable perfectness of the arrangements the ball had been a brilliant success.²³⁵

While much work was left to be completed on the capitol after its occupancy, it was not resumed immediately. Due to lack of funds, Cummings suspended all work and discharged all workers on January 4, 1870. One month later the Board,

Resolved 1st, That the services of the Architect of the State Capitol Building will not be required from and after Feby 1st 1870 as the time of resuming the work on the State Capitol is uncertain and the present probability is that at least a year must elapse before resumption of work.

Resolved 2nd, That the Board embrace this occasion to testify their sense of the ability, energy and fidelity of G. P. Cummings Esq. Architect and Superintendent in the construction of the State Capitol, during the period of his connection with the building.

Cummings was instructed to turn all his books, papers, and plans relating to the capitol over to the Secretary of State.²³⁶ As a tribute,

On Saturday p.m. Geo. P. Cummings, architect of the State Capitol, was presented with a magnificent walking cane with a gold quartz head and an inscription that it was a testimonial from the merchants of Sacramento and his employees. It was presented with an appropriate speech by P. N. Bennett, Master carpenter. Mr. Cummings made some remarks in reply.²³⁷

No major construction work occurred on the building until August 1870. A minimal amount of interior finish work continued including a walnut and laurel panel counter in the Treasurer's office, a walnut book and paper case, and 126 boxes, all built by John Breuner.²³⁸

Meanwhile, the Legislature did appropriate money for the payment of claims for furnishings in the new capitol. On February 7, 1870, "An act making appropriations for payment of claims for furniture, carpets, etc., purchased by the Secretary of State for furnishing the new state capitol and for furnishing Supreme Court-room, Supreme Judges' rooms, etc." was approved by the Governor. It appropriated \$48,276.19 out of the General Fund: \$33,276.19 of it was to pay for furniture for the capitol acquired prior to its occupancy by the Legislature at the eighteenth session; the balance was for the purpose of procuring new furniture for the Supreme Court.²³⁹ On February 26, a similar piece of legislation, "An Act to appropriate money for the payment of curtains, carpets and matting for Senate and Assembly Chambers" was approved, which appropriated \$3,453.66 out of the General Fund "to pay the claims of W. Sharp for curtains, carpets, matting and lining furnished for use of Assembly Chamber, Senate Chamber, halls, galleries and lobbies, and labor in taking up carpets for purposes of lining, as per order of the respective Sergeant-at-Arms of each House...."²⁴⁰ What was different about this funding, from previous funding, was that it was specifically for furnishings and not for fixtures in the building. Therefore, it did not come from the Capitol Fund (which was for construction), but from the General Fund, and it was administered by the Secretary of State as Superintendent of the Building.

In April 1870, another significant change was made in the capitol funding: the issuance of state bonds. Earlier attempts to pass legislation issuing state bonds for the capitol construction had failed. In Gordon Cummings' report to the Commissioners in November 1869, he felt it necessary to state

...it is pertinent for me to say here, that unless the coming Legislature appropriate other funds than the ten cent tax for the completion of the building, the Commissioners should suspend all work and expense of every kind on it for at least one year; or if not entirely suspended, such portions of the work only should be projected as will involve no great expense, and be improved by a slow process.²⁴¹

Evidently the Commissioners agreed, because they did suspend work after January 1870. The Legislature apparently felt the pressure of the delay and passed "An Act authorizing the issuance of State bonds to the amount of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, to be known as State Capitol bonds." It was approved by Governor Haight on April 4, 1870. The seven percent, 15 year bonds, in one thousand dollar denominations, were to be dated July 1, 1870. In addition, an ad valorem tax of 1-1/2 percent was levied on taxable property within the state. The money raised from that tax was kept in a distinct fund known as "The State Capitol Bonds Interest and Sinking Fund", and was used to pay the interest on the bonds as it accrued, and for the redemption and payment of the principal. All work or labor or material furnished for the capitol or its grounds after June 1, 1870 was to be paid for out of the State Capitol Special Fund.²⁴² None of the money raised by bonds could be used to pay indebtedness already accrued on the building; those expenses were to be

paid for by the old State Capitol Tax which was expected to raise \$170,000 between April 1870 and December 1871. \$100,000 was already due because the tax fund was overdrawn in order to prepare the capitol for the occupancy of the Legislature in December 1869.²⁴³ On July 1, 1870, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners met to open the sealed proposals for the first purchase of state capitol bonds which amounted to \$12,000. The sale was awarded to B. F. Hastings & Co., a banking firm in Sacramento. The last of these bonds were sold in April 1871.²⁴⁴

In August of 1870, with the assurance of income from the sale of state bonds, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners decided to resume work on the capitol. They did not rehire Gordon Cummings. The reason is not clear, but some described his removal due to political motives on the part of Governor Haight.²⁴⁵ Instead, the Commissioners appointed Henry Kenitzer of San Francisco, who was a former partner of Reuben Clark, and A. A. Bennett of Sacramento as architects to work on the capitol. The Board made the understanding that Kenitzer's authority was to be greater than Bennett's in "carrying out and perfecting the plans and designs for the construction of said building." The salary of A. A. Bennett was fixed at \$200 for six months, as Architect of the Executive Mansion; the salary of Henry Kenitzer and A. A. Bennett, as State Capitol Architects, was fixed at \$300 per month, jointly.²⁴⁶ In addition to the capitol, Bennett was to work on the construction of a Governor's Mansion. The mansion, and suitable property on which to locate it, was to be paid for with state capitol bonds. The property was not to exceed \$50,000. On August 19, the Commissioners decided to buy a block of land east of the capitol, bounded by Fourteenth, Fifteenth, L and M streets, for \$14,000. Construction began on August 26, 1870, but funding was inadequate and the building sat unfinished for several years. Finally, it was completed for use as the State Printing Office.²⁴⁷

As might be expected when a person (or persons) is expected to resume work begun by someone else, Kenitzer and Bennett were critical of some of the design and structural decisions made by Gordon Cummings. They quickly pointed out these areas to the Commissioners as if they wanted to make sure the Commissioners knew they were not responsible for them. Kenitzer and Bennett also made some design changes to the building.

The first capitol item to which the architects turned their attention was the replacement of all the lead gutters on the roof with ones of copper. Kenitzer and Bennett reported that the lead had "cracked and wrinkled...in such a manner that it was utterly impossible, and also useless, to repair, and the leakage of the gutters had already done a great deal of damage to the building." The job was a large one with between four and five thousand feet of sheet copper to be laid. The contract for the copper was awarded to Brittan, Holbrook & Co.²⁴⁸

Kenitzer and Bennett were very critical of three other features of the building as they found it. The first was one of design. They stated that the original design of the base of the dome was to be an octagon, but it had been converted into a circle which "makes the base too indistinct from the upper part of the dome on account of diminishing the projections, and making the base too insignificant for the dome." Kenitzer and Bennett also pointed out that Cummings had "changed the design of the building" by substituting Grecian mouldings for those of the Roman order.²⁴⁹

Secondly, the two architects, upon examining the west portico, found that the main building had settled two and three-fourths inches below the portico. While remedying some of the effects of that settling, they replaced the granite work and brick arches on that portico. At that time, Kenitzer and Bennett,

after careful consideration, came to the conclusion to omit the heavy, costly and useless granite steps; the principal reason being to give light to the rotunda in the basement, which is certainly one very important point, adding greatly to the cheerfulness of the principal offices located in the basement and which are in daily use, whereas the greater part of the upper stories is only used four months every two years. This change will also add greatly to the more lofty and graceful proportions of the building, exclusive of the savings of from fifty to sixty thousand dollars in said change...²⁵⁰

This decision did more than change the design of the front facade of the capitol -- it changed the entire focus of the structure. Prior to this time, the emphasis, by way of the planned grand exterior stairs to the second story, was on the chambers of the Senate and Assembly. The decision to build an entry stairway into the first story focused attention onto the offices and officers of the executive branch of government and away from the Legislature. Four years later, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, representing a new administration, wrote unhappily about this decision:

When the present Board assumed control of the Capitol it was so far advanced toward completion that the construction of a suitable flight of steps to approach the main entrance would have involved a change in plan or work already done, and an expenditure larger than was thought advisable; and it was thereafter decided to delay such construction until a more favorable opportunity offered. It is apparent that the building never will present a completed appearance until such steps are erected.²⁵¹

A third feature of the building of which the architects were critical was the heating system. In their own words,

We found the arrangements for heating the Capitol building and its various offices to be of the most primitive and inefficient character.²⁵²

In fact, there was no heating system, save for the room fireplaces. To remedy that situation, the "hermetically sealed" basement was opened up for the placement of boilers for heating and for the general ventilation of the building. Kenitzer and Bennett reported that,

Walls had to be cut into and the floors taken up throughout the building, in order to place the heating pipes.... Complete heating apparatus has now been put in position,

and pipes and heaters placed throughout all parts of the building, so that for the future every office and hall in the edifice will be properly heated and ventilated.²⁵³

On September 26, 1870, the firm of Hobson and Ayres was paid over \$40,000 for gas fixtures, heating apparatus, plumbing work, and pipes. A year later Hinckly & Co. won a contract to provide two boilers to provide the steam.²⁵⁴

At the end of November 1870, in his first official report to the Commissioners, Bennett reported,

The work on the dome has progressed slowly on account of the want of Cast-Iron. A sufficient amount is now on hand to insure no further delay. We have commenced laying floors in the third story with the view of completing same.... Work will very soon commence on the Porticoes.²⁵⁵

True to his plans, the dome, porticos, and flooring were three of the major areas of construction during 1871, along with the application of cast iron decorations to the building.

Throughout the spring of 1871, the local newspapers covered the almost weekly arrivals of cast iron pieces for the dome and porticos. Cast at Miners Foundry in San Francisco, the iron could have either been transported to Sacramento by water or by rail. At that time rail service was available from Vallejo to Sacramento via the California Pacific Railroad or from San Jose via the (old) Western Pacific and Central Pacific Railroads. The California Pacific and Western Pacific were both owned by the Central Pacific Railroad, thus, by the terms of the 1864 legislation, material for the construction of the capitol was hauled free. Bills from the California Steam Navigation Co. for 1871 do not indicate iron columns specifically, leaving the question of "by rail" or "by water" unanswered.²⁵⁶

The movement of the enormous pieces of iron through the streets of Sacramento, from the waterfront to the construction site, certainly made for newsworthy stories in the local press. It was a much more dramatic process for the public to watch or read about than the hauling of monotonous loads of brick or lumber. At first, the iron which arrived was the smaller castings, such as parts of the balustrades on the dome and the ornate capitals for the Corinthian columns. These were hauled on trucks, pulled by teams, from the Central Pacific Railroad Co. freight platform on Front Street. In March, the largest columns, those for the north, west, and south porticos and dome colonnade, began arriving and they continued to arrive through July. The enormity of a single column shaft was impressive. Each alone was thirty feet in length, four feet in diameter, with cast iron walls four inches thick, and weighed nearly eleven and a half tons. These large columns may have come by either water or rail. They were left at the Central Pacific Railroad wharf, which was located on Sacramento's waterfront, north of J Street. This could mean that they arrived on Central Pacific Railroad-owned ships and offloaded there or it could mean that they arrived by rail, and because of their weight, the railroad took advantage of the cranes available only at the Central Pacific Railroad wharf to offload.²⁵⁷

At first these columns were pulled to the site by teams. A large truck or wagon was brought from San Francisco especially for the purpose of carrying these columns. Then, in May, a steam road wagon was shipped to Sacramento from San Francisco to expedite the hauling of these very heavy pieces of iron from the railroad wharf. The introduction of the steam tractor generated a great amount of interest in the local press. The Sacramento Daily Union described this very modern machine:

Oliver Hyde's patent American overland steamer, manufactured by Hanscon & Co., San Francisco, intended for hauling freight or steam plowing by direct traction, came up from the Bay City yesterday morning, and soon afterward was set at work hauling three of the mammoth columns for the State Capitol from off the Central Pacific Railroad wharf to the foot of J Street. The machine worked admirably, going ahead, backing and turning very readily. About 1 o'clock the three columns (mounted on trucks) having been attached to one another and to the wagon, the latter started off up J Street with them, moving at the rate of a little over a mile per hour.

After a minor breakdown, the columns were delivered at the capitol at 4 o'clock.²⁵⁸

On March 9, 1871, the job of hoisting into position the iron columns "which are to ornament the dome of the Capitol" began. These were the columns which form the colonnade on the barrel of the dome. Two weeks later Bennett reported to the Commissioners that all of the large castings were set on the dome. Bennett also reported he had advertised for bids to fill the capitol grounds and informed the Board that they should be considering bids for the carving of the stairs. The plastering was in progress in the third story of the building and those rooms would soon be ready to have the wood finished in them.²⁵⁹

In mid-April, the process to begin raising the large portico columns began. The Sacramento Daily Union announced,

The temporary staircase leading to the northern entrance of the State Capitol has been removed, and a derrick erected, preparatory to the raising into position on the portico on that end of the building of the large iron columns which are to ornament it.²⁶⁰

It was nearly two months later, however, that they could report,

Yesterday afternoon the huge derrick so long standing idle opposite the north portico of the Capitol was put to service. The first grand iron column was by its aid raised to the position prepared for it. The services of fifteen men were required for the work.

The next day, under the supervision of Janes E. Ryan, foreman of the riggers' gang, a capital, which weighed 5,800 pounds, was placed on the first pillar put into position on the north portico.²⁶¹

Meanwhile, work on the dome continued. At the end of April 1871, Bennett reported that the iron ribs for the outer dome were drawing to completion. In the inner dome's interior, scaffolding was in place in the upper part of the rotunda, preparatory for plastering.²⁶² By the end of May 1871, a local newspaper was able to report,

The iron framework for the top of the dome of the State Capitol, is being put together in the grounds below, so that when the pieces are hoisted to the position they are intended to occupy, the only work necessary to be done will be the driving of the fastening bolts.²⁶³

This framework referred to is the arrangement of trusses inside the upper dome which give it support.

Finally by the end of July 1871, the dome roof was readied to receive its exterior covering. Bennett announced that workmen would begin setting the ribs of the dome before the next meeting of the Board (presumably the next month) and that all the wood covering for it had been prepared. He promised that the copper would be ready by the time the dome was set up. Also, at the end of July, the columns of the north and south porticos had been set up and were ready for the soffits and cornices. The granite work for the front portico was underway and was expected to be completed in two months. The pieces of granite for the portico were so large that it took several men to remove one from a flat car at the foot of J Street onto a truck. Carpentry work in the third story was nearly finished and the east exterior facade of the building was expected to be completed the last of July or beginning of August. On September 26, 1871, Bennett wrote the Board and announced that the stairs, dome, porticos, painting, and stone work were drawing to completion. Left to install on the dome were crystal sheet glass provided by Sullivan, Kelley & Co., and forty-four lights of plate glass for the dome and skylights, to be cut and ground by Robert Miles.²⁶⁴

One of the finishing touches to the dome was the placement of the gold ball at the top of the cupola on October 30, 1871. The Sacramento Daily Union announced this addition of the capitol in a story headlined, "The Crowning Ornament":

The crowning ornament of the State Capitol building--a ball thirty inches in diameter, made of brass but heavily plated with gold, \$300 in coin having been used for the purpose--was yesterday placed in position, the Secretary of State, A. A. Bennett, State Architect, and several other gentlemen being present....²⁶⁵

While the newspaper erroneously referred to the ball as "brass", the Commissioners paid Sanders & Bofinger \$80.00 for a "copper ball", which indeed it is. The goldplated ball was supported by a redwood shaft upon which state dignitaries signed their name the day of the ball's installation. The cupola, which rose from the apex of the dome and which supported the post and ball, was formed of a cast iron base, columns, and cornice. The frame of the cupola roof was of wrought iron, sheathed with wood and then covered with copper.²⁶⁶

At the end of October 1871, Kenitzer and Bennett reported that the dome and rotunda would be finished by the next meeting of the Legislature, scheduled to convene December 4, 1871. One of the last items to be completed on the inner dome was to illuminate its interior by gas jets. Hobson and Ayres offered an electrical method to ignite the gas throughout the building. The Board responded by stating,

The proposal of Hobson and Ayers to furnish the electrical apparatus is accepted upon the condition heretofore agreed-- to by them, that if the apparatus fails to work satisfactorily upon trial it is to be removed by Messrs. Hobson and Ayers at their own expense and no charge made for it.²⁶⁷

The apparatus was installed because on December 16, the public was informed that, "The dome of the Capitol will be lighted this evening at 7-1/2 o'clock by electricity."

By November 1, 28 men were hired to work on the frescoing of the interior of the inner dome. While the painting was not completed as soon as desired, "owing to the limited space of time", the architects predicted the work of frescoing the dome, rotunda, and vestibule would be completed December 1, 1871. The painting must have been applied shortly because it was completed prior to Cummings' reinstatement as capitol architect in May 1872. Cummings recommended that the rotunda be repainted, "the color to be a tinted fresco, in gold points, as near white as possible, to get all possible light in the halls." He further added that, "The present color, which seems a compound of brick dust and Scotch snuff, almost obliterates the fine delineations of the Messrs. Schrader, and throws a sombre gloom over everything." In December, the construction of the dome, described by the two architects as "the most expensive and difficult work performed under our supervision" had come to completion.²⁶⁸ The architects had also promised that the north and south porticos would be completed by the opening of the nineteenth session of the Legislature in December 1871. The front or west portico did not reach completion at that time, "owing to the length of time required for finishing the statuary for the pediment."²⁶⁹

While the focus of attention during the work season in 1871 was on the dome and porticos, work continued on finish details inside the building. When the building opened for business in 1869, the stairways in the building were not completed, and access to the upper floors was by temporary stairs. In all, four major stairways were installed in the capitol; one in the northwestern area; one at the southeastern area; and two matching stairways just inside the west entrance. In March 1871, N. P. Langland, master stair builder, was at work in the building. On the 26th, Bennett urged the Commissioners to consider bids for carving on the stairs. He reported,

You will find accompanying this report two bids for stairs, which should be acted upon at this meeting of the Board as we have a large force on the stairs, and the carving should be carried along with the ballance [sic] of the work....²⁷⁰

On April 4, 1871, the Board announced that Bryant and Strahan of San Francisco were to do the carving on the stairs according to the plans and specifications of the capitol architect. The job of sawing and turning the stair bannisters was given to both the Central Pacific Railroad Company and N. P. Langland. The work progressed well, according to Bennett, and on May 15, a local newspaper reported,

The temporary stairway leading to the Assembly Chamber at the Capitol is being removed, to make room for a new and ornamental permanent one.

These stairs were the ones located at the northwest part of the building. By the end of September the stairways were completed. The steps and risers were of ash; the newel posts, rails, and balusters of black walnut, "enriched" with laurel. The architect planned to cover the steps with lead to insure "long years of service".²⁷¹ Simultaneously with the stair construction was the finish of the exterior doors of the building. In May 1871, Warren & Kemp of San Francisco were contracted to do all the carving, furnishing lumber, turning, sawing, and moulding for six doors. In addition, in October they were paid for furnishing carved ornaments for sixteen pairs of doors for the capitol. Hartwell, Hotchkiss & Stalker contracted to finish six doors and twelve windows in July. Kenitzer and Bennett predicted that the large doors for the main entrance would be completed by the first of December 1871.²⁷²

By the end of 1871, other interior details had been contracted for, including gas fixtures, floor tiling, glass, and statuary for the exterior. Hobson and Ayres contracted to furnish twenty-six gas pillar lights. (Pillar lights are the type which appeared on the daises in the legislative chambers.) Late in the year, bids for providing floor finishings were also accepted. Included were proposals from Pacific Stone Co. to furnish 2,700, 9 x 9 x 1-1/4" tiles, and from Leon R. Meyers & Co., of San Francisco, dealers in Italian and American marble, to furnish tile for the portico. (Tiles which fit the specifications for the Pacific Stone Co. tile were found on the walkway around the barrel of the dome.) On November 23, 1871, one thousand pounds of tiles arrived on the steamer Sacramento. The balance of the tile floor would be installed over the next two years. On November 1, the proposal of Whittier, Fuller & Co. to provide plate glass for the building was accepted.²⁷³

The long job of creating the statuary to decorate the exterior of the building began in 1871. Two years before, in September 1869, the Board had received a letter from Joseph Argenti regarding some sculpture. It was referred to architect Gordon Cummings to act with his discretion in the matter. Cummings authorized the payment of \$550 to Argenti for the moulding and castings of several figures, including two of Eureka and one of bears. Argenti was described by a newspaper as a "master workman in plaster of Paris ornaments" for the capitol. The figures he created could well have been for interior decoration, possibly in the rotunda.²⁷⁴ In April 1870, the Board received estimates for five figures in bronze from the Philadelphia & New York Ornamental Iron Works of New York, that totaled \$20,000. In May 1871, they received a bid from Pacific Stone Co. for five statues "from suitable moulds to be furnished by you". The following September, that company received the bid for \$3,180 in gold coin, considerably cheaper than the estimate for bronze figures. Their contract was approved October 3, 1871. Sculptor P. Mezzara

was selected, in May 1871, to prepare the moulds. Terms included the "Fronton of the State Capitol at Sacramento a bas-relief of colossal proportions composed of Five figures of Ten feet and attributes representing in the center 'Minerva' as Eureka with the California Bear, -- 'Legislature,' Education, Mines and Industry." Mezzara also agreed to submit models in clay to the Commissioners for their approval before casting and to furnish the Pacific Stone Company "all the plastering work forming the mould for the casting in stone". He agreed to do this work for \$6,260 in gold coin.²⁷⁵ By the end of December 1871, the moulds were near completion. A correspondent from the Daily Alta California, in San Francisco, offered this encouraging report:

We visited yesterday the studio of P. Mazzara [sic], No. 531 Jackson street. This sculptor has shown great talent as an artist in clay. About eight months ago he entered into a contract to design an emblematical group of statuary for the entablature of the fronton of the State Capitol, and to prepare the models and moulds for the work. The sculptor has been increasing in his labors, and in one month more his moulds will all be ready for permanent casting. The design when finished, will be fifty feet in length, the central figure being twelve feet in height. The other figures are proportionately arranged as to posture, so as to fill the fronton in the form of a gable-end entablature.

The figure group included "California" styled after Minerva, in the center; to her right sits "Education" and "Industry"; to her left sits "Justice" and "Mining".

The correspondent also offered an explanation of the material to be used,

Now they are ready for permanent casting, which will be done by the Pacific Stone Company. An artificial sand-stone, which cements itself as firm as the hewn rock, will be the final composition. The work, then, after being retouched by the sculptor, will be ready to be placed in position.²⁷⁶

In January 1872, the Board ordered that Mezzara "be appointed to take charge of and supervise the casting...of the statuary for the pediment of the Capitol, and report to the Board when such casting shall have been furnished...." On February 28, Mezzara notified the Board that he had completed his work. Acting for the Commissioners, P. W. Burnett traveled to San Francisco to examine the moulds and on March 15, 1872, he reported to the Commissioners that he had accepted them and authorized final payment to Mezzara. The casting and application of the figures to the tympanum did not occur immediately. In September, the Sacramento Daily Union reported, "The statuary for the pediment is already completed and will be placed in position as soon as the roof, now being rapidly constructed, is finished."²⁷⁷

While work was continuing on the completion of the interior of the capitol, scandal and allegations of fraud wracked the construction project. On August 1, 1871, a story broke in the San Francisco Chronicle (reprinted the next day in the Sacramento Daily Union) of alleged corruption. According to the article,

For some months past rumors have been in circulation concerning the management of affairs at the State Capitol building, now in process of construction at Sacramento. The Republican State Central Committee were informed of the alleged corruption existing, and appointed a committee to inquire into their truth. This committee of inquiry after being at work a short time obtained affidavits of David Corcoran, Thomas Mehan, John Brannan and John O'Hara, all of whom were employed in the gas-fitting and plumbing department of the State Capitol by John Hobson, Superintendent, which shows a condition of affairs that is a disgrace to the State and the Commissioners -- Governor Haight, Secretary of State Nichols, and Treasurer Corone].²⁷⁸

Even though the men on various work details, such as plumbing, painting, and stone cutting, were hired by the state on a day's labor basis, the unofficial arrangement existed by which their superintendent turned in their time, picked up their state pay warrants, and often negotiated the sale of their warrants for them and paid them in cash. Hobson was accused of paying the men under his supervision at a lower rate than the state was being charged for their time. In other words, he was accused of taking a cut of their wages. He was also accused of collecting money for men even on days when they were sick. The Chronicle story offered Governor Haight the following challenge:

If Hobson practiced this system of fraud and corruption in his department, it is fair to presume that the same course was adopted in others, and that out of the moneys paid for the construction of the State Capitol and gubernatorial mansion, one half has gone into the "ring" that directs and controls both buildings. If Governor Haight has any desire to see the guilty punished, he will make such an investigation as the importance of the case and the vindication of the honesty of his administration require and demand.²⁷⁹

In retrospect, it is apparent that the issue was more than just corruption on the capitol construction project and that more was at stake than finding the guilty and correcting a system which allowed mismanagement of money. What was at stake was the 1871 gubernatorial election. The California Republican Convention had convened in Sacramento, in the Assembly Chamber, on June 20, 1871.²⁸⁰ Their nominee for Governor, to oppose the incumbent Democrat, Henry H. Haight, was Newton Booth. It was that body, through their State Central Committee, which began the inquiry of the alleged corruption which had been brought to their attention.

Over the next few months, but especially during August, the month before the election, the Sacramento Daily Union kept the issue alive with heavy press coverage, much of it inflammatory. The tone of their articles was that the capitol workmen had been wronged, that frauds had been committed, and they placed the blame squarely on the Democratic administration, headed by Governor Haight. The Union accused the Governor of knowing of these irregularities in procedure, and stated, "The affair has all the aspects of being part and

parcel of that system of waste and extravagance which has characterized the administration of Governor Haight since it was inaugurated December 5, 1867, making it compare most unfavorably with the two preceding administrations...."281

Haight was also accused of allowing partisan interests to influence his handling of the State Capitol Commission because he and a Democratic Legislature passed an act removing the two citizen members from the commission, which left only the Governor, Secretary of State, and State Treasurer. The Union also expressed suspicions that it was not coincidental that another act was passed within the week which allowed for the issuance of \$250,000 in state bonds and that G. P. Cummings, appointed under a Republican administration, was "discharged". The newspaper concluded that the release of the citizen members of the Board, the new and increased funding, and the release of the architect added up to "a new order of things established". They stopped short of actually accusing Haight of an outright conspiracy of some sort.282

A. A. Bennett, as the current Superintending Architect, denied any great irregularities in the manner in which men were hired. In a letter to the editor of the Sacramento Daily Union, he wrote,

It is the custom both in Sacramento and San Francisco to employ mechanics upon building in the same manner that Hobson & Ayres, Laufkotter Bros., Kehoe and McGuire have been employed to do special work upon the Capitol, in support of which statement reference can be made to any or all firms engaged in similar business to do special work upon the State Capitol. I have yet to learn that either employer or employee has been injured by this custom of the building trade....283

In response, Bennett was accused by the Union for his part in the affair, of

playing the pranks of an ostrich, which, when pursued, hides its head in the sand, leaving the more prominent parts of its body visible. The charge is made that wrong has been done to laborers, and that law has been violated. Bennett admits the fact that he himself has set the laws aside, and is, therefore, amenable. He says directly that men have been hired by gangs, and paid by gangs since he has been Architect of the building. This is nothing but the contract system prohibited by the law of April 4th, 1870.... This law has become a dead letter by the management at the Capitol....284

Most of the controversy was a paper battle, waged on the pages of newspapers. Charges and denials were reiterated over and over again. Groups such as the Mechanic's State Council looked at the matter. By mid-August, they had resolved that the charges against state officials were not valid, perhaps reflecting the traditional alliance between organized labor and the Democratic Party. The battle did reach a violent stage when two members of that council

were physically attacked while conducting their own investigation in Sacramento. The two identified their attackers by name; workmen at the capitol, whom the Union called "Democratic villains".²⁸⁵

The general election was held on September 6, 1871 and the Democratic administration was defeated. Newton Booth was elected Governor with a vote of 61,819, opposed to the 56,800 garnered by Haight.²⁸⁶ After the election the intense pressure for an investigation subsided. The lame duck Board of State Capitol Commissioners resolved that the arrangements with Mr. Kehoe, the man who applied the copper on the dome, and with Hobson & Ayres be discontinued after September 26, 1871. They further resolved,

That the superintendent Mr. Bennett be directed to procure and furnish this Board a statement of the rates actually paid the men by Mr. Kehoe and Messrs. Hobson and Ayers and be instructed to discharge any of the men in any of the departments which loiter or are unfaithful in their work, and that he be requested to expedite the work as much as possible.²⁸⁷

Despite this order, the above firms must have continued to work on the job because on December 1, the Board was on record for rejecting their claims for use of tools and men for November 1871. At their December 19 meeting the Board ordered that the architects and all employees engaged in the work of constructing the state capitol be discharged at 12 o'clock noon on December 20, 1871, except the engineer and the fireman. Also, as of December 20, David Bush was authorized to take charge of the plumbing and gas-fitting work and P. W. Burnett was authorized to superintend and take charge of the construction of the capitol and of all materials and tools belonging to the state which had been used in the work. Burnett and Bush were directed to employ skilled workmen and laborers as necessary. On the 22nd, Mark Foster was removed of his duties as engineer and replaced by Eden Wadsworth, although Foster was allowed to remain as Wadsworth's assistant.²⁸⁸

At the end of December, the Board began proceedings to consider the payrolls and bills for materials furnished for the state capitol and Governor's Mansion during that month. A. A. Bennett was questioned on time keeping and about the method of paying double time for over eight hours and on Sunday. Bennett replied that that was the custom on the capitol job; in order to get the job done he had to offer the workers an incentive. Because of the depreciation of the scrip in which the men were paid, they had been allowed an extra ten percent on their time. Accusations were made over billing, of accountability, and that the account books showed men getting paid more than they actually were. The proceedings continued on January 3, 1872, in which various foreman and suppliers of materials testified. The Board closely scrutinized all expenditures which came before them for approval during January 1872. Bennett's claim for \$200 in salary as architect of the Governor's Mansion during December 1871 was rejected. Bennett had claimed at a previous proceeding that while he hadn't actually worked that month, he had claimed it as compensation for not receiving a percentage of the cost of the job as income. A bill of Bryant Strahan & Co. for wood carving was denied because it had already been paid once and Hobson & Ayres' request for \$500 for patent rights to electrical apparatus was denied.²⁸⁹

Simultaneously with the investigation of fraud was an investigation by the Assembly Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the sinking west corner of the capitol building. The inquiry came at a time when the credibility of the entire construction project was at stake. Mr. Pardee, the committee chairman, reported on January 24, 1872,

that they have made diligent investigations by procuring the services of an experienced hydrographer, in connection with the United States Surveyor's theodolite (which your committee procured with much difficulty), and made a gyrating survey of the building, and came to the unanimous conclusion that the hypercritical informer had taken undue caution and had caused unnecessary alarm throughout the whole state. Your committee begs leave to report that the building stands perfectly firm and unshaken by fire or flood.²⁹⁰

In January 1872, the Assembly began their own investigation of the alleged frauds on the state capitol. John Luttrell, a Democrat from Siskiyou, offered the following resolution on January 4:

WHEREAS, By a publication in one of the leading papers published at the seat of Government, and frequent assertions within the hearing of legislators, it is charged that the late State Capitol Commissioners have been derelict in their duties, and that frauds upon the State Treasury have been perpetuated by employees on the State Capitol and Governor's Mansion, if not with their connivance with their criminal neglect; therefore be it

Resolved, By the Assembly of the State of California, for the purpose of doing justice to all concerned, and to place the blame, if any exists, in these alleged charges of peculations and frauds upon the proper persons, that a committee of five be appointed by the speaker to investigate the matters embraced in the preamble, with power to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and affirmations, and to report to this House the facts in regard to the same.

By a vote of 41 to 23, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which recommended that the resolution not pass. This committee also recommended not to concur in a Senate resolution which called for a joint inquiry "into the manner in which all contracts for materials have been furnished, and all labor has been performed, in the construction of the State Capitol...." Their reason was because "they [had] the same [inquiry] under consideration".²⁹¹

The Assembly Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds pursued the investigation on their own. Beginning on the evening of March 11, 1872, they took testimony from people who had worked on the capitol, including architects, mechanics and laborers, foreman, and suppliers of materials. The

inquiry focused mainly on the methods of hiring and paying personnel, purchasing procedures, and some construction procedures. The last testimony was taken on March 22.²⁹²

On April 1, 1872, Mr. Pardee, the committee chairman, issued the following, rather anticlimatic, report:

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have obeyed the wishes of this House, and have examined many witnesses, but on account of sickness in the family of the Chairman of the committee, it is an impossibility to epitomize an extended report, compiling it from the voluminous testimony in the hands of the committee, and they refer those interested to the testimony in the Appendix.

The committee will state that the law of eighteen hundred and sixty-three, prescribing the manner in which materials shall be furnished, has been grossly ignored, and that the whole business pertaining to the construction of the State Capitol and the Governor's Mansion has been conducted in a loose and uncommendable manner.²⁹³

With that, the public investigation of the capitol frauds came to an end.

From December 20, 1871 until May 8, 1872, the capitol construction proceeded without the services of an architect. No major work was undertaken on the building during this hiatus and the new Board of State Capitol Commissioners, comprised of the new Republican administration, essentially acted as a caretaker commission. This lack of activity was due, it seems, to a lack of available cash. During early 1872, the Legislature began to actively concern itself with raising the money necessary to keep the project going. On February 13, 1872, Senate Bill No. 32 was approved by the Governor, which appropriated \$5,948.68 out of the General Fund "for the purpose of paying the bill of William Sharp for carpets, matting, etc., furnished for the new Capitol prior to the meeting of the Legislature...."²⁹⁴ On March 28, 1872, two pieces of legislation were signed by the Governor, both introduced by the Senate Finance Committee. One, which provided immediate financial relief, was "An Act appropriating fifty-six thousand dollars in United States legal tender notes for the payment of the necessary incidental expenses of the State Capitol and Governor's Mansion." The money was to come from the General Fund "for the purpose of paying the monthly wages and salaries of such employees as may be necessary to be retained for the proper care and safety of the State Capitol and Governor's Mansion, and for material furnished under direction of the said Commissioners."²⁹⁵ The other legislation, which provided long-term financial relief, was "An Act authorizing the issuance of State bonds to the amount of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, to be known as State Capitol Bonds of Eighteen Hundred and Seventy-two."²⁹⁶ The bonds were to be dated July 1, 1872. Revenue raised by their sale, which was to be added to that raised by the already established Capitol Tax, would relieve the capitol of what a local newspaper called "its present ragged appearance". On July 1, 1872, the bonds were sold: seventy of the one thousand dollar bonds to the State Board of Examiners and one hundred eighty to the State Treasurer.²⁹⁷

With the assurance of money in hand, the Board proceeded to again hire an architect "to take charge of, supervise and complete the State Capitol". Gordon P. Cummings, the capitol architect in earlier years, was "unanimously elected" on May 8, 1872; work resumed on the 15th.²⁹⁸

Before actual construction resumed, the Board adopted the following set of rules and regulations on June 5, 1872:

1. The Architect is to have entire charge, subject to the Commissioners' orders, of all foremen and shall designate the number of men to be employed.
2. The salaries and wages of all employees are to be fixed by the commission.
3. The Architect shall have no power to alter wages.
4. The Architect shall receipt to the Controller for all warrants drawn in repayment of wages.
5. Materials of every description used in construction, repairing and finishing shall be obtained upon the written order of the Architect, solely. The Architect is to examine materials.
6. The Architect is to report monthly to the Commission in writing.
7. The foremen are to be responsible for the honesty and competency of the men working under them.
8. The foremen shall work as the others work, except when necessarily engaged in superintending or instructing.
9. The foremen shall make weekly returns of the number of days each men working under them has worked.
10. No employee shall smoke or drink ardent spirits or liquors during working hours.
11. If an employee leaves the premises during working hours, a proportionate amount should be taken from his pay and his absence reported to the Architect.
12. Eight hours is a day's labor; eight hours of actual work will be required each day of each workman.
13. No foremen or any other person will be permitted to retain any part of the wages earned by any workman employed.

At the same meeting, they established the following rates of wages per day: Foreman of laborers, \$5; other foremen, \$7; laborers, \$2.75; carpenters, \$4; blacksmiths, \$4; bricklayers, plasterers, and stonecutters, \$5; painters, \$3-4, as rated by their foremen. This action by the Board was an obvious attempt to preclude the irregularities which had previously occurred on the job.²⁹⁹

One of the first items which Cummings brought to the Commissioners after his reappointment was a proposal to alter the front portico. He presented drawings and plans to extend the width of that portico to twenty-four feet and to construct a porte-cochere directly in front of the lower vestibule. The estimated cost for this change was \$35,000. The Board, however, rejected Cummings' proposal and ordered that the front portico be completed according to the present design.³⁰⁰

In June 1872, the Board began the process of once again acquiring building materials. Awards were made to James Dillon and John Coffee for building sand, at 80¢ per cubic yard, and C. H. Krebs for painting materials, including white lead, boiled and raw linseed oil, and paint brushes. Cummings' desire was to complete the exterior of the building before proceeding with the interior renovation, "at least such parts as will not suffer by delay". Rather than let the carpenters go, he engaged four-fifths of them in making furniture during June. On the exterior of the building, Cummings reported that during June, work progressed on both the north and south porticos. The walls on the north portico were going up and the iron on the south portico was nearly completed. The stairs under both porticos were also under construction.³⁰¹

Beginning in June 1872, the Board also began to consider additional sculpture for the exterior of the capitol. One of Cummings' plans, which dated back to his earlier tenure as capitol architect, was to commission and place a statue on the top of the dome. On June 28, 1872, he reported to the Board, "I have written to the Chickosee Co., near Springfield, Mass., to get the cost of a bronze statue 14 feet high for the summit of the Tholus on the Dome."³⁰² About six weeks later, Cummings again brought the matter to the attention of the Board. He informed them that,

Another, and most important matter requires your immediate attention: not only my own, but universal public opinion condemns the terminating finish of the dome. The Tholus is classic and proper if in right proportion: but it wants breadth at the base, and the little top with a gilt ball is simply ridiculous and abominable. I propose to increase the base, and have written to the Chickosee in Mass.--also to Philadelphia--for the probable cost of a figure in bronze six feet high: but as yet have no satisfactory answer. This addition will involve no great expense, and if not done, whatever may be the other beauties of the building and grounds, the defect will forever remain a slur on our taste...."³⁰³

By the first of October he had received one offer, from the East, to do the bronze figure for \$8,500, if the state would furnish the model. At the end of November he once again urged the Board to seriously consider the matter. He wrote,

Accompanying my report are some letters from the East in reference to the upper figure contemplated. Further, Mr. Mezzara informed me that it will take 2 years, and the cost be somewhere near \$13,000. If, as I firmly hope, your Board intended this necessity to the beauty of the Capitol you will see that some measure should be taken at once....³⁰⁴

In his last biennial report to the Board in November 1873, he wrote, "A bronze figure, after Powers' "California", was intended to surmount the apex, with some changes to the present Tholus...." And, as if he still had some hope for the statue, he included an estimate of \$12,000, along with other items that were still "required or may be added" to the building.³⁰⁵ For what reasons we do not know, but the statue never became a reality.

Other statues planned for the capitol, including those for the north and south porticos, the acroteria of the front portico, and around the building on top of the balustrade, met with a better fate. On July 6, 1872,

P. Mezzara, of San Francisco, G. P. Cummings, Architect, and Mr. Hayward representing the Pacific Stone Company of San Francisco, appeared before the Board, and a consultation was held in relation to the construction of statues and groups of statuary for the exterior ornamentation [sic] of the building. The subject was disposed of for the present with the understanding that designs and estimates are to be furnished by Mr. Mezzara at an early day.³⁰⁶

By early August, Mezzara had transmitted his first draft of the additional statuary intended for the capitol and models in plaster of the more important groups to the Commissioners. On September 3, 1872, the Board contracted with Mezzara for artist work and with Pacific Stone Company for casting in artificial stone the statuary for the exterior walls.³⁰⁷ The statuary included the following:

The groups designed for the north and south porticos, and for flanking the frontoon [sic] will be each fourteen feet long by ten feet high. At each corner of the building will be placed statues eleven or twelve feet high, representing respectively "War," "Peace," "Prudence," and "Force," and on the intervening pedestals between corners and centers will be placed and arranged six statues seven feet high -- "Fame," "Eloquence" and "Verity" -- and fourteen richly ornamented and figured vases from three and one-half to five and one-half feet high. All of these groups, statues, and vases are to be case in solid stone by the Pacific Stone Company.... By the terms of the contracts the work is to be fully finished and in place before the adjournment of the next Legislature. The total cost of artist and mechanical work, materials and finishing, will be \$34,500....³⁰⁸

Along with the building statuary, other improvements included the addition of a balustrade five feet high around the top of the exterior walls, upon which some of the planned statues and vases were to be placed. And, along with the statues, the Board contracted with Pacific Stone Company to make the balustrade out of artificial stone. The decision to use stone instead of cast iron was expected to save the state \$10,000.³⁰⁹

While plans were being drawn up for this additional statuary and the balustrade work, the tympanum statuary for the front portico was being fabricated and that portico itself was being completed. By the first week in August 1872, the brick work on the front portico was carried up to the dental band. However, an error in the size of several of the iron castings for the front of the building, including a three-inch deficit in the height of several columns, delayed its completion. On October 31, Cummings reported that the front portico was essentially finished, including the wood work on the roof. The copper roof and the mastic finish were nearly completed at the end of November, along with the stone work and steps. At the same time, the north and south porticos were being completed. Scaffolding was erected and a new derrick built, preparatory for setting the statuary and balustrade.³¹⁰

At the end of November 1872, Cummings went to San Francisco to check on the tympanum statuary and after offering some minor suggestions, declared it to be "one of the finest pieces of statuary extant". In December, the California Pacific Railroad Company transported a total of fifteen pieces of statuary from San Francisco, presumably, to Sacramento. Once in Sacramento, the statues were drilled, preparatory to attaching parts of the ensemble together and then to the pediment of the front portico. On January 7, 1873, the statuary was exhibited to the public.³¹¹ The Sacramento Daily Union covered the event and described the artwork:

The central figure is that of Minerva, as she appears on the coat-of-arms of the State, but standing erect; in her right hand is held a spear, while the left rests upon her shield, and a grizzly bear crouches at her feet. This figure is 10 feet 10 inches in height [sic] and weighs 6,500 pounds. On Minerva's right sits Education, her left hand resting upon a globe, while the right holds a pencil and the arm is supported upon a book. Next to Education is Industry, wearing the cup of Mercury, and surrounded by emblems of agriculture and manufactures. On Minerva's left is a figure representing Justice and Legislation, holding a sword in its right hand and a tablet in the left. Next to this is Mining, an Indian figure, with picks, shovels, pans and other mining implements, together with a "horn of plenty" lying at hand. The countenances of the figures are handsome and expressive, and the proportions and lines of the bodies and their drapery very correct, reflecting great credit upon the designer. The color of the statuary and that of the background do not well agree, however, but this difficulty will doubtless be remedied; in fact, a short session of dry weather would do much toward removing the objection. The hundreds of people who viewed the work of yesterday universally spoke of it in terms of praise, and a highly ornamented addition to the Capitol.

With the placement of the sculpture on the pediment, construction work on the building ceased temporarily, the appropriation of \$250,000 being exhausted.³¹²

While the production of the exterior artwork was underway, the completion of the rest of the exterior and the interior of the capitol progressed. In June 1872, the Board ordered architect Cummings to provide "suitable cases and shelves in the Cabinet Department of the Library", located in the apse. The Board and the State Librarian agreed to award the job to John Breuner.³¹³

By August 1, the gas-fitters and plumbers were through in the building except for work on a second floor water closet which the Board instructed Cummings, on September 5, to build. A total of twelve water closets were under construction on the second floor that fall. Unfortunately, the man in charge of the plumbing crew, David Bush (the successor to Hobson & Ayres) was found to be guilty of the same charges as his predecessors. The Commissioners "gave Bush explicit directions to the effect that hereafter he shall neither advance any money to his men, nor purchase any of their warrants, nor retain the slightest part of their wages;..." In October, Cummings informed the Board that he felt that David Bush had charged the state for more lead pipe than the amount delivered. The Board allowed payment after reducing the amount of Bush's bill.³¹⁴

In September 1872, another labor controversy arose; this time unwarranted. On the 18th, John Harrington, a discharged employee, brought charges against John Herring, the blacksmith foreman, for not being at the job, allowing men to sit around, and for taking lumber belonging to the state. Herring was called before the Board, and he said that the charges were "maliciously false". The Board decided to investigate. According to newspaper coverage, at the conclusion, the Board unanimously decided that the charges were frivolous and unsustainable by the evidence.³¹⁵

Although the upper part of the interior of the rotunda was already plastered and frescoed, the floor of the rotunda needed to be replaced. It was constructed of wood and was only a temporary arrangement. According to Cummings, in August 1872,

The rotunda floor has been removed:--none too soon, as the thin walls were crumbling, and would have fallen, probably, with all the gas and water pipes attached to them. The walls were strengthened by four inches on each side, and the brick arching like all the other floors will be finished this week.

Iron girders, resting on the brick walls which extended from the foundation, were placed four feet apart between the arches of the brick, each which had a rise of six inches. The bricklayers were through by September 21.³¹⁶ This flooring technique was the same as used in the rest of the building.

Marble tiling was the planned finish for the first floor of the rotunda. The Board considered bids for the material in September 1872. Edwin Glover, of Sacramento, received the contract for supplying the marble, with Andrew Aitken and Israel Luce acting as his agents. The proposal of William Jones to

furnish ornamental tiles manufactured at Shropshire, England, for the second floor of the rotunda was also accepted.³¹⁷ Because of the delivery time for the tiles, they did not begin arriving at the capitol until late the following summer. Work would not begin on installation until then.

In October of 1872, the basement (now referring to the underground area, not the first story) of the building began to be renovated. Cummings reported that it was not known what Reuben Clark's intentions were for the basement after the walls were carried up nine feet. Not until October 1868 did the Capitol Commissioners question whether or not to fill it up to the level of the iron floor support beams. During Cummings' first tenure as capitol architect, the project had neither the time nor the money to spend on the basement. It was not until the extensive heating system was introduced into the building by Kenitzer and Bennett that it became necessary to open up the basement. According to Cummings, "the whole of this expensive system of heating was carried on somehow, without anyone being able to go from one cellar to another, except through a manhole."³¹⁸

In a story, over a year later, a Union reporter described the dismal conditions of the basement:

All the rooms in the basement had been left in an unfinished condition, in fact, it seems that originally they were not intended for rooms. Thick brick walls partition them off, about 24 feet square, but no doors were left -- no means of entering them except little man-holes about 18 inches square. All the waste brick, mortar, pieces of lumber, etc., that was produced in building, were thrown into them, so that a perfect chaos was produced, rivaling the interior of the Egyptian pyramid. Of course no light could enter, and consequently their interior was as dark as Erebus. Being damp, a heavy mat of fungus grew up on the ceiling, and drooped like stalactites from the walls of caverns. From the rubbish on the ground ephemeral plants grew and died, and the air being confined became the more noxious by the contaminating decaying vegetation. As a result, the air became so foul as to be poisonous, and a lighted candle would not live beyond a few seconds.³¹⁹

On October 1, Cummings proposed to open six windows into the basement, and by the end of that month he reported that one-half of the basement was completed and the other half commenced. As a result, the "entire basement walls" were pierced with arched doorways and openings made into the walled areas from outside. By the end of November, all the lower brick work of the building was completed except for cutting two or three more doors in the basement and a few water grates.³²⁰

Cummings was very critical of the working principle of the heating system which had been introduced by his predecessors and he referred to it as "altogether false". When a Union reporter inspected the heating apparatus early in 1874, he described the system for his readers. The heating source was two boilers which had been installed in December 1872 by Hinckley and Co. They were located in a room on the east side of the capitol, directly below the law library of the Supreme Court. The boilers

have 54 3-inch tubes, and are 16 feet long. The average pressure maintained the year round is 25 pounds to the square inch, but in cold weather the pressure is advanced to 40 pounds. About 2-1/2 cords of wood are consumed daily to keep up the steam in the boilers, and most of this is live oak. The dry steam as it rises, passes into two steam drums--one above each boiler. These drums are each five feet long by 32 inches in diameter. From the drums it passes into pipes, and is conveyed to all parts of the building. There are 16 miles of pipe used; and the heat is disseminated through 66 registers. The pipe is all wrapped with felt and cloth, for the double purpose of protection and retaining the heat. After passing through the registers, the steam is returned to the engineer's room and enters the condensing traps, which are seven in number. It is here condensed and the water flows into a tank, from which it is pumped, at a temperature of 125 degrees, into the boilers.³²¹

By the end of November 1872, the Board decided to stop all work "not actually necessary for the preservation of the building and grounds from injury...." All employees except for Cummings, P. W. Burnett, and the plasterers, who were completing the front portico. Burnett was allowed to hire or discharge men as "necessary to complete or to secure from danger or injury or destruction of the building and its adjuncts."³²²

On December 27, 1872, Cummings reported to the Board that the scaffolding could not be removed because the statuary had not arrived yet. The plaster and cement work was to be done that week, and the carpenters, except for Burnett, were discharged on December 21. He stated that as soon as the figures were secured and the scaffolding removed, he proposed to strip the derrick and abandon all work on the building until all the tiles and balustrade were on the grounds. He felt that resuming work in July 1873 would allow enough time to finish the acroteria, tiling, water closets, and rotunda rail before the next Legislature convened. On the 30th, the Board decided to dispense with Cummings' services as architect for the time being. As soon as the pediment statuary was attached, the plastering completed, and the scaffolding and derrick properly disposed of, he was to consider himself suspended until such time as the Board notified him.³²³ Cummings later wrote,

On the fifteenth of January, eighteen hundred and seventy-three, after placing and securing the sculptures of the pediment, I closed the work up by your direction, the appropriation of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars being exhausted....³²⁴

Finally, in April 1873, P. W. Burnett and the carpenters working under him were also dispensed with by the Board. Construction on the building virtually came to a halt, except for minor repair work, such as the water tank in the attic which overflowed and leaked into the State Library.³²⁵

Work officially resumed on the capitol August 1, 1873, and the Board decided that Gordon Cummings should report to duty on that day. One of Cummings' and his assistant J. Lotchfield's first duties were to receive and set the balustrade and completed statuary on the exterior capitol walls, to lay the flooring tiles in the rotunda, and to complete the water closets. Prior to that time, during late 1872 and spring and early summer of 1873, P. Mezzara had continued to work on the artwork and moulds needed to cast the statues and vases for the acroteria, north and south porticos, and balustrade. As Mezzara worked, in his San Francisco studio, he was given progress payments "in order to relieve him from financial embarrassment arising from his expenditures in executing statuary work under his contract with the State...."326

On July 28, the Board decided to proceed with the installation of the balustrade by the first of August. The balustrade, made of artificial stone, was already manufactured and ready to be shipped. In addition, the Sacramento Daily Union reported that, "The statuary for the pedestals of the front wall is also nearly completed and will be placed in position when the balustrade is prepared for it."327 In August 1873, after work resumed on the building,

Plans and drawings were examined, and the Architect was instructed to set the statuary in accordance with the drawings and designs of P. Mezzara, the artist--and also to construct the necessary escape-warp from the flues that would thus be blocked up.328

By the end of August, the first section of the balustrade was positioned on the building and for the first time the public had an idea of what the appearance of the upper portion of the capitol would be like when completed. The Sacramento Daily Union gave its approval of the new art work:

Several panels of the balustrade for the State Capitol building have arrived from San Francisco, and the whole will soon be here. They are a novelty, inasmuch as viewed from a distance of ten or twelve feet, anyone would naturally infer that they were formed of wood and painted white, whereas they are manufactured of patent stone, cast in panels of eight to twelve feet in length by the Ransome process, and are very handsome as well as substantial.329

By the end of October, more than two-thirds was finished; however, at the end of November, the job was not yet completed. The Board's order to clean out the attic, reported Cummings, delayed the completion of the balustrade. A large part of the statuary was on the grounds, awaiting placement.330

In November 1873, an art column in a California periodical described one of the acroterion sculptures still being created by Mezzara. Flatteringly, it stated,

Mr. Mezzara has completed the model for his second colossal group designed to adorn the State Capitol. It represents a buffalo attacking an Indian woman and child on horseback, and is full of spirit and action. The horse,

one of the most difficult subjects for a sculptor, judging from the almost universal failure of foreign modelers in this direction, is, to our mind, the best feature of this very admirable group. The whole is now being cast in Ransome stone, and will, on completion, be immediately placed in its position on the facade of the Capitol building.³³¹

Setting the acroteria sculptures on the west facade and the statues and vases on the balustrade was all that Gordon Cummings expected to have completed by the end of 1873, and the end of that work season.³³² The crew worked through the fall and most of the winter, until early February 1874. On the fourth of that month, the Sacramento Daily Union reported,

All of the statuary for the ornamentation of the Capitol, which has so far been manufactured, having been placed in position, the large derrick which had been used was yesterday stripped and the rigging housed. All of the men employed about the building, with the exception of those engaged in gardening, have been discharged and the architect suspended. It will probably be several months before work is resumed.³³³

While the statuary which had been placed to date was generally well received, Senator Gibbons of Alameda offered an especially facetious appraisal of the art work. What prompted his comments is not known, but they may have been an expression of the old Bay Area-Sacramento rivalry. He reported to the Senate,

Mr. President: The minority of the Joint Committee appointed to inquire into the cause of the conflict now going on upon the north facade of the Capitol, beg leave respectfully to report:

That they tarried in the presence of the woman on the south front of the building solely from a sense of public duty and not from any improper motives.... Her almost nude condition naturally attracted our attention to the material and texture of her apparel--nothing else was in view. Knowing that whatever will contribute to the development of the agricultural interests of the state should be taken hold of in the spirit of impartial and critical investigation, we gave our attention to the subject of textile fabrics in the hope of discovering some new material that might be cultivated to advantage, but the woman had nothing on here that was of any account.

We did not observe that she differed in any respect from others of her sex, except that the woman herself predominated--her dress was nowhere.

Nevertheless, as all great public wants are suggestive of supply, and impel individuals to be an active exertion of their inventive facilities, we believe that the time will come when women themselves will discover something in

the way of dress that will reach almost as high as the waist and prevent criticism from "going on a bust."

Consoling ourselves with these reflections but at the same time deploring the degeneracy of the age, we proceed elsewhere, and after traversing the whole field of duty, have reached the following conclusion:

1st. We recommend that the woman on the south front of the Capitol should have something on her for decency's sake.

2nd. That the man from Tipperary should be conciliated.

3rd. That the mugs should be emptied.

4th. That the woman on the north front should let go the anchor on the instant of the final adjournment of the Legislature, so that the members may not carry off anything more than the inside of the building.

5th. That the cupids holding the roses should be dismissed, inasmuch as the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate is fully competent to discharge that duty, and it will save expense to the State.

6th. That the man with the fireman's cap should be required to deposit his shield and sword in the State Armory, subject to the requisites of the Adjutant General, said man not being a citizen of the United States, and as a consequence, having no Constitutional right to bear arms.

7th. That the letters U.S. on the shield should be declared by legislative enactment to mean Useless Statuary instead of Upper Sacramento.

8th. That the star surmounting the shield should be so modified as to represent the planet Saturn with its two rings -- one for the House and the other for the Senate.

9th. That the combatants on the north facade be separated, and the bear sent to San Francisco, the man to State Prison, and the horse sent to the nearest elevator to have his tail rectified.

10th. That an appropriation of \$30,000 be made by the State to keep the south facade as it now is--vacant.

11th. That \$6,500 be appropriated by the State for the establishment of a public ground for impounding all animals hereafter found on top of the Capitol.

12th. and finally, That artificial stone work as illustrated in its extraordinary results on top of the Capitol, is unsatisfactory in every respect, and we may well deplore the time when nature will be supplanted by art in this mode of animal reproduction.³³⁴

Despite Gibbons' remarks, work continued on the statuary all through 1874. In June, the Board, in response to a letter from Mezzara, seemed to express some impatience about the completion of the work. The Secretary was to inform Mezzara by letter, "that the Board declines to purchase or contract for any other or more statuary than already arranged for: and that the undelivered portions of the work will be received at any time when properly completed."³³⁵ In July, Mezzara appeared before the Board and asked for

payment of the balance he felt was due him. After some discussion of the matter, the Secretary was directed to draw up an order for a warrant for Mezzara for \$7,000, "the balance being reserved until such time as the Commissioners shall be satisfied with the work."³³⁶ This indicates that at that time the statuary was not completed. On October 1, 1874, bills from both P. Mezzara and Pacific Stone Company for statuary work were paid. This was the last payment made by the Commissioners for the statuary and presumably, it was placed on the building about then. For certain, the job was completed by the time of the November 1, 1875 Commissioners' report.³³⁷

The other major work detail that resumed when construction on the building officially resumed on August 1, 1873, was the laying of the flooring tiles. The encaustic tiles had arrived from Maw & Co., of Shropshire, England in July 1873, and William Jones, the contractor, sent them to the site at the end of that month. They were earthen tiles of an ornamental pattern and color, and were designed for the circle around the second floor well of the rotunda. They arrived packed in hogsheads and weighed a total of ten or twelve tons. The same tile was scheduled to be laid in the second story of the front portico as well. By August 4, Jones had permission to hire men as needed and to proceed. By mid-August, the bricklayers had begun building the arches on the second floor on which to lay the floor tiles. Within six weeks, the brick work was completed and the preparatory cement floor was laid for the English tile.³³⁸ In late October, Cummings recommended laying the encaustic tile in the halls of the first and second floors, in addition to the rotunda and front portico floors. The advantages, he stated, were that,

The hermetrical seal they substitute for the water absorbing wood will remove a great deal of the chill and dampness of the halls; the noise is less than the echo from wood; easily kept clean.

He urged the Board to make a decision quickly because,

a great saving can be made in money, if you would take advantage of time, by bringing them from New York by sea, which may require a year.

Cummings estimated that 7,500 tiles would be required for the first floor hall, and 2,600 for the second floor.³³⁹ The tile laying was reported to be completed by November 22, 1873, but only in the rotunda and second floor hall. The Sacramento Daily Union described the beauty and practicality of the finished product:

The encaustic tiling of the rotunda and hall floor of the State Capitol second story is now completed, excepting the cleaning after the painters, which is now being done. The combination of colors of which the tiles is composed has a very pleasing effect. They are from the manufactory of Maw & Co., England, the principal manufacturers of encaustic tiles, who have a thousand different patterns, from the simplest for kitchen basements to the most elaborate for halls, conservatories, etc. They are made from a pure kind

of clay, colored to suit the necessary [word illegible], compressed under heavy pressure, and then burned. W. Jones is the contractor for supplying the tiles, which have been laid under the superintendence of T. H. Jones, the work having to be done hurriedly, so as to have it completed for the meeting of the Legislature. W. Jones has also laid about 5,000 feet in Judge Crocker's art gallery in this city, and has now a shipment due for a contract in San Francisco. Judge Crocker and the Capitol are the only complete floors (excepting a few vestibules) yet laid on the Pacific Coast. In the principal cities of the Eastern States, they are imported and used very extensively. The advantages claimed for these tiles are that they are far more beautiful and from twenty to fifty per cent cheaper than marble; so durable that it is said they are ultimately cheaper than a common wooden flooring, having in England stood fifty years' constant wear without any perceptible difference to their appearance, they being so hard that they will scratch glass.³⁴⁰

Simultaneously with the laying of the encaustic tiles was the laying of marble tiles on the first floor of the rotunda and the north and south proticos. On September 6, 1872, the Commissioners entered into a contract with Edwin Glover to furnish the necessary marble tiles. The contract "required the white tiles to be fully equal to the best white vein marble and the black tiles to be fully equal to the best black Belgian marble tiles...." On August 1, the local press reported that Andrew Aitken and Israel Luce, his agents, had received the marble tiles. Each tile was twelve inches square and they were to be laid alternately to form a checkerboard pattern. Arriving in San Francisco on the ship Matterhorn, some came from quarries in Vermont, others from New York. Some differences of opinion existed over the quality of the marble in the 8,000 tiles. The Board was hesitant to accept them because they had doubts about the color of the black tiles; they were uncertain whether they would become lighter or darker in color over time and with wear. The Board ordered that Glover be required to give them an obligation with bonds binding himself to remove and replace with satisfactory tiles, the tiles which had been delivered, in the event they proved not to be equal with the best black Belgian and white vein marble. Such an agreement was made with Glover a few days later and he presented the necessary bonds. By the end of September the floors had been prepared and more than half the marble tile had been laid. On October 25, 1873, Cummings reported to the Board that the laying of the marble tiles was completed.³⁴¹

While the statuary and floor tiles were the main focus of the work effort on the capitol during late 1873 and early 1874, work continued on installing other features in the building and acquiring furnishings. To complete the rotunda, a walnut rail was completed around the open well on the second level. Cummings also designed additional gas fixtures for the building. They were manufactured in New York and he expected them to arrive about the middle of November. Records do not indicate where these gas fixtures were installed, but it is reasonable to assume they were for the rotunda, which was just being completed. In October 1873, Charles Knowles was appointed by the Commissioners to have charge of lighting the gas in the capitol.³⁴²

Some art work and furnishings were added to the capitol during this time. In August 1873, Samuel J. Bridge, of San Francisco, donated a portrait of Manuel Micheltorena, Governor of California from 1842 to 1845. It was intended to be eventually hung in the rotunda, but for the time it was placed in Governor Booth's office in a "conspicuous position" where it attracted much attention. The portrait was painted in Mexico City by Obregon and was a copy of one which belonged to Dr. James L. Ord.³⁴³

In November of 1873, new coverings were acquired for the first floor, finishing off those areas not covered by the new tiles. Describing the new matting as "quite stylish", the Sacramento Daily Union commented,

At the State Capitol the halls on the lower floor are fast assuming quite a ball-room sort of an appearance. New cocoa-matting, clean and fresh nankeen aprons at a May party, is being laid wherever there is a board to tack it to, and carefully fitted against all the wall projections and into all the angles and spaces. The theory that matting of this kind is made with interstices, and is full of openings for the express purpose of letting imported mud and dust fall through, and the fact that if it were simply laid down instead of being nailed, both the matting and the floor could be occasionally dusted, seems to have been lost sight of. But the taste displayed is excellent, and first class house-keeping principles are observed in this: that beneath the matting is placed the patent carpet lining that connoisseurs of large incomes occasionally use to protect and enhance the luxury of "body Brussels." This improvement is due to the taste and economy of the Secretary of State.³⁴⁴

By the late winter of 1873-74, almost all of the structural and finish work on the capitol was completed. Some minor work remained, including the installation of the remainder of the statuary, repainting the interior of the rotunda, painting the exterior of the building, including the dome which Cummings recommended be painted white, and the installation of a lightning rod over the dome. By that time, all of the present grounds had been acquired and the part around the building had been graded, landscaped, and walkways laid. However, much development remained to be done to the grounds.³⁴⁵

The Board decided that the remaining work would be carried on without the supervision of an architect, and on February 4, 1874, Gordon Cummings was suspended from his duties as architect. His suspension was due to lack of funds. On March 31, 1874, the Board decreed, "No appropriation for the management and preservation of the Building and grounds having been made by the Twentieth Legislature, it was ordered that all work be stopped."³⁴⁶ Despite the order, some minor work continued, such as placement of the remaining statuary. Probably, when money again became available after the next session of the Legislature, there was no need to rehire an architect. Cummings was the last supervising architect on the job.³⁴⁷ No date has ever been identified as the exact day on which the capitol construction actually came to a halt. Indeed, this would probably be impossible since maintenance

work on the building was already underway even before it was completed. However, since Cummings and other workmen were suspended on February 4, 1874, and since no other architect was hired to supervise the job, that date can conveniently be used as the completion date of the capitol construction. By June, Gordon Cummings announced the resumption of his architectural practice in San Francisco. A local paper was proud to state of his work on the capitol that "the whole of this noble pile is almost all his work from foundation to top."³⁴⁸ In a last housekeeping action on the construction project, the Legislature passed a bill providing \$10,363.37 out of the General Fund to pay for various debts incurred, including a \$2,099.25 claim of John Breuners.³⁴⁹

FOOTNOTES

1. John B. Weller, "Message from the Governor," January 9, 1860, Journal of the Senate, 11th session, p. 45.
2. C. F. Curry, comp., California Blue Book or State Roster, 1909 (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1909), p. 716; and Journal of the Senate, 11th session, January 20, 1860, p. 177.
3. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, January 24, 1860, pp. 222-223, March 19, 1860, pp. 222-223, 521, and March 23, 1860, p. 549.
4. Sacramento Daily Union, January 24, 1860, 2/2.
5. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, January 25, 1860, p. 225 and February 7, 1860, pp. 297-298; and Journal of the Senate, 11th session, January 27, 1860, p. 215.
6. Journal of the Senate, 11th session, March 8, 1860, pp. 394-399; and Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 9, 1860, pp. 459-463.
7. Journal of the Senate, 11th session, March 8, 1860, pp. 399-400; and Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 9, 1860, p. 464.
8. Journal of the Senate, 11th session, March 8, 1860, pp. 400-401; and Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 9, 1860, p. 464-466.
9. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 20, 1860, pp. 526-527.
10. Journal of the Senate, 11th session, January 23, 1860, p. 194 and March 12, 1860, pp. 429-430; and Sacramento Daily Union, January 24, 1860, 1/1.
11. Ibid., March 13, 1860, 2/1.
12. Journal of the Senate, 11th session, March 15, 1860, pp. 445-446.
13. Sacramento Daily Union, March 21, 1860, 1/3.
14. Ibid., March 22, 1860, 1/3; and Journal of the Senate, 11th session, March 21, 1860, pp. 496-497.
15. Ibid., March 22, 1860, pp. 500-501 and March 23, 1860, pp. 503-504.
16. "An Act to provide for the construction of the State Capitol in the city of Sacramento," passed Senate March 23, 1860, Legislative Bill File for Senate Bill 58, 11th session, California State Archives, Sacramento, California. Despite the fact that the State decided not to construct on the City Plaza, it retained ownership of that property until 1935. In that year, Sacramento Assemblyman Roy Nielsen introduced Assembly Bill 78 which gave to Sacramento any interest the State might have in the plaza. The bill passed and became Chapter 721 of the Statutes of 1935. See the Sacramento Bee, May 3, 1947, 5/6.

17. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, February 20, 1860, p. 366; Sacramento Daily Union, February 21, 1860, 1/2; "An Act to provide for the construction of the State Capitol in the city of Sacramento," introduced February 20, 1860, Legislative Bill File for Assembly Bill 224, 11th session.

18. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 14, 1860, p. 492; and Sacramento Daily Union, March 15, 1860, 1/6.

19. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 14, 1860, p. 492; "An Act submitting to the people the selection of a place for the permanent location of the Seat of Government of the state, a substitute offered for A.B. 224," March 14, 1860, Legislative Bill File for Assembly Bill 224; and Sacramento Daily Union, March 14, 1860, 1/6.

20. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 21, 1860, p. 535 and March 23, 1860, pp. 549-551; and Sacramento Daily Union, March 22, 1860, 4/1-2.

21. "Substitute for Assembly Bill No. 224," adopted by Assembly, March 23, 1860, Legislative Bill File for Assembly Bill 224, 11th session.

22. Journal of the Assembly, 11th session, March 24, 1860, pp. 552-553 and March 30, 1860, p. 588; Journal of the Senate, 11th session, March 26, 1860, pp. 526-527 and March 27, 1860, pp. 530-531; and California, Statutes (1860), Chapter 161, pp. 128-132, Approved March 29, 1860.

23. City of Sacramento, "Assessor's Map Book," 1860, pp. 167-168, 182-183, Sacramento History Center, Sacramento, California.

24. Statutes (1860), Chapter 161, Section 2, pp. 128-129, Approved March 29, 1860.

25. Sacramento County, "Records," Book E, April 4, 1860, p. 774, Sacramento History Center, Sacramento, California.

26. California, Board of State Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 6, 1860 and May 9, 1860, California State Archives, Sacramento, California; and Condemnation and Purchase of Property, 1856-1911, April 21, 1860, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

27. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 2, 1860; and Sacramento Daily Union, June 9, 1860, 3/1.

28. Sacramento Daily Union, June 11, 1860, 3/1, June 12, 1860, 3/1, June 13, 1860, 2/2, June 15, 1860, 3/1, June 19, 1860, 3/4, June 30, 1860, 3/2, July 5, 1860, 2/4, and July 6, 1860, 2/5; and Daily Alta California, July 7, 1860, 1/6 and July 8, 1860, 1/6.

29. Journal of the Senate, 11th session, April 28, 1860, p. 798; and Statutes (1860), Chapter 261, pp. 232-233, Approved April 28, 1860. (The date is erroneously printed as April 21 but will hereafter be given as April 28, 1860.)

30. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 24, 1860; and Order of Board of State Capitol Commissioners, 1860, Condemnation and Purchase of Property, 1856-1911; and Sacramento Daily Union, August 25, 1860, 2/5.

31. Sacramento Daily Union, September 3, 1860, 3/1.

32. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 5, 1860 and December 13, 1860.

33. Acct. Sales, Improvements on Capitol Blocks and Order of Board of State Capitol Commissioners, in Condemnation and Purchase of Property, 1856-1911, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 18, 1860; and Sacramento Daily Union, September 3, 1860, 3/1 and September 13, 1860, 3/1.

34. Ibid., September 20, 1860, 3/3.

35. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 13, 1860; and Sacramento Daily Union, November 22, 1860, 3/1.

36. Ibid., December 13, 1860, 3/1.

37. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 31, 1860.

38. Statutes (1861), Chapter 63, p. 53, Approved March 13, 1861; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 17, 1861.

39. Sacramento Daily Union, February 7, 1861, 2/1.

40. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 12, 1860.

41. Ibid., August 12, 1862, May 1, 1866, March 2, 1869, March 3, 1869, and August 1, 1869; and George F. Wright, ed., History of Sacramento County, California... (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1880; reprint ed., Berkeley: Howell-North, 1960), p. 87.

42. Statutes (1861), Chapter 161, p. 129, Approved March 29, 1860.

43. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 6, 1860, May 19, 1860, May 21, 1860, May 22, 1860, and May 24, 1860; and Sacramento Daily Union, May 21, 1860, 3/1, May 22, 1860, 2/3, May 23, 1860, 4/2, and May 25, 1860, 2/3.

44. Ibid., May 25, 1860, 2/3.

45. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 28, 1860 and June 20, 1860.

46. Ibid., June 29, 1860, July 12, 1860, and July 13, 1860; and Charges Made by P. J. O'Connor Against M. F. Butler, July 12, 1860, F:3580:20, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

47. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 14, 1860 and July 17, 1860; and Daily Alta California, July 15, 1860, 2/1 and July 16, 1860, 2/3.

48. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 28, 1860 and July 17, 1860; P. Edw. Connor, H. T. Higgins, and Andrews Lester to Gov. J. G. Downey, June 18, 1860, in Applications for Architect, 1860, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Statutes (1860), Chapter 161, pp. 129-130, Approved March 29, 1860.

49. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 17, 1860; and Reuben Clark to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, July 23, 1860, in Correspondence of Architect sent to Commissioners, 1860-1872, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

50. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 30, 1860.

51. Ibid., August 17, 1860.

52. Ibid., August 24, 1860.

53. Ibid., September 3, 1860, September 18, 1860, and September 20, 1860; Sacramento Daily Union, September 4, 1860, 2/1 and September 20, 1860, 3/3.

54. Ibid., September 22, 1860, 2/1.

55. Ibid., September 25, 1860, 3/1.

56. Ibid., October 18, 1860, 3/1; and Capitol Commissioners, Bills and Receipts, October 24, 1860 - March 22, 1861, F:3580:145.

57. Ibid., October 26, 1860, 3/1 and October 31, 1860, 3/1; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 24, 1860.

58. Sacramento Daily Union, October 31, 1860, 3/1 and November 11, 1860, 5/1.

59. Ibid., November 23, 1860, 3/1; and Michael Fennell to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, December 19, 1860, in Correspondence Received, 1860-1870, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

60. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 13, 1860.

61. Reuben Clark to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, n.d., in Architect's Reports, 1861-1911, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

62. Sacramento Daily Union, February 28, 1861, 2/1.

63. Ibid.; and Journal of the Assembly, 12th session, February 27, 1861, p. 277.

64. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 15, 1861.

65. Journal of the Senate, 12th session, March 26, 1861, p. 416; and Sacramento Daily Union, March 27, 1861, 2/1.

66. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 4, 1861.

67. Ibid.
68. Ibid.; and Sacramento Daily Union, April 8, 1861, 4/4.
69. Journal of the Assembly, 12th session, April 23, 1861, p. 749; and Sacramento Daily Union, April 24, 1861, 1/3.
70. Journal of the Assembly, 12th session, April 23, 1861, p. 749.
71. Ibid., April 25, 1861, p. 768; Sacramento Daily Union, April 26, 1861, 5/6-7; and "Concurrent Resolution No. 31," Adopted April 25, 1861, Concurrent and Joint Resolutions in Statutes (1861), p. 679.
72. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 4, 1861; Journal of the Senate, 12th session, May 14, 1861, p. 805, May 16, 1861, p. 824, May 17, 1861, pp. 838-839, May 18, 1861, p. 861, and May 20, 1861, p. 879; Sacramento Daily Union, May 15, 1861, 2/1; and Statutes (1861), Chapter 529, pp. 600-602, Approved May 20, 1861.
73. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 28, 1861.
74. Ibid., June 3, 1861, June 12, 1861, June 15, 1861, June 21, 1861, and July 11, 1861; and Sacramento Daily Union, April 4, 1862, 2/3.
75. Ibid., April 8, 1861, 4/4.
76. "Journal of Proceedings, Grand Lodge of California," May 1852, p. 201, Grand Lodge of Mason of our State of California, San Francisco, California.
77. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 20, 1861, April 23, 1861, May 7, 1861, May 9, 1861, May 13, 1861; J. N. Bowman, "Cornerstone of the State Capitol," California Historical Society Quarterly 33 (December 1954), pp. 329-336; and Daily Bee, May 3, 1861, 3/1.
78. Daily Bee, March 19, 1861, 3/1.
79. Carl I. Wheat, ed., "California's Bantam Cock," California Historical Society Quarterly 9 (September 1930), p. 282; and Sacramento Daily Union, May 16, 1861, 2/2-6.
80. Bowman, "Cornerstone of the State Capitol," pp. 329-336.
81. Sacramento Daily Union, May 16, 1861, 2/2.
82. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 4, 1861 and June 15, 1861; and Statutes (1861), Chapter 529, p. 602, Approved May 20, 1861.
83. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 24, 1861 and July 25, 1861; and Sacramento Daily Union, July 25, 1861, 2/1, July 27, 1861, 2/5, and August 5, 1861, 3/1.
84. Ibid., August 13, 1861, 2/1 and August 31, 1861, 2/3.

85. Ibid., August 31, 1861, 2/3.
86. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 23, 1861; and Sacramento Daily Union, August 31, 1861, 2/3.
87. Ibid.
88. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 3, 1861 and September 11, 1861; and J. P. Robinson to C. T. Torbert, Secretary, September 10, 1861, Correspondence Received, 1860-1870, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.
89. Journal of the Senate, 13th session, January 11, 1862, pp. 104-105 and January 22, 1862, pp. 123-124; Journal of the Assembly, 13th session, January 11, 1862, pp. 104-107 and January 22, 1862, pp. 125-126; and "Concurrent Resolution No. 11," Adopted January 22, 1862, Concurrent and Joint Resolutions, in Statutes (1862), p. 594.
90. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 718; Sacramento Daily Union, January 23, 1862, 1/4-5; Journal of the Senate, 13th session, January 24, 1862, p. 125; Journal of the Assembly, 13th session, January 24, 1862, p. 127; Senate: Messages Received from the Assembly, 13th session, January 28, 1862, Legislative Material (Unprocessed), Drawer 651-LP5, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.
91. Journal of the Senate, 13th session, May 9, 1862, p. 673, May 10, 1862, p. 686, May 14, 1862, pp. 721-722, May 15, 1862, pp. 726-727; and Statutes (1862), Chapter 440, p. 563, Approved May 15, 1862 and Chapter 442, p. 566, Approved May 15, 1862.
92. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 718.
93. Journal of the Senate, 13th session, January 30, 1862, p. 142.
94. Ibid., p. 155.
95. Ibid., February 25, 1862, p. 254, February 26, 1862, p. 268, February 27, 1862, p. 278, and March 5, 1862, p. 303.
96. Ibid., February 27, 1862, p. 274 and February 28, 1862, p. 284; and Sacramento Daily Union, March 3, 1862, 2/6-7 and 3/1-2, and March 4, 1862, 2/3.
97. Sacramento Daily Union, March 3, 1862, 4/5; and Journal of the Senate, 13th session, March 18, 1862, p. 384.
98. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," February 14, 1862.
99. Ibid., February 15, 1862 and February 28, 1862.
100. Ibid., February 28, 1862.
101. Ibid., May 19, 1862.
102. Journal of the Senate, 13th session, February 26, 1862, p. 267.

103. Sacramento Daily Union, March 1, 1862, 1/2.
104. Journal of the Senate, 13th session, February 27, 1862, p. 276, March 1, 1862, p. 287, and March 18, 1862, p. 384; and Sacramento Daily Union, April 2, 1862, 1/3-7, 4/1.
105. *Ibid.*; and Journal of the Senate, 13th session, March 29, 1862, pp. 456-457.
106. *Ibid.*, April 1, 1862, pp. 163-165.
107. *Ibid.*, April 2, 1862, pp. 474-475; and Sacramento Daily Union, April 5, 1862, 1/2-6. There is a discrepancy in reports of the voting: the Sacramento Daily Union lists 22 aye votes, while the Journal of the Senate lists only 21.
108. Sacramento Daily Union, April 4, 1862, 2/3.
109. Journal of the Assembly, 13th session, April 9, 1862, pp. 556-557; Sacramento Daily Union, April 12, 1862, 4/2-3; Journal of the Senate, 13th session, April 12, 1862, p. 550; and Statutes (1862), Chapter 276, pp. 309-311, Approved April 19, 1862, pp. 309-311.
110. Sacramento Daily Union, April 25, 1862, 2/2.
111. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 25, 1862, April 29, 1862, and May 2, 1862.
112. *Ibid.*, April 29, 1862.
113. *Ibid.*, May 2, 1862, May 12, 1862, and May 19, 1862.
114. *Ibid.*, June 6, 1862; Sacramento Daily Union, June 14, 1862, 3/1 and June 7, 1862, 3/1; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contracts between M. Lynch and State of California, June 12, 1862, E. O. Dana and State of California, June 12, 1862, J. H. Culver and H. T. Holmes and State of California, August 19, 1862, Charles N. Hayden and State of California, June 12, 1862, and John Tansman and State of California, June 12, 1862, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:72.
115. Sacramento Bee, July 14, 1962, B16/6, 100 Years Ago Column.
116. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 30, 1862.
117. Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners," December 1862, p. 4, in Appendix to Journals of the Senate and Assembly, 14th session.
118. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 31, 1862; and "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners," December 1862, pp. 12-14.
119. "Annual Report of the State Treasurer, for the Year 1862," December 15, 1862, p. 23, in Appendix to Journals of the Senate and Assembly, 14th session.

120. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 31, 1862.
121. "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners," December 1862, pp. 3-4.
122. Statutes (1863), Chapter 100, p. 113, Approved March 27, 1863.
123. Ibid., Chapter 266, pp. 351-352, Approved April 20, 1863.
124. "Annual Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Year 1863," December 5, 1863, p. 5, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 15th session, volume 2; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 21, 1863 and May 6, 1863; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contracts with H. T. Holmes, June 30, 1863, to deliver 975 barrels of lime, E. O. Dana, June 30, 1863, to deliver 7,243 square feet of granite for water table, window sills, door sills, and ashlar, John Tansman, June 30, 1863, to deliver 1,450,000 bricks, James Carlile, June 30, 1863, to deliver 850 cubic yards of sand, and Calvin Nutting, June 30, 1863, to deliver iron lining and frames for Treasurer's vaults, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:72.
125. Leland Stanford, "Message from the Governor," December 9, 1863, in Journal of the Assembly, 15th session, December 9, 1863, pp. 49-50; Sacramento Daily Union, July 2, 1863, 3/2, December 2, 1863, 3/1, and January 1, 1864, 4/6; and "Annual Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Year 1863," December 5, 1863, p. 5.
126. Sacramento Daily Union, January 1, 1864, 4/6.
127. Daily Alta California, December 23, 1863, 1/5 and 6/1.
128. Stanford, "Message from the Governor," in Journal of the Assembly, 15th session, December 9, 1863, pp. 49-50.
129. "Senate and Assembly: Messages Received from the Governor, 15th session," Drawer 651-LP5, Legislative Material (Unprocessed).
130. Journal of the Assembly, 15th session, January 5, 1864, p. 168, January 15, 1864, p. 214, January 28, 1864, p. 269, February 27, 1864, pp. 419-420, February 29, 1864, p. 430, March 4, 1864, p. 458, March 9, 1864, p. 484, and March 10, 1864, p. 490; California Blue Book, 1909, p. 719; Sacramento Daily Union, January 29, 1864, 1/4-7 and February 29, 1864, 8/4; and "Report of the Assembly Committee on Public Buildings on Assembly Bill No. 79," in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 15th session, volume 2.
131. Sacramento Daily Union, March 15, 1864, 4/2.
132. Journal of the Assembly, 15th session, March 16, 1864, pp. 531-532; and Sacramento Daily Union, March 17, 1864, 1/5.
133. Ibid., March 17, 1864, 2/1.

134. Journal of the Assembly, 15th session, February 8, 1864, p. 318, March 16, 1864, p. 531, and March 18, 1864, p. 550.

135. "Annual Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Year 1863," December 5, 1863, pp. 5-6.

136. Architect's Report, December 5, 1863, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; "Annual Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Year 1863," December 5, 1863, pp. 5-6, 13.

137. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 30, 1864; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with H. T. Holmes, February 18, 1864, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:72.

138. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1864 and 1865," November 1, 1865, pp. 5-6, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 16th session, volume 2; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," February 29, 1864.

139. Sacramento Daily Union, February 29, 1864, 8/4.

140. Statutes (1863-64), Chapter 320, pp. 344-346, Approved April 4, 1864.

141. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 8, 1864.

142. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1864 and 1865," November 1, 1865, p. 6.

143. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 1, 1864.

144. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 16, 1864 and March 3, 1865; "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1864 and 1865," November 1, 1865, p. 7; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with S. D. Smith, September 12, 1864, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:80.

145. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 1, 1864 and November 1, 1864.

146. Sacramento Daily Union, November 23, 1864, 2/2; and Mining and Scientific Press, article quoted in Sacramento Daily Union, October 8, 1867, 2/3.

147. Daily Alta California, November 24, 1864, 2/1-2; and "Report of the Assembly Committee on Public Buildings on Assembly Bill No. 79," February 24, 1864, pp. 7-11, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 15th session, volume 2; and Sacramento Daily Union, November 28, 1864, 2/3.

148. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 1, 1864.

149. Sacramento Daily Union, January 2, 1865, 2/7.

150. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 31, 1865 and June 7, 1865.

151. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 31, 1865, March 3, 1865, April 1, 1865, and August 8, 1865; Reuben Clark to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, August 30, 1865, and G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board to State Capitol Commissioners, October 1, 1865, November 1, 1865, and December 1, 1865, both in Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

152. Daily Bee, September 4, 1865, 3/2.

153. Sacramento Daily Union, October 7, 1865, 3/1.

154. Frederick K. Low, "Governor's Biennial Message," December 4, 1865, in Journal of the Assembly, 16th session, December 8, 1865, p. 49.

155. Sacramento Daily Union, December 15, 1865, 2/2.

156. Journal of the Assembly, 16th session, December 18, 1865, p. 135, February 2, 1866, p. 312, and February 6, 1866, p. 328; and Sacramento Daily Union, February 7, 1866, 1/5.

157. Sacramento Daily Union, February 8, 1866, 2/2.

158. Journal of the Assembly, February 13, 1866, p. 360 and February 27, 1866, p. 422; and Statutes (1865-1866), Chapter 157, p. 142, Approved March 2, 1866.

159. Ibid., Chapter 380, p. 465, Approved March 30, 1866.

160. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 4, 1865.

161. Executive Committee of the Union League Association of Sacramento No. 2 to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, May 13, 1865, Correspondence of Commission, 1860-1898, F:3580:22, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Mrs. Reuben Clark to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, October 3, 1865, Correspondence of Architect sent to Commission, 1860-1872, F:3580:29, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

162. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 2, 1866.

163. Betty L. Thompson, Medical Records Officer, Stockton State Hospital, to Lucinda Woodward, October 19, 1979, on file in Capitol Restoration Project Office; "Register of Deaths," June 6, 1862-December 30, 1921, Stockton Insane Asylum (Unprocessed), California State Archives, Sacramento, California; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills and Receipts, May 5, 1866, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:130.

164. J. A. Clark to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, July 9, 1866, and Dr. John F. Morse to the Capitol Building Commissioners, July 9, 1866, Correspondence Received, 1860-1870, F:3580:17, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

165. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 1, 1866.

166. Albert W. Crumpton, Director, Cemetery Properties, Woodland Memorial Park, Masonic Cemetery Association, to J. N. Bowman, Office of the Secretary of State, August 12, 1952, Capitol Architect Folder, General Information File, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.

167. G. Cummings to the Honorable Board of Commissioners of the State Capitol Building, November 25, 1865, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1864 and 1865," pp. 22, 24.

168. Sacramento Daily Union, December 15, 1865, 2/2.

169. Cummings to Capitol Commissioners, November 25, 1865, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1864 and 1865," pp. 22-23.

170. Ibid., p. 24.

171. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," February 1, 1866; and Gordon P. Cummings to the Honorable Fred'k. F. Low, President, and The Board of State Capitol Commissioners, November 18, 1867 in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865, to November 1st, 1867," p. 18, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 17th session, volume 3.

172. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 1, 1866; and Cummings to Low and Capitol Commissioners, November 18, 1867 in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865, to November 1st, 1867," p. 17.

173. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865, to November 1st, 1867," pp. 6-7; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 1, 1866.

174. Cummings to Low and Capitol Commissioners, November 18, 1867 in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865, to November 1st, 1867," p. 18; Elliott and Kenitzer to Governor Low, October 30, 1866, Reports from Sources Other Than Architect, 1860-1911, F:3580:34, Board of Capitol Commissioners; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 1, 1866; and Sacramento Daily Union, November 2, 1866, 2/1 and December 11, 1866, 4/3.

175. Sacramento Daily Union, November 9, 1866, 2/4-5.

176. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 1, 1866.

177. Ibid., November 1, 1866 and November 2, 1866.

178. Ibid., November 3, 1866.

179. Ibid.

180. Sacramento Daily Union, November 9, 1866.

181. Edgar Mills to Mr. F. F. Low, November 16, 1866, Correspondence Received, 1860-1870, F:3580:17, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

182. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 3, 1866; and Charles B. Grant to the Honorable Board of Commissioners of State Capitol, December 15, 1866, Correspondence Received, 1860-1870, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.
183. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 3, 1867 and January 16, 1867.
184. Sacramento Daily Union, January 17, 1867, 2/1 and January 19, 1867, 2/1.
185. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 1, 1871. Information on how the new Board dealt with this claim was not found.
186. Sacramento Daily Union, December 31, 1866, 1/4.
187. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 1, 1866, August 23, 1866, June 1, 1867, July 1, 1867, and November 19, 1867.
188. Sacramento Daily Union, July 12, 1867, 3/1; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contracts with Howland, Angell, and King, April 29, 1867, Joel Johnson, July 17, 1867, and Bills from Phoenix Iron Co., October 18, 1866, R. B. _____, October 17, 1867, Furton and Knox, May 24, 1867, C. F. Chadbourne, May 15, 1867, Pioneer Iron Works (Kittredge and Leavitt), June 17, 1867 and August 16, 1867, and Union Foundry, May 29, 1866, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73, F:3580:143, F:3580:146, and F:3580:130.
189. Cummings to Low and Capitol Commissioners, November 18, 1867, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865, to November 1st, 1867," p. 18; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bill from Phoenix Iron Co., October 9, 1867, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:143.
190. Ibid.
191. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 3, 1868; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bill from Phoenix Iron Co., October 12, 1868, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:143.
192. Ibid., March 1, 1867, March 26, 1867, and May 1, 1867; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contracts with H. T. Holmes, March 28, 1867, and Elias Bowers and Frederick Walters, March 28, 1867, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73.
193. Sacramento Daily Union, May 9, 1867, 3/1.
194. Ibid., July 12, 1867, 3/1.
195. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 1, 1867 and June 1, 1867.
196. Sacramento Daily Union, July 12, 1867, 3/1.

197. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 1, 1867, August 31, 1867, and October 1, 1867; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contracts with William Johnson, September 2, 1867 and August 9, 1867, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73.

198. Quoted in Sacramento Daily Union, October 8, 1867, 2/3.

199. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865, to November 1st, 1867," pp. 5, 8.

200. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 31, 1867 and February 3, 1868; and Elias Bowers and Frederick Walters to Board of State Capitol Commissioners, December 5, 1867, Correspondence Received, 1860-1870, F:3580:17, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

201. Gordon P. Cummings to His Excellency Governor Haight and the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," p. 9, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 18th session, volume 3.

202. Journal of the Assembly, 17th session, January 10, 1868, pp. 231-232 and March 21, 1868, pp. 812-813; "Report of the Joint Committee on Public Buildings in Relation to the Construction of the State Capitol," pp. 3, 13-14, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 17th session, volume 1; and Journal of the Senate, 17th session, January 31, 1868, p. 316.

203. Journal of the Assembly, 17th session, January 23, 1868, p. 319; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 719.

204. Journal of the Assembly, 17th session, January 30, 1868, p. 377; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 720.

205. Ibid.

206. Dashaway Association to Hon. Geo. Pardee, January 31, 1868, Legislative Material (Unprocessed), Assembly: Miscellaneous Messages Received, 17th session; Journal of the Assembly, 17th session, February 4, 1868, pp. 397-398; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 720.

207. Journal of the Assembly, 17th session, February 27, 1868, pp. 427-429; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 720.

208. Journal of the Assembly, 17th session, February 21, 1868, p. 530; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 720.

209. Ibid.

210. Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," p. 9.

211. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," February 3, 1868, March 3, 1868, and April 1, 1868; G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, March 31, 1868, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with Kittredge and Leavitt, February 8, 1868, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73.

212. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 1, 1868.

213. Ibid., April 9, 1868; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills from N. L. Drew, 1865-1875, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:130 and F:3580:132.

214. Daily Bee, April 18, 1868, 3/1.

215. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 1, 1868 and June 2, 1868; and Sacramento Daily Union, May 30, 1868, 4/3.

216. Ibid.

217. Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," p. 10; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 2, 1868.

218. Ibid., June 2, 1868 and July 1, 1868.

219. Ibid., August 1, 1868.

220. G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, September 30, 1868 and October 30, 1868, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 10, 1868.

221. Ibid., November 10, 1868, January 6, 1869, April 1, 1869, and June 1, 1869; G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, May 28, 1869, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with Boehme and Lawson, December 14, 1868, and Bill from Boehme and Lawson, June 25, 1869, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73 and F:3580:128.

222. Sacramento Daily Union, January 1, 1869, 3/1.

223. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 3, 1869.

224. Ibid., December 1, 1868, January 6, 1869, January 7, 1869, and January 20, 1869; Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," p. 10; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with P. J. Devine, January 28, 1869, and Bill from Alta California Newspaper Office, December 15, 1868, California State Archives, Sacramento, F:3580:73 and F:3580:127.

225. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 1, 1868, January 20, 1869, February 2, 1869, and March 3, 1869; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills from G. W. Parker, November 25, 1869, Kittredge and Leavitt (Pioneer Iron Works), August 23, 1869 and November 23, 1869, and Huntington, Hopkins, and Co., May 31, 1865 - August 28, 1875, and Contracts with Langland and Cameron, February 18, 1869, and Kittredge and Leavitt, March 11, 1869, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73, F:3580:138, F:3580:140, and F:3580:143.

226. Ibid., April 1, 1869; and G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, April 30, 1869, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

227. Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," pp. 12, 14; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 1, 1869, August 12, 1869, and October 1, 1869; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills from Whittier, Fuller, and Co., February 25, 1868 - July 1880, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:147.

228. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State from November 1, 1867, to November 1, 1869," p. 7, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 18th session, volume 1.

229. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 1, 1869.

230. Ibid., July 15, 1869.

231. Ibid., August 1, 1869; and G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, August 28, 1869, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with Hunt and Anderson, August 17, 1869, and Bill from Easton and Brother, December 13, 1869, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:73 and F:3580:133.

232. Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," pp. 10-11; Statutes (1868), Chapter 70, p. 63, Approved February 21, 1868; and Frederick L. Ryan, Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Building Trades (Norman: University of the Oklahoma Press, 1935), pp. 7, 10.

233. Sacramento Daily Union, November 27, 1869, 5/1; California Blue Book, 1909, p. 720; and Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," p. 9.

234. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 720; and Sacramento Daily Union, November 30, 1869, 3/1 and December 4, 1869, 5/1.

235. Ibid., December 16, 1869, 3/1.

236. G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, January 4, 1870, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 19, 1870 and February 7, 1870.

237. Daily Alta California, February 21, 1870, 1/6.

238. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 1, 1870; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills from John Breuner, March 31, 1870 and October 29, 1870, California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:128.

239. Statutes (1869-1870), Chapter 48, pp. 53-54, Approved February 7, 1870.

240. Ibid., Chapter 101, p. 99, Approved February 26, 1870.

241. Cummings to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, November 19, 1869, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867, to November 1st, 1869," p. 11.

242. Statutes (1869-1870), Chapter 496, pp. 724-726, Approved April 4, 1870.

243. Daily Bee, April 5, 1870, 2/1.

244. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 1, 1870 and April 20, 1871.

245. Daily Alta California, June 25, 1874, 1/2.

246. Daily Bee, August 19, 1870, 3/1; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 24, 1870 and October 4, 1870.

247. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 721.

248. Henry Kenitzer and A. A. Bennett to His Excellency Governor Haight, and the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 5, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 19th session, volume 4; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 24, 1870 and February 2, 1871; and Sacramento Daily Union, August 26, 1870, 3/1.

249. Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and the Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 5.

250. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

251. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," November 1, 1875, p. 4, in Appendix to the Journal of Senate and Assembly, 21st session, volume 3.

252. Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and the Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 7.

253. Ibid.
254. Ibid., p. 11; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 1, 1871.
255. A. A. Bennett to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, November 28, 1870, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.
256. Railroad information from personal communication with Walter P. Gray III, Curator at the California State Railroad Museum, January 22, 1980; stories on arrival of iron in Sacramento Bee, February 3, 1971, A-14/5 (100 Years Ago Column); Sacramento Daily Union, February 14, 1871, 3/2, February 18, 1871, 5/1, February 25, 1871, 5/1, March 11, 1871, 5/2, March 22, 1871, 3/2, April 4, 1871, 3/2, and April 8, 1871, 5/1; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills from California Steam Navigation Co., California State Archives, Sacramento, California, F:3580:129.
257. Sacramento Daily Union, February 18, 1871, 5/1, March 22, 1871, 3/2, April 8, 1871, 5/1, May 25, 1871, 3/2, May 26, 1871, 3/1, June 16, 1871, 3/2, July 26, 1871, 3/2; and personal communication with Walter P. Gray III, January 24, 1980.
258. Sacramento Daily Union, April 8, 1871, 5/1, May 25, 1871, 3/2, and May 26, 1871, 3/1.
259. Sacramento Daily Union, March 10, 1871, 3/2; and A. A. Bennett to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, March 26, 1871, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.
260. Sacramento Daily Union, April 19, 1871, 3/2.
261. Ibid., June 15, 1871, 3/1 and June 16, 1871, 3/2.
262. A. A. Bennett to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, April 26, 1871, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.
263. Sacramento Daily Union, May 26, 1871, 3/2.
264. Ibid., September 26, 1871, 3/1; A. A. Bennett to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, July 26, 1871 and September 26, 1871, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 12, 1871 and November 1, 1871.
265. Sacramento Daily Union, October 31, 1871, 3/1.
266. Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 6; and Sacramento Bee, September 28, 1953, 26/4-5.
267. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 25, 1871; and Sacramento Daily Union, December 16, 1871, 5/2.

268. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 1, 1871; Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," pp. 6-7; and Gordon P. Cummings to His Excellency, Newton Booth, President, and the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 12, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 20th session, volume 2.

269. Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 6.

270. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 26, 1881; and A. A. Bennett to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, March 26, 1871, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

271. Ibid., September 26, 1871; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 4, 1871; Bills and Receipts for Central Pacific Railroad Company, 1870-1872, April 30, 1871, F:3580:130, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Sacramento Daily Union, May 15, 1871, 3/2; Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 7; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Bills from N. P. Langland, May 23, 1870 - October 21, 1871, F:3580:141.

272. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 2, 1871 and July 31, 1871; Bills and Receipts for Warren and Kemp, October 24, 1871, F:3580:147, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Kenitzer and Bennett to Haight and Capitol Commissioners, October 31, 1871, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1870 and 1871," p. 7.

273. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 2, 1871 and November 1, 1871; and Bill from Leon R. Meyers & Co., October 11, 1871, Bills and Receipts, F:3580:129, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

274. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 3, 1869; Payment to Joseph Argenti, September 25, 1869, Bills and Receipts, F:3580:127, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Sacramento Daily Union, November 13, 1869, 1/7.

275. Proposal from Philadelphia & New York Ornamental Iron Works, April 30, 1870 and Proposal from Pacific Stone Co., May 1, 1871, Proposals and Bids General, 1870-1871, F:3580:62, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 12 1871 and October 3, 1871; and Contract with P. Mezzara, May 16, 1871, Contracts, F:3580:74, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

276. Daily Alta California, December 30, 1871, 1/3.

277. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," January 26, 1872 and March 15, 1872; P. Mezzara to Honorable L. E. Crane, Secretary of the Board of Commissioners for the State Capitol, February 28, 1872, Correspondence Received, 1871-1898, F:3580:18; and Sacramento Daily Union, September 4, 1872, 3/1.

278. Sacramento Daily Union, August 2, 1871, 3/3.
279. Ibid.
280. Theodore H. Hittell, History of California, IV (San Francisco: N. J. Stone & Co., 1898), p. 497.
281. Sacramento Daily Union, August 3, 1871, 2/2; an article appeared in the Union August 2, 1871, 2/3, showing that Haight had reduced the state debt less than the two Republican administrations which preceded him.
282. Ibid., August 4, 1871, 2/2.
283. Ibid., August 5, 1871, 5/5-6.
284. Ibid., August 8, 1871, 2/1.
285. Ibid., August 4, 1871, 2/5-6, August 5, 1871, 4/4, August 7, 1871, 2/3, August 10, 1871, 2/1, August 11, 1871, 2/1, August 12, 1871, 5/3, August 14, 1871, 2/1, August 17, 1871, 1/3-4 and 2/5, August 18, 1871, 2/2 and 2/5, and September 5, 1871, 3/2.
286. Roy R. Glaskan, comp., American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections, 1775-1975 (Stillwater, Minnesota: The Croixside Press, 1975), pp. 26-27.
287. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 4, 1871.
288. Ibid., December 1, 1871, December 19, 1871, and December 22, 1871.
289. Ibid., December 30, 1871, January 9, 1872, and January 18, 1872; and Sacramento Daily Union, January 1, 1872, 6/3 and 10/5-7, and January 4, 1872, 3/2.
290. Journal of the Assembly, 19th session, January 24, 1872, p. 309.
291. Ibid., January 4, 1872, pp. 160, 194-195 and January 9, 1872, p. 219.
292. "Testimony Taken Before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in Relation to the Construction of the State Capitol," in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 19th session, volume 4.
293. Journal of the Assembly, 19th session, April 1, 1872, pp. 917-918.
294. Statutes (1871-1872), Chapter 91, p. 88, Approved February 13, 1872.
295. Ibid., Chapter 439, p. 655, Approved March 28, 1872.
296. Ibid., Chapter 462, pp. 694-695, Approved March 28, 1872.
297. Sacramento Daily Union, March 13, 1872, 4/4; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 1, 1872.

298. Ibid., May 8, 1872; and Gordon P. Cummings to His Excellency, Newton Booth, President, and the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 11, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 20th session, volume 2.

299. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 5, 1872; and Sacramento Daily Union, June 10, 1872, 3/3 and June 12, 1872, 2/2-3.

300. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," May 23, 1872 and May 28, 1872.

301. Ibid., June 5, 1872 and June 28, 1872; Sacramento Daily Union, June 10, 1872, 3/3; and G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, June 27, 1872, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

302. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 28, 1872.

303. Ibid., August 10, 1872.

304. Ibid., October 1, 1872 and November 29, 1872.

305. Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 13.

306. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," July 6, 1872; and Sacramento Daily Union, July 8, 1872, 3/2.

307. Daily Alta California, August 12, 1872, 1/6; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 4, 1872; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contracts with P. Mezzara, September 3, 1872, and Pacific Stone Co., September 3, 1872, F:3580:74.

308. Sacramento Daily Union, September 4, 1872, 3/1; and Daily Alta California, September 5, 1872, 1/6.

309. Sacramento Daily Union, August 14, 1872, 3/1 and September 3, 1872, 3/2; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 4, 1872; and Contract with Pacific Stone Company, September 19, 1872, Contracts, F:3580:74, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

310. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 1, 1872, August 31, 1872, October 1, 1872, and November 29, 1872; and Sacramento Daily Union, August 15, 1872.

311. The California Pacific Railroad Co. ran between the Vallejo area and Sacramento and was owned by the CPRR. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 29, 1872; Bill from California Pacific Railroad Co., December 12, 1872 and December 19, 1872, Bills and Receipts, F:3580:129, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and personal communication with Walter P. Gray III, January 24, 1980.

312. Sacramento Daily Union, January 8, 1873, 3/1; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 30, 1872; Bill from J. S. Colby, December 26, 1872, Bills and Receipts, F:3580:130, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 1, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 12.

313. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 28, 1872 and August 10, 1872.

314. Ibid., August 1, 1872, September 5, 1872, and October 1, 1872; G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, July 29, 1872, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 11; and Sacramento Daily Union, July 26, 1872, 2/1.

315. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 18, 1872 and September 19, 1872; and Sacramento Daily Union, September 22, 1872, 3/2.

316. Ibid., September 5, 1872, 3/1; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 31, 1872 and October 1, 1872.

317. Sacramento Daily Union, September 2, 1872, 3/2; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 5, 1872; and Agreement with Capitol Commissioners and Edwin Glover, August 21, 1873, F:3580:44, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

318. Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," pp. 10-11.

319. Sacramento Daily Union, February 2, 1872, 3/4.

320. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 1, 1872, October 31, 1872, and November 29, 1872; and Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 11.

321. Sacramento Daily Union, February 2, 1874, 3/4; and Board of State Capitol Commissioners, Contract with Hinckley and Co., September 14, 1871, F:3580:74.

322. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 30, 1872.

323. G. P. Cummings to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, December 27, 1872, Architects' Reports, 1861-1911, F:3580:33, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," December 30, 1872.

324. Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 12.

325. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," April 2, 1873; and Sacramento Daily Union, April 17, 1873, 3/3.

326. Ibid., August 2, 1873, 5/2; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," February 26, 1873, May 26, 1873, June 26, 1873, June 28, 1873, July 28, 1873, and August 4, 1873.

327. Sacramento Daily Union, July 30, 1873, 3/2.

328. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 21, 1873.

329. Sacramento Daily Union, August 20, 1873, 3/2 and August 30, 1873, 5/3.

330. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," September 30, 1873, October 29, 1873, and November 28, 1873.

331. "Art News," California Mail Bag (November 1873), pp. 97-98.

332. Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," p. 12.

333. Sacramento Daily Union, February 4, 1874, 3/1.

334. Daily Alta California, April 4, 1874, 1/5.

335. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 15, 1874.

336. Ibid., July 7, 1874.

337. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1874 and 1875," in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 21st session, volume 3.

338. Sacramento Daily Union, August 1, 1873, 3/1 and August 16, 1873, 3/3; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 4, 1873 and September 30, 1873; William Jones to the Board, July 23, 1873, F:3580:44, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

339. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," October 25, 1873.

340. Sacramento Daily Union, November 28, 1873, 3/1.

341. Agreement with Capitol Commissioners and Edwin Glover, August 21, 1873, F:3580:44, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Sacramento Daily Union, August 1, 1873, 3/1; Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 18, 1873, August 21, 1873, September 30, 1873, and October 25, 1873.

342. Ibid., October 29, 1873 and November 28, 1873; and Sacramento Daily Union, October 31, 1873, 3/2.

343. Ibid., August 25, 1873, 3/3.

344. Ibid., November 22, 1873, 5/2.

345. Cummings to Booth and Capitol Commissioners, November 12, 1873, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Years 1872 and 1873," pp. 12-13; and Journal of the Senate, 20th session, February 11, 1874, p. 432.

346. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," March 31, 1874.

347. Sacramento Daily Union, February 4, 1874, 3/1; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," February 26, 1874.

348. Daily Alta California, June 25, 1874, 1/2.

349. Statutes (1873-1874), Chapter 358, pp. 519-520, Approved March 23, 1874.

CHAPTER III

YEARS OF MAINTENANCE AND REDECORATION (1874-1905)

From 1874, when the capitol was completed, until 1906, when a major remodeling effort commenced, work on the building consisted mostly of maintenance, although some redecoration took place; no major structural work occurred. Legislation which affected the capitol was usually concerned with appropriations for continued maintenance. Issues, such as efforts to remove the capital of the state from Sacramento, also continued to emerge.

After 1874, a major change occurred in the responsibility for the capitol. During the construction years the Board of State Capitol Commissioners had been in charge of the building. However, once construction was completed, responsibility shifted to the Secretary of State. Section 412 of the State Political Code provided that, "The Secretary of State is the superintendent and has charge of the State Capitol, and he must keep the same, together with all property therein, in good order and repair."¹ The Capitol Commissioners issued no published reports from 1875 until 1890, although they still continued to meet. Their meeting minutes during those years indicate that their major area of responsibility was the development of the grounds, however, they still handled some contracts for work on the building. Another change which occurred was in the funding for the capitol building. Once the building was considered completed annual appropriations were made by the Legislature as part of the state's budget, as well as special legislative appropriations, instead of the earlier system of issuing bonds and taxing real property to raise revenue.

One of the last recommendations made by the Capitol Commissioners, while they were still actively concerned with the building, was to paint the exterior of the building. In their report of November 1, 1875, they notified the Governor that,

No appropriation having been made at the last session of the Legislature for the purpose, the Commissioners have not caused the building to be painted, and desire to call your attention to the fact that such painting is greatly needed, for purposes of actual preservation as well as for proper ornamentation.²

At that time, the Board was in possession of at least one proposal, dated July 30, 1875, from Thomas Jones to do the exterior painting.³ The Secretary of State echoed the Commissioners' concerns about the painting. He reported,

I have deemed best to incur no expense of painting, whitening, etc., inasmuch as there was no appropriation made at the last session for this purpose, and mechanics are unwilling to perform the work and await the action of subsequent legislation for payment; and were they even willing to wait, are certainly not disposed to perform the

work without increase of price to cover interest and supposed risk. It is, to my mind, a mistaken view of economy to fail in making appropriations to meet expenditures which are altogether necessary in the proper preservation of public property, and at times leads to serious embarrassment on the part of the officers required to perform this duty, and, not unfrequently, to great loss to the State. It is competent judges that the entire building, inside and out, is suffering seriously from want of thorough painting of both wood and iron work.⁴

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and Assembly was sympathetic. They reported that "The entire exterior of the structure required immediate painting, and certain portions of the interior...."⁵ Finally, in the state's budget approved on April 3, 1876, an appropriation of \$7,000 was made for painting the state capitol. In 1877, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners was able to advertise for paint bids. Whittier Fuller & Co. won the contract for 20 barrels of raw linseed oil, with the contract for 18,000 pounds of white lead going to Sullivan Kelly & Co. C. H. Krebbs & Co. was awarded the contract to provide the labor, at \$1,580. By September, the job had commenced.⁶ In a statement of obvious local civic pride the Daily Bee wrote,

The recent improvements made at the State Capital [sic] by the Capital [sic] Commissioners go far toward making it what it ought to be -- a pride to Sacramento and an honor to the State. The walls are cheerful with a coat of new paint, and the old dingy carpets, some of them eight years old, have given place to new ones of tasteful patterns.⁷

Beginning in the last half of the 1870s, minor repair work and modifications to the interior of the building took place indicating that although the building had been occupied for less than 10 years, things were wearing out and tastes had changed. The joint Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the 1875-1876 session identified many areas where repairs were needed:

The roof had been badly damaged from the work done in putting on the balustrade and figures over the cornice, and the valleys and portions round [sic] the sky-lights, and at the base of the dome and the roof of the lantern, should at once be soldered in the best possible manner, as from this source the decay of the work is greatly hastened.... The glass of the sky-light requires immediate repairs, many of them being broken; strong plate should be used in the exposed portions.... Hoods should be provided for the chimneys.... Water closets at south end of building should be repaired.... Screen over the dome lights.... Iron gratings in small windows of the dome to prevent access to the roof.⁸

John Breuner did much of the required cabinet work. In late 1875, he received over \$800 for repairing furniture. The next year, he was paid for adding shelves to the Assembly members' desks and for making drawings and

constructing mineral cabinet cases for the State Cabinet. In addition, the Board of Commissioners acquired a new burglar-proof safe and vault for \$7,000. Also, in 1876, repairs were made to the roof where leakage was an on-going problem. An appropriation by the Legislature of \$5,000 allowed for both the repair and painting of the roof.⁹

During this time, a new system of maintenance for the building was initiated. The twentieth session of the Legislature, which met from December 1, 1873 to March 30, 1874, provided for the appointment of a janitor, engineer, fireman, watchmen, and porters for the capitol. They were appointed by the Secretary of State and their salaries were appropriated out of the state budget, the same as other state officers. The Secretary of State's response to the Governor over this new system was that,

The result has been to relieve this department to a great extent of the care in detail incident to proper protection of the building, furniture, carpets, etc., and the helping of the same in such order and neatness as to care for the frequent favorable remarks from visitors -- both citizens and strangers. This system of management should be continued.¹⁰

Two years later, in 1877, another Secretary of State, Thomas Beck, was equally impressed with this system and reported that,

Most of the repairs needed in and about the building, such as stopping leaks in, and repairing gas and water pipes, putting up basins, water-cocks, fixing hose, moving machines, and pipes and machinery in the engine room, which repairs have always heretofore been done by outside workmen, at a heavy cost to the State, have been made by the Engineer and Janitor's assistant, involving the State in no outlay whatever, save the cost of raw material. The work in the engine room alone, if done in the usual way, would have cost over one thousand dollars. The manner in which the building has been managed I know has challenged, and I think deserves, general commendation.¹¹

Perhaps because Secretary Beck was particularly conscious of a good maintenance program, it was under his jurisdiction that access to the dome was closed to the general public for the first time, the reason given "that evil-disposed and mischievous persons, mostly boys" congregated in the dome area and defaced the walls with "obscene and improper writing". Beck noted that because of the same reason, he was forced to keep the building closed on Sundays.¹²

Thomas Beck was especially proud of the manner by which the engine room was operated. The boilers, engine, pipes, etc., were managed by Mark Foster, who had been an engineer on the building while it was under construction. Beck described the engine room as a "model of neatness" and was pleased to report that Foster, along with the keeper of the gas room, did much repair work on the building which saved the state a substantial sum.¹³

In September 1879, the administration of George C. Perkins was elected, with Daniel M. Burns the new Secretary of State. In their short two years in office, this administration was responsible for additional redecorating, major repairs, plus some new features for the structure. As far as redecorating went, Burns reported that,

I have had the several departments therein thoroughly renovated by kalsomining and tinting the walls and ceilings, [and] furnishing new carpets where needed....

In addition, the interior of the dome was "whitened".¹⁴

Major repairs included work on the water tanks in the attic of the capitol. One had begun leaking, so Burns had ordered

them to be relined with copper, and had placed under each tank a copper vat with a discharge therefrom to the roof of the building, so that any leakage or destruction of the tanks would not precipitate the contents through the ceilings into the rooms below.¹⁵

In a related manner, the roof on the building continued to leak and, in the spring of 1880, one storm caused water to enter the building. Interior damage was caused and the Sacramento Bee noted,

The State library has been flooded to some extent, and this morning men were set at work to take up the carpet. The lower floor in the rotunda is sopping wet and the water lies in little pools here and there. The engine room is flooded and the engine was at work today pumping out the water.¹⁶

Improved ventilation was needed in the building and the Legislature appropriated \$1,500 for that purpose to be expended by the Board of State Capitol Commissioners. In June 1880, a contract was given to George F. Bush. The next year, an additional \$1,000 was appropriated, and the Board of State Capitol Commissioners adopted the plans, specifications, and proposal of W. H. Hamilton to alter and ventilate the water closets and urinals at the north end of the first and second stories. His contract, which included 107 vents, plus some additional work on the fence around the grounds, was completed by April 1883.¹⁷

1880 was a year in which several quite visible new additions were made to the capitol. In June, telephones were installed in the offices of the Governor and the Secretary of State.¹⁸ Telephones were not yet common household or office equipment, and their installation indicates a certain forward thinking by the administration.

Less novel, but definitely a decorative element, was the placement of terra cotta vases and flower pots in the rotunda in July of 1880. These may have been placed in the niches or may have sat on the floor to hold potted plants. They were purchased from Hobby & Harper, 329 J Street, Sacramento which, a

newspaper assured their readers, was a firm that carried "the finest assortment of this class of goods in the city."¹⁹ Shortly afterwards, the Sacramento Pioneer Society offered their own suggestion of a way to decorate the rotunda. In an effort to memorialize John A. Sutter, who had died June 18, 1880, they called

upon the State to place in one of the niches of the Capitol a life-size marble statue of the General, to secure which end, they called upon all similar associations in the state to aid them and pledge themselves to the work.²⁰

Nothing came out of this suggestion, however.

During July of 1880, what was probably the most spectacular addition to the exterior of the building since the installation of the gold ball in 1871 was made -- the gilding of the cupola roof. The following newspaper story describes the literal sparkling effect this had:

The work of gilding the top of the upper cupola of the State Capitol building is progressing under the management of Mr. Lamphear. A staging has been erected around it and covered in with cloth to protect the gilding from the rays of the sun. When completed, the work will add much to the appearance of the building, and will have a fine effect at a distance of several miles from the city. It will also, perhaps be of service to surveyors in prosecuting their labors, as, under the sun's rays, the gilded top will be discernible from every point of the compass. During some of the operations of the State Surveyors' corps last summer, signals were exchanged from the dome with men at the mouth of Feather river by means of looking glasses. Perhaps, in the course of time, the authorities may see fit to have the roof of the lower dome itself gilded.²¹

While this latter suggestion has never come to fruition, mainly because of the prohibitive cost, the cupola remained gilded with gold leaf until the present restoration project when it was gold plated.

In early 1883, perhaps hoping to attract the attention of the newly elected administration of Governor George Stoneman, the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds gave an especially critical report of the condition of the capitol building. There were definite political overtones to their criticism, pointing out the neglect of the previous two years, which coincided with the administration of Governor Perkins. The committee reported that,

The condition of this building is simply disgraceful. We find the accumulated dust and cabinets of nearly two years -- the globes of the chandeliers are incrustated with dirt so as to render them opaque. The condition of the conveniences for the Senate and Assembly is at once both unhealthy and disgusting -- an utter lack of cleanliness and ventilation is apparent. A radical change must be made, not only in the character of the accommodations, but

in the system of ventilation. The plumbing is out of repair in every room in the structure, and the mantelpieces and grate are smoked and burnt out. The roof requires repairs of an extensive character to prevent disastrous leakage in the future. The Senate and Assembly Chambers should be thoroughly ventilated; heretofore the proposed alterations suggested for such a purpose were of such a radical character as to almost change the construction of the building, so that it was not deemed prudent to experimentalize so extensively, and the matter has remained in its present position. A cheap and effective system has been devised, which in our judgment will vastly improve, not only the ventilation of the chambers, but their acoustics. The painting and whitening needs thorough repairs, also the glass work throughout.... The condition of the building cannot be attributed to the present administration. As they have no means at their disposal to put the structure in proper order, we have recommended an appropriation for that purpose.

Their efforts paid off, because in March 1883, the Legislature included a \$15,000 item in the state's budget "for plumbing, repairing of roof, and ventilation of the Senate and Assembly chambers, and water-closets in and painting and renovating of the State Capitol."²²

It was also in 1883 that a significant contribution was made to the state capitol: the statue of Columbus at the Court of Spain. The piece of art was presented to the State of California by former California banker Darius Ogden Mills. Mills had an early interest in the capitol, being one of the Sacramento businessmen who advanced money to the State during the construction years of the building.

The statue was sculpted by Larkin Goldsmith Meade, an American, in his studio at the Baths of Montecatini, near Florence, Italy. The work had been commissioned by LeGrand Lockwood for his mansion in Norwalk, Connecticut. It was started in 1868 and completed about six years later. Apparently, following Mr. Lockwood's death, his wife sold the statue to D. O. Mills for \$30,000.²³

The statue arrived at the Central Pacific freight office in Sacramento during the summer of 1883. After a period of several weeks in storage it was moved, still crated, to the capitol rotunda on August 21. There, the work of removing the freight cases began. There was an element of suspense in this whole procedure for, as the press reported, "...little is known of the statue here, as it has never been seen by any one in this city, and no questions appear to have been asked when it was presented." The statue was packed in one hardwood case, inside another one, and cushioned in between with straw. By the 23rd, the statue was unpacked, found to be intact, measured, and re-cased until the grand unveiling late in December. Meanwhile, the job of preparing a pedestal upon which to position the statue was given to Aiken and Fish. All of this preparatory work was done at Mill's expense.²⁴

On December 17, the marble art work was removed from its case (presumably still covered) and placed on rollers so that it could be removed to its granite base. The whole group would be placed beneath the dome, according to the Union in a rather emotional story, "fronting the west; so the mariner in marble will kneel on the western shores of the world he found as he knelt at the feet of Isabella -- as he knelt on the Pinta's deck -- as he knelt on the Bahama beach." This mystery attracted the attention of curious spectators who daily crowded around the workmen. Shortly before Christmas, it was formally presented to the state in an appropriate holiday gesture. The presentation was made by former Capitol Commissioner Edgar Mills, brother of D. O. Mills, who by then resided in New York. In a letter to Governor Stoneman, which was read at the unveiling, D. O. Mills wrote, "Trusting that you will agree with me in the belief that the rotunda of our State Capitol is an appropriate place for a work of art commemorating an event that has had so great an influence on the destinies of this western world...."25

D. O. Mills' donation created much publicity; and the Union challenged others of means to do likewise. They wrote,

The group occupies a position beneath the dome of the Capitol, and testifies to the taste and liberality of the giver, while it forms the most costly and exquisite work of art in the Capitol building. The example of Mr. Mills may well be followed by other men of broad means. The State building has niches for statuary and walls admirably adapted to hanging fine works, and these should be, to their full extent, filled by the best examples of art. Unless citizens of California who are blessed with deep and well filled purses, fill these places, it is probable that they will long remain vacant.26

In January 1887, newly elected Secretary of State W. C. Hendricks took office, and he identified many areas in the building which needed attention. Much of the neglect was due to insufficient appropriations which caused the Capitol Fund to be continually overdrawn. To help remedy the problem, in March 1887, the Legislature appropriated \$15,000 towards the "repairs of the State Capitol building, and furniture, and purchase of carpets", instead of the usual \$5,000. \$7,500 was available during 1887-1888 (the 39th fiscal year) and the other half during 1888-1889 (the 40th fiscal year).27

The exterior of the building was badly in need of painting, along with others on the capitol grounds. In 1887, the Legislature passed legislation which called for the painting of those buildings, which should

consist of two good coats of the best white lead, and best linseed oil paint, trimmed in such colors as may be directed by the State Capitol Commissioners; the roofs of said buildings to be painted with one good coat of fireproof roof paint; said roof paint shall be oil paint with lead or iron base, mixed with any fireproof material satisfactory to said Commissioners.28

In June, the Capitol Commissioners defined their paint specifications more tightly and agreed to advertise for proposals. They called for

All work that has previously been painted to have two coats of white lead and best linseed oil.... Window sashes and doors of Capitol to have one coat of oil and one of wearing body of varnish (Valentine's or Murphy's).... The statuary and ornaments on Capitol to have three coats of paint.... All places where the iron rust has eaten through the paint, to have one coat of red lead and boiled linseed oil before painting.... The roofs, other than copper, to have one coat of Princess Metallic, mixed with pure boiled linseed oil. The copper roofing over dome to be cleaned and painted with copper paint.... The ceilings of the vestibules of the Capitol to be painted the same as either portion of building.... The granite around Capitol not to be included in contracts.²⁹

In addition to the deteriorating paint on the upper stories, stains existed on the first story granite facade, including rust stains, but the Board members were warned against people who offered patent cures for stain removal. The Commissioners signed a paint contract with C. M. Bombaugh on August 2, 1887. By mid-1888, Hendricks noted that the painting job was complete, but he still hoped to get the granite work cleaned and polished, using the remaining balance of the paint appropriation. It was apparently not until 1894 that this was completed when Secretary Waite reported "cleaning with acid the entire granite basement."³⁰

Secretary Hendricks noted that, "Strange as it may seem, the Capitol was destitute of any waiting room for women and children." To remedy that situation, the firm of Carle & Croly was contracted to "fit up and furnish compartments exclusively for ladies", at a cost of \$1,246.13. On February 17, 1887, the Governor approved legislation which authorized the Secretary of State to alter a room on the first floor of the capitol for such use and which provided the necessary appropriation.³¹

Hendricks also made a major redecorating effort in many of the capitol offices. The \$15,000 appropriation had to be divided, with half to be spent between July 1, 1887 and June 30, 1888; the other half the next fiscal year. By June 1888, he had recarpeted several offices with a total of 3,337 yards of "Bigelow, five frame body Brussels and velvet carpets". Offices included were all three rooms in the Governor's suite; three rooms in the Controller's office; two rooms in the Treasurer's office; two in the Attorney-General's office; Supreme Courtroom, Department 1; one room in the Supreme Court Clerk's office; two rooms in the Adjutant-General's office; two rooms in the Surveyor-General's office; and two rooms in the Superintendent of Public Instruction's office. In August 1887, 1,000 square yards of linoleum, called courticine, were laid in the hallways of the first and second stories.³²

The next year, Hendricks finished the redecorating. He reported that,

In the Governor's office three rooms were recarpeted [referring to the work of the year before], the walls and wood work repainted and grained, the ceilings frescoed, and furniture reupholstered, repaired, and varnished; the marble of the mantels cleaned and polished, and the rooms all generally refurnished and beautified.

The two rooms in the Secretary of State's office, two of the Surveyor-General's, two of the Adjutant General's, and the private office of the State Librarian have all been thoroughly overhauled by repainting and generally recarpeting [referring to the work of the year before]; also in the addition of shelving and furniture.

Patent backs and regulators have been placed in nearly all the fireplaces in the Capitol, thereby adding to comfort and economizing fuel. The gas fixtures through all the offices, and over the entire building, have been, or will be, rebronzed.

The halls on the second and third floors were repainted, and the plastering repaired and kalsomined; stairways varnished and polished; also, the walls of the front halls repainted and the frescoing retouched.³³

Also, before the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, the basement of the capitol was cleaned out. Years of trash had been allowed to accumulate there, creating a definite health and fire danger. A contract was signed with C. M. Bombaugh to clean out and whitewash the basement for \$1,200. The job was a massive one; Hendricks estimated that between 800 to 1,000 tons of debris were removed. The material was scattered throughout the grounds, probably to fill low, undeveloped areas east of the capitol.³⁴

In July 1888, John Coffey, capitol engineer, reported to Secretary Hendricks that many important repairs were necessary to the heating system. Over the next two years, many improvements were made in the Engineer's Department. The boilers were examined and repaired; steam and water pipes were repaired or replaced; water mains were repaired, along with new connections and shut-offs to better regulate water flow; and the heating system was generally overhauled, including new fittings in the State Library.³⁵

Governor Waterman was proud of the improvements Hendricks had made to date, especially the cleaning of the basement. In his message to the Legislature in January 1889, Waterman supported Hendricks' position that the capitol must be adequately funded so that it could be maintained and not be allowed "to decay...for want of paint and varnish."³⁶ On March 21, 1889, an act was approved by the Governor which included an appropriation of \$43,000 for building and furniture repairs and the purchase of furniture and carpets. Although, as Hendricks explained, he would be out of office before the end of the time period for that appropriation, he expected to exhaust it before his successor's incumbency and, therefore, felt obliged to report how he planned to use the funds. He anticipated that,

The Senate and Assembly Chambers, and the Sergeant-at-Arms' rooms attached thereto, will be entirely repainted and kalsomined, and the wood work painted; the rooms of the Board of Equalization, Supreme Court, Controller, Attorney-General, and Clerk of the Supreme Court, will all be painted and frescoed, and desks, furniture, and wood work painted, varnished, and grained.³⁷

In 1889, the Legislature appropriated \$10,000 for a significant and needed addition to the capitol: a vault in which to collect and preserve the state's archives. Located in the basement, the vault was required to be fire-proof, burglar-proof, and moisture-proof. A concrete floor, six inches thick, was laid. The sides, bottom, and top were lined with three-eighths inch steel sheets which were placed several inches from the side walls and the top and bottom, to allow air circulation. A "first class" burglar-proof door was installed. The overall size was 22 feet by 21 feet by 12 feet high.³⁸

On November 4, 1890, Henry H. Markham was elected Governor and with him E. G. Waite, Secretary of State. When Waite took office in January 1891, he found that the \$43,000 appropriation made by the Legislature in 1889 was not only exhausted but had \$2,726.50 in additional debts against it. Waite had a fine wit and a great deal of energy, both of which were often revealed in his reports. According to Waite, "My predecessor left me no money, but the comforting assurance in the closing words of his last report that he turned over the building, 'fresh and clean and in perfect order from garret to basement'." Waite then proceeded to give a detailed account of all that was not "fresh and clean and in perfect order". With an appropriation of \$35,000, approved in April 1891, he was able to begin correcting many of those problems. Major areas of work on the building involved improved sanitation, chimney repair, roof repair, stoppage of gas leaks, prevention of further parapet disintegration, exterior step repairs, and cleaning the stained granite on the first story.³⁹

Before the advent of modern sewage drainage systems, the use of cesspools often presented a health problem. The state capitol building was no exception. The cesspool into which wastes from the building drained had not been cleaned in years, and the pipes draining into it were clogged with sewage. Mechanisms to prevent the escape of sewer gases were defective. As Waite put it simply, "The air in the halls was foul." To remedy the problem, Waite had the cesspool cleaned; the pipes irrigated with water and lime; the openings closed which allowed gases to escape; and, in order to prevent future problems, ordered sulphate of iron to be used daily as needed.⁴⁰ In a related matter, the leaking of illuminating gas was also detectable in the building. The gas was finally traced to leaks under the floor of the gas room. Pipes, in general, presented a problem for maintenance workers at the capitol. Many were rotten and needed to be replaced. Further investigation revealed that no plans existed for the pipe system within the building, nor were the pipes laid according to any formal drawings. An interesting bit of information came to light from Waite's research of the pipe problem which was probably related to the scandal which rocked the capitol construction project in 1872. Waite wrote,

This finds confirmation in the discovery of large pipes of lead which have no use, and never had any, in the fact that the old plans of the building have at last been found with no indication of plumbing on them, and from the testimony of a prominent gentleman who, as a boy apprentice, worked at the laying of the pipes in the Capitol. His statement is that the work was not done by drawings furnished, but the contractors received pay for the lead pipes by the pound, and the more they could bury in the walls the fatter the job.⁴¹

Waite had another reason for wanting to understand the pipe layout in the capitol: he desired to introduce electricity into the building and needed a pipe plan because the electrical wires would have to pass through the gas pipes. Someone offered the state a set of plans for \$10,000. Waite was suspicious of this offer and instead of making this business deal he appointed Eden Wadsworth as capitol engineer in 1891. Wadsworth had held this position under the Newton Booth administration, until he resigned in May 1873, and was already familiar with the pipe layout. Before his death in December 1891 he had located the pipes on the first floor.⁴²

The design of the chimneys had proved to be a problem over the years. According to Waite,

On stormy days the wind drove down the chimneys and filled the offices of the Secretary of State, Treasurer, State Printer, Surveyor-General, Adjutant-General, and all the rooms in the front of the Capitol, except the Governor's, with coal gas and smoke, and soot and cinders were scattered over the carpets, all to our great discomfort, and damage to the property of the State. Tradition had it that this offense had been going on for years, that the dome was responsible for it, and the defect could not be remedied.

Probably looking at the supposed irreparable problem as a challenge, Waite proceeded to correct the defect. He heightened the chimneys so that they were above any roof interference and then supported them with guy wires. The caps on the chimneys were removed and replaced with ones with larger wings. Apparently, the problem was solved as there were few complaints the next winter about smoke or coal gas.⁴³

As early as the legislative hearings in 1872, the workmanship of the roof had been under question. Secretary Hendricks had dealt with the problem of leaking by constructing a false roof under the copper roof, but Waite was not pleased with the condition of the roof when he assumed office. He found it patched with painted canvas, fastened with nails which, after coming in contact with the copper, had produced galvanic action which resulted in enlarged holes and leaks. The same problem arose from fastening electric wires, which passed over the building, to the roof with nails. Despite the false roof, leaking into the building continued. By the end of June 1892, Waite had had the roof inspected by a Mr. Lawson, reportedly the man who put it on 20 years earlier. Lawson was hired to remove the canvas patches and to repair the roof. The results were satisfactory and Waite claimed, "The clamor for a complete new roof is entirely without reason."⁴⁴

Waite spoke too soon about the condition of the roof. In November 1892, a storm of large magnitude hit Sacramento. Summoned to the capitol, he found water "pouring" into the Senate Chamber. Further inspection revealed that the wind had torn loose the copper on the roof. Several state employees, and apparently Waite himself, ascended the roof carrying timbers which they nailed down to hold the roof in place. The biggest leaks were stopped with putty, saving the south wing of the building.⁴⁵ Waite's informal account, in a letter to a friend, of his heroic roof rescue indicates the severity of the storm:

They say I would have made a good subject for caricature during the late storm. The copper roof rose and fell in waves, broke loose, and streams came through threatening destruction to thousands of dollars worth of fresco. I went on that roof when the wind blew a hurricane, and had timbers spiked down upon it. My hat took a notion to navigate the air and left one. I thought the feathers would all be blown off me. But the work was done, the holes puttied up and property saved. But I did think my clothes would whip me to death, or that I would be blown to Marysville without any stop-over privileges. I have some first class fellows under my command. They braved the pittiless wind and rain and did grand work for the State, when skilled roofers declined the job for coin.⁴⁶

After the storm, he repaired the roof more permanently by having it riveted down at 18 inch intervals. Waite reported, "no hurricane can ever disturb it, and I am pleased to report that it leaks no more."⁴⁷

Other repairs to the building included work on the parapet and steps. The cement layer which once coated the parapet had disintegrated, leaving the bricks exposed. This led to rain water running off the bricks which discolored the walls below. Waite had a new coat of cement applied. The steps at the north and west entrances were also victims of aging. Due to settling, they were out of line with the building. With the use of a hydraulic jack the steps were realigned, although some had to be recut in order to be finished off properly.⁴⁸

Discoloration of the granite facade on the first story was a perpetual problem. Despite earlier cautions regarding the cleaning of the granite, Waite was determined to go ahead. According to Secretary Waite, too many blocks of "sap-rock" had been used. They had a tendency to scale off and iron rust would appear on the surface. Additional rust appeared when water came in contact with the iron pins used in holding the blocks together. In addition to the rust, some of the grout used to set the blocks had run down the walls. Waite contracted with a party to clean the walls for \$2,000. However, he noted, some of the rust reappeared onto the surface of the granite after cleaning. He hoped to continue experimenting until a process could be found which would permanently prevent the rust's reappearance.⁴⁹

To Waite also fell the job of completing the vault in the basement for the State Archives. Work included the installation of screens on the doors and windows "to insure ventilation while keeping out small animals", lights, and an electric bell so that the archivist could communicate with the offices upstairs. New stairs with "wide and easy" steps were constructed to the basement, replacing the earlier ones which were narrow and steep. Also in the basement, under the Governor's office, rooms were fitted up with flooring and shelving for the storage of state publications.⁵⁰

Late in 1892, electricity was introduced into the capitol building. Despite the fact that electricity could probably have been justified solely on the grounds that it was a modern, and also functional, innovation, Waite chose his

justification on the grounds that it was healthier than gas. He calculated that each gas jet in the capitol burned seven feet of oxygen per hour; in the Assembly Chamber, alone, there were 227 gas burners. He concluded,

that the substitution of incandescent electric lamps for gas lights in the chamber is equivalent to the removal of more than two thousand seven hundred men from the hall in the effect upon the healthfulness of its breathing atmosphere. Acting upon the facts, I proceeded to have the Capitol wired and supplied with the best modern inventions to light all the rooms by electricity.⁵¹

At the end of August, the chandeliers and gas fixtures were taken down, boxed up, and sent to a San Francisco firm to be remodeled by adding electrical fixtures for incandescent lights. The firm of Thomas Day Company was given the contract for remodeling, while the electrification was done by the Electric Light Company. Secretary Waite appointed James C. Pearson of Sacramento to superintend the job. In all, 1,400 incandescent lights, of 16 candle power each, were installed, along with wiring for an additional 500 lights if needed. Some of the original fixtures were, according to Waite, "inelegant and badly placed", especially those in the Supreme Court Chambers. He also characterized the fixture in the Governor's private office as "cheap and clumsy". He had those fixtures replaced with ones he felt were more appropriate. The cost of wiring and electrifying the capitol was \$9,000, while remodeling and rebronzing the fixtures and the acquisition of new ones was less than \$7,000.⁵² By the end of December, the remodeled and electrified fixtures were reinstalled in the building and, on the 28th, a private test was made. After minor adjustment to some machinery, the capitol was lighted up for the public for the first time on New Year's Eve. Rather than installing an independent electrical plant, which could not be conveniently placed in the building, the capitol initially purchased electricity from the Capitol Gas Company. At the same time that the fixtures were being remodeled, bronze brackets were planned for installation at the entrances to the capitol for arc lights, and arches were constructed over the stone steps of some of the middle terraces for better exterior lighting.⁵³

Another item which was completed late in 1892 was the redecoration of the State Library. Years of soot had accumulated on the walls and skylight. While the library was disassembled, during the wiring of the building, Waite decided to take advantage of the situation and renovate. The walls, dome, and ceiling were frescoed, and the old indigo colored skylight was replaced with one of softer colors. Waite stated, "It has been my aim to make the State Library the attractive feature of the Capitol."⁵⁴ On the same day that the building was electrified for the public for the first time, a Bee reporter visited the redecorated library and described it for their readers:

An "ivory-yellow" is what the artists call the tint with which everything is suffused, and gold leaf and a shade bordering on a delicate brown form the contrasts. So slight are the latter, however, as to be scarcely distinguishable, though they are all the more agreeable on that account. The ceiling panels are decorated with designs in plaster, such as a globe here and an open book

there, and are burnished, where not pure white, with gold, the background being the prevailing ivory shade. Light is shed down the dome from a circular stained glass top and in the morning, when the sun is back of the Capitol, the effect of the glowing colors on the interior of the library is exquisitely beautiful.

There is no unnecessary filigree work about the frescoing. Such places under the galleries, side walls, etc., as are relieved with ornamentation show a simple design like two branches of fern leaves worked in plaster and tipped with gold. The tall Corinthian columns forming a circle outside the library alcoves are coated simply with the yellow-ivory color, and look the more majestic for their plainness, as these classic shafts invariably do.⁵⁵

One literally earth shaking event that happened during 1892, which Secretary Waite did not even choose to mention in his report, was the earthquake of April 21, 1892. The capitol, and Sacramento in general, had only minor damage. Part of one of the statues over the portico (which portico was not specified) fell and landed about 40 feet from the building. In addition, a crack was made in the ceiling, from one end of the building to the other, passing through the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and into the Assembly Chamber. The Assembly ceiling, which was "formed of stucco work dipped with gold", was cracked in several places, as were the Corinthian columns which supported the visitors' gallery.⁵⁶

Waite's vigorous pace during his first two years in office continued throughout the rest of his four-year tenure. A local newspaper gave Waite a sort of mid-term progress report in late 1892. It read,

Secretary of State Waite is to be commended for what he has accomplished. In fact, he is about the only Secretary of State who has any real, tangible improvement to show for his term of office. Instead of giving a "lick and a promise" to different parts of the building, he has waited until enough money was on hand to do some real good, and this he has applied wisely and in a manner showing handsome returns for the outlay.⁵⁷

The Legislature of 1893 appropriated an additional \$25,000 "for repairs to Capitol building and furniture, and purchase of carpets and furniture, and construction of an elevator."⁵⁸ Waite used this money to continue his ambitious program for the capitol. During October 1893, Waite embarked on a flurry of activity, painting the exterior of the building and the Supreme Court rooms. Three coats of paint were applied to the roof of the dome, statuary, and cornices; the rest of the building received two. All of the building was painted a glossy white except for the roof of the dome which was "colored to a slate color with a greenish cast to it so as to imitate green slate and to be colored by painter". The ribs on the dome were painted glossy white. The paint was manufactured by the Phoenix Pure Paint Company of San Francisco, and the painting was done by L. P. Anderson of Sacramento.⁵⁹

Beginning in the summer, and ending in November 1893, the eight Supreme Court rooms, including the two chambers, the Justices' private rooms, the ante-room, the brief-room, and the ladies' waiting room, were redecorated. The work was elegant as this description will testify:

The chambers of the Justices of the Supreme Court, whose walls had a very weary air, and yawned continually with unsightly cracks, are being frescoed in the highest style of the art, and will be furnished with carpets and window blinds, harmonizing in color. Most of the frescoing is raised work, brightened with gold leaf and aluminum leaf -- a new thing in the arts. The ceiling of one of the rooms is frescoed in cornstalks, with leaf and cob tassel. Another room is finished in Arabesque, and another in apartments that are being thus treated the richest creams, buffs, salmons and light shades of turquoise blue predominate.⁶⁰

Waite's redecorating plans extended into the rotunda, as well. More than a year earlier, he had been urged to redecorate that area to bring it up to the standards of the Senate and Assembly Chambers, most of the offices, and the State Library. The Bee wrote,

The time will come, no doubt, when the big rotundas of the Capitol will look less gloomy than they now are....much could be done toward beautifying other portions of the Capitol, such, for instance, as the rotundas, and it is hoped that Secretary of State Waite will use his influence toward bringing about that desirable end.⁶¹

Waite agreed that, "The rotunda was not in harmony with its surroundings." He hired Thomas A. Walthew for the job of beautifying the rotunda in an "allegorical style". Walthew already had gained experience by painting the State Library and the Supreme Court area.⁶² Although no references exist in the Secretary of State's reports, the daughter of William C. Randolph (the foreman for John Mallon and the Pacific Art Glass Works' in San Francisco) claimed in a statement made to the State Library that, "Sometime between 1890 and 1894, leaded glass was installed in the Capitol dome. This was removed seemingly about 1905."⁶³ This work may have been done when the rotunda was being redecorated.

The floors in parts of the capitol had begun to become badly worn and, in either late 1893 or the first part of 1894, Waite began to replace them. In the rotunda and on the porches, the white marble tiles had worn out faster than the black ones, creating an uneven floor surface. He had that entire expanse of floor repaired. The wood was badly worn on the landings of the main stairway, and Waite substituted it with encaustic tiles. The tiles, from the Howell Tile Company of San Francisco, were also used to replace the linoleum on the second story corridors. Waite felt this would be a permanent solution to the flooring there, "thus dispensing with the constant purchase of linoleum forever."⁶⁴

Waite also continued an active maintenance program on the building. A perpetual problem existed of soot falling off the chimneys onto the projected cornice, creating a black band around the building. The problem was solved by Col. J. W. Guthrie who installed eaves of iron, of a new design, which allowed the water and soot to drip clear of the cornice, eliminating the unsightly band.

Other routine maintenance was carried on, including a complete overhauling of the boilers in the basement, the installation of a Spencer damper regulator on the furnaces (to save fuel), and the installation of burglar alarms in the State Treasury area and around the building. This latter addition was in reaction to rumors that known outlaws planned to hold up the Treasury.⁶⁵

The appropriation made by the Legislature of 1893 specifically provided for the installation of an elevator in the capitol. The building, of course, was never designed to house an elevator and to find a place to install one was difficult. According to Waite,

The doors in the different stories are not over each other, and the hardest of steel girders had to be cut away at every floor, compelling a support for the floors built from ground to the roof. But the work has been successfully accomplished, and a fine elevator running by steam, and in case of necessity by compressed air, large enough to carry twenty persons at a time, the work of Cahill, Hall & Co., of San Francisco, has been doing good service since January last [1894].⁶⁶

In an innovative move, Waite had a track laid from the coal-room in the basement to the elevator, upon which four cars ran. This eliminated the need of "a small army of men" to haul the coal from the basement up to the three floors. Waite felt that the use of the cars and the elevator, instead of men, to haul coal would save enough to pay for the elevator in less than six months of legislative occupation of the building.⁶⁷

While E. G. Waite was, undisputably, a very energetic and productive Secretary of State, two events happened during his term which hindered the smooth operation of the capitol. The first of these was the issue of serving liquor in the building. This peaked as a scandal in 1893 and, through an expose by the Daily Bee, the public was given a glimpse of the more prurient aspects of life in the capitol. The issue of liquor in the building was not new. In 1871, the Sacramento Daily Union, an oft Republican sympathizer, reported that a liquor saloon was in full operation on the second floor, near the Assembly Chamber, during the Democratic State Convention. The paper saw fit to chide: "Our Democratic friends in attendance upon the State Convention do not appear to be in danger of suffering from a lack of 'refreshments'."⁶⁸ While this was obviously a temporary establishment, it does illustrate that alcohol was being dispensed in the capitol. Two years later, the Senate and Assembly jointly resolved,

That William F. Swimley be and he is hereby authorized to fix up a restaurant in the basement of the Capitol, and to keep the same during this session of the Legislature;

provided, that the same be done without any expense to the State, under the direction of the Secretary of State; and, provided further, that no intoxicating drinks be sold therein.⁶⁹

As early as 1872, Section 172 of the State Penal Code was established which prohibited the sale or distribution of alcoholic beverages within two miles of the State Prison (San Quentin). The Legislature of 1875-76 amended the Code to include the state capitol, as well as several other state-owned institutions, and the distance was reduced to one mile. The one mile limit did not apply to the capitol; the Code only provided that no alcohol be sold or distributed in the building or within the limits of the grounds.⁷⁰ Whether as a preventative measure against potential abuse or an attempt to curtail ongoing abuses, the Legislature passed a special state law in 1880 which specifically prohibited the sale of liquor in the capitol building. In part, the statute read,

Section 1. Any person or persons having in charge or control the State Capitol building, and allowing the same, or any portion thereof, to be used for the sale or distribution in any manner, for profit, of any malt or spirituous liquors, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than one thousand dollars.⁷¹

Whether or not Swimley's restaurant continued to operate on a continuous basis in the basement is not clear. The Secretary of State's reports are noticeably silent on the matter. It is known that in late 1888, a Charles Mund fitted up two rooms in the basement restaurant in the capitol, for a total of \$51.76. He did the repairs on his own account, according to Secretary of State Hendricks, "with the understanding that the State could purchase at cost any future time from him", which they did on October 12, 1889. Historian Donald W. Wheaton, writing in the midst of Prohibition, did shed some light on the matter. He wrote that as a result of emerging political strength by the Prohibition Party, the state capitol became "legally dry" in 1889. Wheaton claimed that, previous to 1889, the restaurant in the basement was combined with a saloon, known as "the well". He stated, "This place was patronized by senators and assemblymen to such an extent as to interfere with the business of legislation" and so, in 1889, the bar was supposedly closed though the restaurant was allowed to remain.⁷²

Apparently, that was not the case in reality because, with the opening of the legislative session of 1893, Assemblyman A. J. Bledsoe of Humboldt took on "the well" as a sort of personal moral crusade. On January 3, Bledsoe moved that the Speaker appoint a special investigative committee of five "to inquire by what right or authority the legal custodian of the State Capitol building allows a saloon and restaurant to be maintained in the basement thereof...." By a vote of 40-35, the matter was referred to the Committee on Public Morals, when it was appointed. Bledsoe was appointed chair of that committee.

The next day, Bledsoe continued his attack and moved that a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker to visit the Mayor of Sacramento and the District Attorney of Sacramento County relative to the alleged sale of liquor in the

state capitol. Bledsoe was overruled on that point, after which he responded that if the Democratic majority wished to allow the saloon to be maintained in defiance of the law, the Republican minority would let them have "that glory". The Daily Bee's observation of this debate was that "there seemed a disposition on the part of the majority to retain this convenient attachment." One legislator, at least, claimed that he had been entirely ignorant of the existence of the establishment and that Bledsoe's attention was giving "the well" a boom to business from curiosity seekers.⁷³

On January 12, the Committee on Public Morals began taking testimony. Henry Gallagher was the first to appear before the committee. He claimed that a man named McKay had employed him to serve lemonade, ginger ale, and "like refreshments" in "the well" since the opening of the session. He further testified that he was the only one who had served liquid refreshments that session and that he had dispensed no brandy, beer, or whiskey to anyone. T. H. Cook, a grocer, testified that he supplied Joseph Rainford, the proprietor of the adjacent restaurant, with groceries, but no liquor. Contrarily, however, two newspaper men, who were reporting on the investigation, were sworn in, and one testified that "he and some friends got drinks in 'The Well' last week." The next day, the probing continued with an examination of A. J. Rhoads, the man responsible for operating the basement concession. In his testimony, according to the Evening Bee,

He admitted that if he had obtained the reputation of being a Republican boss it was deserved, as he had done whatever he could for his party. He said that he got the privilege to conduct "the well" from Secretary of State Waite. He expected it this year, as he got it two years ago, Mr. Waite being a friend of his. He makes nothing out of it, and simply got the privilege for his friends. He turned over the eating department to Joseph Rainford and the fluid department to Joseph McKay, who transferred it to Henry Gallagher, as McKay is in Seattle. The witness directed that no intoxicating liquors be sold there. The fluids were to be lemonade and such drinks. Mr. Waite told him that he had heard that liquors were sold there last session, and Mr. Rhoads said that he would give the fluid department to another man this year, who would serve only temperance drinks. The witness said that "the well" has been run ever since 1871, in Governor Booth's administration. Mr. Rhoads said that he owns the fixtures and cooking arrangements in "the well".... Mr. Rhoads said he never got any money from "the old well", and does not expect to. The fixtures were put in twelve years ago by Mr. Rhoads.⁷⁴

The Committee on Public Morals announced their report on January 13. They found that intoxicating liquors had, indeed, been sold in "the well" during the present session of the Legislature. Held responsible for maintenance of "the well" were Secretary of State E. G. Waite, A. J. Rhoads, Joseph Rainford, James McCue [Joseph McKay?], and Henry Gallagher. They recommended a resolution ordering the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Assembly to cause "the well" to be vacated immediately and the restaurant removed. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 71 to 6.⁷⁵

On the 14th, the Bee offered what appeared to be an obituary, of sorts, in which they gave the public a glimpse of some of the most sensational aspects of "the well". By today's standards of stricter lobbyist control, the following incident seems rather blatant:

And, ask many of our readers, what was "the well?" "The well," dearly beloved, was an apartment fitted up in the cellar of the State Capitol, the entrance to which was through a door cut under one of the stairways. It was a place where the legislators could go and get a meal or a drink, largely the latter. Time was when it was notorious that a man could get any drink he called for in "the well," but that day seems to have departed, if we are to believe the testimony given the other day before the Investigating Committee. It appears that "the well" this session has been run as a strictly temperance auxiliary to the two Houses of the Legislature, though one would scarcely credit the assertion after having encountered a number of the variegated breaths coming up the dark, lonesome and narrow stairway that leads up from the depths.

"The well" has had many an auspicious and suspicious night, but never had it such a baptizing as Chris. Buckley [political boss from San Francisco] gave it at the end of a recent session in which he owned the Legislature. He had made many and many a dollar during the session, and was disposed to paint the building a rich vermilion color on the last night. So he went around among the scarlet women of the city, and invited the prettiest and shapeliest of them up to the closing festivities.

"The well" was not a temperance institution then, and Chris. "set up" the champagne for all the females and their followers. About 10 o'clock "the well" was crowded with beautiful women who were largely drunk, and seemed to be very much offended that they had so much clothes on. This feeling was shared by their male admirers, who kindly assisted, at various intervals of drinking, to remove their inconvenient garments.

By 11 o'clock the can-can was the order of the night, and the indecencies grew fast and furious. A curtain had better be drawn over what followed. Suffice it to say that while these magnificently-shaped Eves were disporting in "the well," Chris. Buckley, with two women on his lap, was seated in the Sergeant-at-Arms room of the Senate, drinking champagne and singing "White Wings." The noise became so offensive to the Senate, that it had to send its Sergeant-at-Arms out and politely request the autocratic Chris. to keep a little quite.

There will be none of that this session, for "the well" has been closed down.

This graphic description was accompanied by two views of the establishment drawn by the Bee's artist.⁷⁶

Despite the expose, "the well" did not dry up until 1899. In January of that year, the San Francisco Evening Post reported, with illustrations, that "Curry's Cave", as they referred to the establishment, had only temporarily become a quiet little restaurant after the scandal of 1893. Their description of the place is so complete it deserves a verbatim quotation:

The "well" in the Capitol is running as usual, Secretary of State Curry having given the privilege of carrying it on to one of his Sacramento friends. This place was intended as a convenience for the State's lawmakers when in need of refreshment, but many memories of scandalous conduct are connected with it, and the mention of the "well" to those familiar with legislative history revives stories of popping champagne corks, of excessive liquid indulgence by men and women, and of shady transactions touching bills and appointments.

Originally, the counter and tables in the "well" were for lunch purposes, but a bar was added and the barkeeper was busier than the cook. Then partitions were put up, and apartments like those in side-entrance saloons gave a certain amount of privacy to such women as went down the "well" stairway. The descent to Avernus is said to be easy, but that to the "well" is not, although events there have made it seem as if the "well" were part of the Avernus establishment. The entrance is at a little door, opposite the State Printer's office, and under the stairs which lead up to the Assembly chamber. You won't discover the "well" the first time without directions or a guide.

The portal of the most vulgar underground melodeon in San Francisco would bear comparison in the sight of an art critic with that of the "well." Care must be taken by the uninitiated to avoid a fall in going below. It was natural that the unholy reputation of the "well" should grow even worse.

When "connubiators" wished to bribe, they took their man thither; when lobbyists came together in the Legislative halls, at least part of their deliberations over a job or a steal were carried on in the "well;" when women of the half-world visited the Senate or Assembly chamber to smile upon the lawmakers whose glasses had clinked with theirs the night before, it was in the "well" that the former gayety was renewed for an hour or two. Whenever, for lack of a quorum, a call of the House was ordered, the sergeant-at-arms repaired first to the "well" to find absent Senators or Assemblymen. Once a Senator promised the advocates of a bill to vote for it and gave the opponents a pledge to vote against it. To escape embarrassment he fled to the "well" before the roll was called on the passage of the bill. There were other Senators who did not wish to vote, and their absence caused a call of the house. The Senator to whom dodging was at this moment a matter of vital importance was warned that the sergeant-at-arms was coming. He ran from one of the

rooms in which merriment reigned to a dark corner of the "well," and there, with the connivance of persons in charge of the place, he escaped the scrutiny of the sergeant-at-arms. The call of the house lasted a long time, but the Senator was successfully hidden until the proceedings were over.

With the "well" handy, the purchase of votes of legislators has been made easier. Many a barrel of whisky, keg of beer and case of wine has gone down to the "well" stairway and been carried up again in installments by tempters and victims. So gross was the behavior there at one session that a crusade against the "well" was started, and it temporarily became a quiet little restaurant. At this session drinks are not yet served over a bar for the sake of appearances, but drinks can be had at the tables. It is not profitable, it is argued, to run a restaurant alone without an alcoholic attachment in the "well." Curry's Cave is to be kept closed to-morrow night because of the order of the Legislature that no spirituous refreshment shall be served or sold in the Capitol during the Inaugural ball.⁷⁷

Despite their inaction, at times, legislators remained cognizant of the problem and, in 1905, codified all of the provisions in earlier statutes relating to alcohol in or near state buildings and consolidated them with Section 172 of the State Penal Code.

Another event happened in 1893 which had potential impact on the future of the state capitol in Sacramento. On March 11, during the closing days of the session, E. C. Seymour introduced a resolution into the Senate to consider Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 23. The resolution passed, and the proposed amendment was put to a vote. The subject of the amendment was to put a proposal to change the seat of government to San Jose to a vote of the people. It passed the Senate by a vote of 27 to 8. The same day, it was considered by the Assembly where it passed 57 to 7. As adopted, it read,

The Legislature of the State of California at its thirtieth session, commencing on the second day of January, A.D. one thousand eight hundred and ninety-three, two-thirds of all the members elected to each house of said Legislature voting in favor thereof, hereby proposes that section one of article twenty (miscellaneous subjects) of the Constitution of the State of California be amended so as to read as follows:

Section 1. The City of San Jose is hereby declared to be the seat of government of this State, and shall so remain until changed by law; but no law changing the seat of government shall be valid or binding unless the same be approved and ratified by a majority of the qualified electors of the State voting therefor at a general State election, under such regulations and provisions as the Legislature, by a two-thirds vote of each house, may

provide, submitting the question of change to the people; provided, that the State shall receive a donation of a site of not less than ten acres and one million dollars before such removal shall be had. The Governor, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney-General are hereby authorized to approve said site, and upon the approval thereof, and the payment of one million dollars into the State Treasury, the Legislature shall provide for the erection of the necessary building and the removal of the seat of government.⁷⁸

The immediate reaction of the Sacramento Daily Record-Union was that the action of the Legislature was facetious in nature, not to be taken seriously, and was merely a spirited retaliation against remarks published by the Bee on March 11, 1893, which were critical of certain legislators. In a self-righteous tone, the Union wrote;

The Legislature must be assumed to know what is requisite under the Constitution for the removal of the Capitol, and therefore it must be assumed that it did not act seriously, but in the direction of facetiousness, and to rap very properly a bit of sensationalism and scandal-monging by a newspaper, for which the people are not to be held responsible; a sensationalism in which the RECORD-UNION never engages and which is the bane of journalism, being neither defensible nor to be excused.⁷⁹

City government reacted immediately. On March 13, Sacramento's Mayor Comstock met with 250 leading citizens to consider what action might be advisable to take. A committee of several dozen people was formed to make decisions about how to influence the Legislature. A general expression of the committee was that all citizens should influence members of the Legislature to reconsider their hasty vote. It was noted that already a contingent of thirty prominent San Jose citizens had arrived in Sacramento, whose purpose was to urge the Legislature not to reconsider its vote. Another sentiment which came out of the meeting was a denouncement of the Bee's story. There seemed to be some question, also, whether the removal action passed by the Legislature was valid. The Union felt that there was not a two-thirds vote of each house in adopting the concurrent resolution.⁸⁰

Immediate reactions by some editors of other California newspapers, as reported by the Union, were unfavorable to the removal proposal. Sentiments expressed were that Sacramento was in the most central portion of the state, and that the \$1 million and the 10 acres of land offered by San Jose was merely a "drop in the bucket" to the cost of erecting a new building. Most seem to feel that the issue would fail at the polls. Throughout March, the Union continued to be a forum for those critical of the amendment. While, at first, that newspaper saw the removal issue as somewhat of a joke, their campaign quickly took on a more serious tone.⁸¹

On April 12, the first of two lawsuits was filed against the state on the matter. On that day, H. P. Livermore commenced a suit in the Superior Court of Sacramento County, entitled Horatio P. Livermore v. E. G. Waite, Secretary

of State. The complaint was that the removal resolution did not pass the Senate by a two-thirds vote and that the resolution did not pass both houses at all. Livermore stated,

My action is personal, and is taken because as a taxpayer in several counties of the State, I do not think it right that I, in common with other taxpayers, should be saddled with the cost of the Capitol removal, amounting to at least \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, merely to gratify the whim of a few piqued members of the Legislature. I base my contention on the informality and illegality of the whole proceedings, and my object is to prevent the Secretary of State from taking cognizance of the legislative resolution, and from proceeding further in the matter.⁸²

On the 13th of May, a second suit was filed. This one was initiated by an organized group of Sacramento citizens after determining that the Attorney-General was not unfriendly to Sacramento instituting an action in the name of the people against the Secretary of State, to restrain the Secretary from taking any action under the resolution. This suit was also filed in the Superior Court of Sacramento County, entitled The People of the State of California on the relation of N. D. Rideout, plaintiff, vs. E. G. Waite, Secretary of State of the State of California, defendant. Like Livermore, Rideout questioned the validity of the procedure followed to get the resolution passed. The complaint also asked that the Secretary of State be restrained from proceeding on the matter.⁸³

After being heard in lower courts, both cases were heard by the Supreme Court on November 15, 1893. The court had determined to hear the two cases together, and a decision was made on March 29, 1894. The Judges' opinions were filed in the case of Horatio P. Livermore, Respondent, v. E. G. Waite, Secretary of State, etc., Appellant. The court ruled in favor of the plaintiff and declared the proposed amendment unconstitutional on two grounds:

The proposed amendment...to change the seat of government to the city of San Jose was invalid and ineffective, its operative effective being limited upon the uncertain conditions of the donation to the State of not less than ten acres in land, and one million dollars in money, and the approval of the Governor, Secretary of State, and the Attorney-General of the site so donated.

The constitution does not permit the legislature to propose an amendment that will not upon its adoption by the people become an effective part of the constitution, nor one which if ratified will take effect only at the will of other persons, or upon the approval of such other persons, or some specified act or condition.⁸⁴

Sacramento had won its latest battle to prevent the removal of the seat of government to another city and disruption to the operation of the state capitol was averted.

Secretary E. G. Waite died in office in October 1894. Never before or since was there a Secretary of State who seemed to take such an active role and interest in the care of the capitol. Despite all of Waite's, and others', efforts, the next Secretary of State, L. H. Brown, who took office in 1895, found much to criticize in the capitol. One of the things Brown found was that the flooring in different parts of the building needed replacing and that many of the carpets were worn. Six rooms were recarpeted and, in others, carpets were taken up, cleaned, and relaid. In January 1895, Governor Markham recommended an appropriation of \$6,000 for tiling the first floor (presumably, the corridors) in the same manner as the newly tiled floor on the second story. On March 28, 1895, the necessary legislation was approved and, on May 26, the contract to do the work was awarded to J. F. Sims. The cocoa matting which was still in use on the third floor corridors was badly worn and patched with oil-cloth. It was removed and replaced with the linoleum recently taken up from the first floor when the tile was laid there.⁸⁵

The basement was again recognized to be a problem, as it had been by at least two previous Secretaries of State. Foul air rose from the basement and permeated the building. Brown recommended that the building be ventilated, a feature that was never designed into the building originally. He also recommended that a fire protection system be introduced into the building, especially in the attic. It was the opinion of the chief engineer of the Sacramento Fire Department that if a fire started above the third floor (the attic area), the entire building could easily be destroyed. As a start, Brown installed a number of fire extinguishers throughout the corridors and offices. Brown also characterized the elevator shaft as a fire-trap and recommended that it be lined with sheet iron to prevent fire from sweeping upward through it.⁸⁶

Perpetual, like the basement problem, was the leaking roof. Despite Waite's earlier pronouncement that the roof was repaired and ceased to leak, Brown reported that it leaked in many places and, over the past two winters, the use of over 20 tubs and buckets was required to prevent damage to the rooms below. Despite these efforts, plaster fell in the State Library and water came into both the Senate and Assembly chambers. Unlike Waite, Brown felt it was impossible to make the roof leak-proof because the copper expanded during the summer heat opening the seams.⁸⁷

Brown turned his attention to the maintenance of some of the decorative elements in the building. He felt that much of the furniture in the building was in bad condition. Some he had repaired and, for some offices, he acquired new furniture and shades, "to the extent that our limited resources would permit." In 1895, the Legislature had only appropriated \$5,000 for the repairs and purchase of furniture and carpets which was to last for two years. Brown also provided signs identifying each office which were installed so that they projected from the door casing at right angles.⁸⁸ A slight change was made to the exterior of the building. Arc lights, of 2,000 candle-power each, were placed around the cupola of the dome. This enabled the capitol to be seen for many miles at night. Inside the building, the remaining gas jets (in the basement and in the lavatories) were replaced with electrical fixtures.⁸⁹

During Brown's second two years as Secretary of State, he continued a minor maintenance program. Brown did not feel that the legislative appropriations were large enough to make the improvements he felt were necessary to the building. The areas which he believed remained neglected were the sanitation and ventilation of the capitol; floor renovation on the second story; new carpeting in several offices; the redecoration of his own office, which he said was the only one not "tastily decorated"; the brickwork supporting the boilers; and the cramped quarters of the State Library. Of this latter concern, Brown recommended moving the law library to the first floor adjacent to the Supreme Court quarters. Despite the small allocations, Brown was able to get the following improvements made: a large room in the Attorney-General's office was decorated, plumbed, carpeted, and furnished; two rooms each for the Surveyor-General and State Treasurer were painted and carpeted; the walls of some corridors were "whitened", and the doors and woodwork in the building were varnished; and in the basement, electrical wiring was introduced, and the walls were "whitened". Brown also optimistically reported that the roof was repaired, "and for the first time in years, the building is free from leaks." Brown also turned his attention to the fireplace system throughout the building. He installed new grates in the fireplaces in several of the offices. These were designed to consume coal at a slower rate than the old ones and to be ornamental as well. Brown felt the results of the change would be a "considerable...saving in coal...and for better results in heating...."⁹⁰

At the beginning of his term, Brown had urged the state to drill a well on the capitol grounds for use on the grounds and in the building. The state was paying \$600 annually for water used in the building and \$1,200 for water used for irrigation. He argued that a well could be drilled for \$500. The state had the necessary pump, which was already being used to lift the water from the mains into the storage tanks in the attic. By mid-1897, the well was bored at the east side of the building. It was 150 feet deep and cost \$135.00. By October 1898, however, the water supply was not sufficient, and the state was forced to again rely on the Sacramento Water Company.⁹¹

Brown made some other recommendations that were not followed, at least immediately. One of these was to install heaters in the offices instead of using the grates. He felt them to not only be more economical but more energy efficient, easier to start, and cleaner. He felt they could be operated at no additional expense because steam was already kept up in the boilers for the larger heaters already in use in the corridors. He also recommended the installation of electric motors in the basement to run the elevator and the pump used for pumping water into the tanks in the attic.⁹²

C. F. Curry took office in January 1899. As most Secretaries of State did when they first assumed responsibility for the building, Curry evaluated the condition of the capitol and then set about to make some changes. And, like other Secretaries, he was appalled by the sanitation in the building. He felt that the bad condition of the sewage system, the toilets, and the lack of ventilation were responsible for the sickness that prevailed among the capitol employees. The basement was still unfinished, with some rooms without ventilation or light. The attic of the capitol was in equally bad condition. It was used as a storage area, and all the electrical apparatus for lighting the building was there, creating a potential fire hazard. Curry recommended that the attic be remodeled into usable office spaces to alleviate the crowded conditions of the capitol.⁹³

In 1899, two special pieces of legislation were passed which appropriated money for capitol maintenance. The first was an emergency measure which provided \$2,500 "for repairing the roof, gutters, and conductors on the State Capitol building, and repairing the interior of the Capitol building resulting and existing from defects in such roof, gutters, and conductors." That winter, severe storms had damaged the roof of the capitol, particularly over the Senate Chamber. The money was used to contract for the repair of the roof, which was guaranteed for two years. In addition, the walls and ceilings, including fresco work, were damaged in the Senate Chamber and the adjacent corridor. These areas were also repaired out of the appropriation, along with related minor damage in the offices of the Board of Examiners; Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Supreme Court Chambers.⁹⁴

The second appropriation, for \$5,000, was for the purpose of taking out the worn tiles on the second floor of the capitol and on the landings of the four stairways; taking up the steam pipes and heaters on the second floor; laying a new concrete foundation and laying new tiles on the second floor; and resetting steam pipes and heaters. In February 1900, the entire job was contracted to a San Francisco firm for \$4,996.00.⁹⁵

During his first two years in office (1898-1900), Curry also engaged in some office refurnishing, including new carpeting, furnishings, wall frescoes, and plumbing throughout the building. In particular, the Governor's rooms were recarpeted, and new furniture was added. Curry pointed out that, "The private office occupied by the Governor is not of adequate size for comfort, much less to transact any business in. A larger and more commodious room would be in keeping with the office of Governor." Also within that time period, the Secretary of State's office returned from the second floor to the first floor, in its original location at the front of the building just south of the west entrance. The floors in that area were puttied, shellacked, and painted, and new plumbing was installed. Within two years, however, the offices of the Secretary of State had new floors laid in them. In addition, new furniture was acquired for those rooms, "the old desks, etc., being removed and those which are more modern being substituted." The Supreme Court Clerk's office was also modernized with metallic furniture from the Office Specialty Manufacturing Company. Curry recommended that the Legislature should take action in renovating the Senate and Assembly Chambers. By mid-1902, their carpets were very worn. The desks and chairs were also in a worn condition and needed continual repairs. Curry felt that "new and modern furniture" was also in line for these areas. Another change was made in the library spaces. Acting on a request from the Trustees of the State Library, a room in the Supreme Court Department No. 1 was allocated to the State Library for the law section.⁹⁶

By mid-1902, the sanitary conditions of the building and the ventilation of the basement were improved. Modern plumbing was installed in the offices of the Secretary of State, Attorney-General, and Controller. Curry was quick to point out, though, that the toilets on the first floor were of "ancient design" and should be replaced. The ventilation problem was improved by some renovations in the basement which also offered the capitol staff additional working space. By August 1901, Secretary Curry was embarked on the following renovation program:

Under the appropriation made by the last Legislature for repairs to the Capitol, etc., Secretary of State Curry, as custodian, is now carrying out an extensive scheme looking to the opening up of some thirty to forty rooms in the basement of the Capitol building for use as committee rooms, the storing of documents and files, etc. Until this work was begun the Capitol basement has been a very fair imitation of the catacombs. It is cut up into two score or more of rooms of varying size, but they have been of no use except for storing archives or for purposes which do not require light and ventilation. Only one or two of them have been used at all. The rest consist of four plain brick walls, with an opening from the corridor only, without floors, and as dark and foul smelling as a prison dungeon.

Custodian Curry is now having windows cut in them, opening on the Capitol park, and they will be suitably lighted and ventilated. The corridors and rooms will also be given a cement flooring. The last Legislature appropriated about \$12,000 for repairs to the Capitol, etc. This leaves about \$6000 outside of the usual repairs and maintenance of the building for the two years before another session, to be expended upon permanent improvement. Out of this, however, will come the cost of covering the steam pipes with asbestos throughout the building, which is estimated to effect a saving of some 40 per cent in coal consumption. To carry out the entire plan some \$3,000 more was desired, but the amount available will make a big difference in the capacity of the building.

Heretofore the committees during sessions of the Legislature have been obliged to put up with makeshift quarters in the various departments, interfering with the department work and greatly inconveniencing the members themselves. At the last session two important committees had to find quarters outside of the building, furnishing them at considerable expense. The opening up of the basement will permit of permanent committee rooms, suitably furnished.

The archive room will be changed to the old armory, directly under the Secretary of State's office, and eventually a stairway will be constructed between the two. The armory will be moved to what was known as the "well," formerly used as a restaurant and barroom. At the close of the last extra session a futile attempt was made to have plans drawn for fitting up committee rooms under the roof. Many more and better rooms can now be provided in the basement.⁹⁷

Curry had a strong concern about the lack of adequate fire protection in the building. The only protection was one hydrant, consisting of a three-inch pipe, located on the grounds east of the capitol. Shortly after Curry's election to office, he coordinated a drill with the Sacramento Fire

Department. The experiment illustrated that they could not spray water above the second story. In July 1901, Curry wrote Mayor Clark of Sacramento about the situation. His letter of complaint appeared in a local newspaper,

Hon. George H. Clark, Mayor of Sacramento--Dear Sir:
I desire to call your attention and through you the Board of Trustees of Sacramento, to the great danger of fire to the State Capitol, one of the most valuable pieces of State property in the State, that cost about \$3,000,000.

It is left in case of fire to the mercy of one little hydrant situated on the south of the building that only gives one inch and a half flow of water. This matter has been called to the attention of the city officers before, but never has any action been taken. I would suggest that while Tenth street in front of the Capitol is all torn up, to be repaved with new asphaltum, it would be an opportune time for the city to put a large water connection in, at least to the sidewalk, if not through the Capitol grounds, so that in case of fire the State Capital might at least have a chance from being entirely destroyed.

Yours respectfully,

C. F. CURRY,
Secretary of State.⁹⁸

In 1902, this condition was the subject of a Sacramento Grand Jury investigation. Their report issued on December 6, as reported in the San Francisco Chronicle, declared

that the beautiful State Capitol building is in constant danger of destruction by fire, together with the State Library, containing the second largest collection of books in the United States.

The jury points out that it is impossible to get a supply of water in the attic or garret, and that all of the electric wires throughout the building enter by means of this garret instead of the cellar and present a menace to the safety of the structure. The Capitol Commissioners are urged to take steps immediately to remove this danger.⁹⁹

Shortly before the next session of the Legislature convened in January 1903, a state official, whose office was in the capitol, publicly announced that he felt that the attic was a menace to the entire structure. It was unfinished, was of wood flooring (which was very dry), and had electrical wiring running through it. In the words of the Sacramento Union, "It is, therefore, the hight [sic] of folly to permit this unfinished half story of the Capitol building to be the one weak spot of the entire costly structure." The newspaper further pointed out that the area could be finished up and made into twenty or thirty additional rooms, which were greatly needed in the overcrowded capitol. Some stop-gap relief came in February when Governor George Pardee approved legislation appropriating an additional \$1,200 for repairs to the building for the 54th fiscal year (1902-1903). By mid-1904, the heavy girders, which held up the capitol roof, were strengthened by

putting iron bands around them. The girders were of wood and some had sprung and others were badly split. The attic was cleaned out "by removing a large amount of old lumber, furniture, and rubbish; all of which has been saved up and used for kindling, thereby making the place far less liable to take fire." In addition, the water tanks in the attic were cleaned and repaired, and filled with water, making them useful in case of fire.¹⁰⁰

The basement was further cleaned up, and storage areas were created to be used by state officials. The Surveyor-General's offices were refitted. Modern office furniture and steel cases were installed, and the "antiquated" steam radiators were removed. According to Secretary Curry, "It is now one of the best equipped offices in the building."¹⁰¹

Clearly, by 1904, the condition of the building was not good. While it was usual for Secretaries of State, upon entering office, to find fault with the building, only then to offer a set of recommendations to remedy the situation, Curry seemed justified in his assessment. He pointed out that the structure was 35 years old and needed to be modernized in some areas. Taking a somewhat unacceptable stand for today's historic preservation standards, Curry called for a "general overhauling". The following specific items were listed by the Secretary as needing attention:

- Modern plumbing needed to be installed -- the toilets should be torn out and the washstands in the offices should be replaced;
- the stairway to the dome needed to be replaced by one of iron;
- the interior and exterior of the building needed to be painted and the walls kalsomined;
- the granite on the building was badly discolored;
- steam heaters should be installed in the various offices to replace the system of burning fuel in grates;
- standpipes should be run up both sides of the building as a fire protection measure;
- an additional elevator needs to be installed at the south end of the building;
- circular storm doors were recommended at each of the first floor entrances;
- the only ventilation of the building was through the fireplaces, windows and doors -- a modern ventilating system should be installed;
- the Governor's offices should be rearranged -- the Governor's private office should be moved into one of the large rooms occupied by his staff and another room should be constructed from the short hall adjacent to the present private office of the Governor to be used as a public reception room;
- the over forty thousand documents in the custody of the Secretary of State should be removed from the present wooden fixtures and placed in steel cases and shelving; and
- the Senate and Assembly chambers should be re-furnished and remodeled.

In addition, he suggested

the advisability of the erection of a building on the Capitol grounds, to be occupied by the State Library and the Supreme Court; or the construction of an extension to the present building, between the Senate and Assembly

chambers, and in harmony with the architecture of the Capitol; or a portion of the attic could be fitted up for the use of the State Library and the rest for the use of legislative committees. More rooms are required for the several State officers and for legislative committees. The only available place to construct them is in the attic of the Capitol. I would recommend that an appropriation be made to construct an iron stairway to the top of the dome, and to put the attic in as near fireproof condition as possible. 102

The State Board of Health also entered the picture, and in 1904 issued a statement very critical of the building's sanitary condition. They wrote,

It would be impossible to find a public building of any kind in the State which would so quickly bring the blush of shame to the cheek of a loyal Californian. The toilets, old and antiquated, are foul to the extreme -- not for want of care on the part of the officials in charge, but on account of the construction being such as to make cleanliness impossible -- with the result that the halls are often filled with foul and impure air and some of the offices are unfitted for use. Ample appropriations should be made to put this building in perfect sanitary condition, both for the honor of the State and for the health of the occupants. 103

As well as being in poor condition, the capitol building was grossly overcrowded. As a result, some offices and commissions were located outside the building; some even in other cities. The Committee on Laws and Legislature of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce took great exception to this partial removal. In an attempt to remedy the situation, that organization threw their support behind the movement to improve the attic of the capitol so that office space could be fitted up there. With that accomplished, they reasoned, all of state government could be returned to Sacramento. The old fear that the seat of government might be removed from Sacramento had emerged again. The Bee wrote,

The tendency has been, during recent administrations, for the State officers to get away from the Capitol whenever they could do so, and because their whims or their business interests have drawn them away, the State has been obliged to pay an immense sum yearly in rentals, when it has plenty of room for new offices on its own property. Governors Budd and Gage did much to encourage this tendency by themselves spending as little time in Sacramento as they could, but Governor Pardee has declared himself in favor of obeying the provision of the Constitution that the home of the Executive shall be in Sacramento, and it is not improbable that he will exert his influence toward having other departments of the State Government located where they should be, at the Capitol. 104

The Chamber of Commerce's fears were not allayed when Lewis Oneal introduced Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 16 on January 28, 1903, which provided that after the first Monday in January 1907, the seat of government would transfer to San Jose. In February, Eli Wright introduced a similar amendment into the Assembly. Sacramento's citizens were outraged and, under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce and the Sacramento Board of Trustees, they mounted a campaign to defeat the removal measures. Neither amendment materialized; the first failed on the Senate floor and the other was withdrawn by the author.¹⁰⁵ Thus, some people, especially Sacramentans, favored expanding the usable space in the capitol to not only alleviate the overcrowded conditions in the building, but to preclude removal attempts.

It was very evident that, by the beginning of the legislative session in January 1905, a movement existed which supported major remodeling work on the capitol. In his message to the opening of the session, Governor Pardee endorsed Secretary of State Curry's recommendations for major repairs. Pardee stated, "This is a noble building, and a great credit to earlier generations of Californians, but in its plumbing and heating systems it is sadly antiquated, besides being out of repair in a good many ways." In addition, according to the Governor, the State Board of Health had declared the "condition of the building dangerous to the health of its inmates."¹⁰⁶

In early February, Senator C. M. Belshaw, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, presented a "Report of Associated Architects on Condition of State Capitol Building". The report laid out two propositions for repairs and remodeling. The first estimate, for \$170,573, called for placing the building in "thorough repair and in a sanitary condition"; the second was more extensive and comprised of "remodeling the interior of the building, making it entirely fire-proof and rendering all space available for use from basement to roof", for a price of \$352,925. In addition, a third proposition was offered to build a separate building on the capitol grounds, on the site occupied by the State Printing Office and State Fair Pavilion, for the State Library and Appellate Court.¹⁰⁷

About a week later, J. A. McKee of Sacramento introduced Senate Bill 819 entitled "An Act authorizing and directing the Board of State Capitol Commissioners to remodel and repair the State Capitol building, making the same fireproof, rendering all space therein available, and making the appropriation therefor." After being slightly amended, it passed the Senate on March 3, 1905 by a vote of 22-0. Three days later, it passed the Assembly. As it was approved, the bill reflected the second proposal presented by Belshaw the month before. \$352,925 was appropriated

for remodeling the interior of the State Capitol building, and making the same fireproof, rendering all space therein available, equipping the same properly for gas and electricity, painting the same, placing in the necessary elevators, paving the driveways leading to said building, installing proper plumbing, heating and ventilating apparatus, and doing all other work of every kind and description necessary or proper for any of the purposes aforesaid.¹⁰⁸

FOOTNOTES

1. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, from December 4th, 1871, to July 1st, 1873," p. 15, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 20th session, volume 1.

2. "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1874 and 1875," p. 3, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 21st session, volume 3.

3. Thomas Jones to the Board of Capitol Commissioners, July 30, 1875, Correspondence Received, 1871-1898, F:3580:18, Board of State Capitol Commissioners, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.

4. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, from July 1, 1873, to July 1, 1875," p. 15, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 21st session, volume 2.

5. "Report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and Assembly," p. 11, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 21st session, volume 5.

6. California, Statutes (1875-1876), Chapter 492, p. 747, Approved April 3, 1876; Board of State Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," August 20, 1877, August 23, 1877, and September 10, 1877; and Sacramento Bee, September 16, 1952, 38/6, 75 Years Ago Column, and September 20, 1952, 44/6, 75 Years Ago Column.

7. Daily Bee, November 16, 1877, 3/3.

8. "Report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and Assembly," p. 11.

9. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," November 30, 1875, August 7, 1876, and November 20, 1876; and Statutes (1875-1876), Chapter 253, p. 332, Approved March 18, 1876, Chapter 521, p. 796, Approved April 3, 1876, and Chapter 492, p. 751, Approved April 3, 1876.

10. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, from July 1, 1873, to July 1, 1875," p. 16.

11. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, from December 6, 1875, to July 1, 1877," p. 22, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 22nd session, volume 1.

12. Ibid.

13. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, from July 1st, 1877, to June 30th, 1879," p. 11, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 23rd session, volume 1.

14. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, 1880-1882," pp. 3-4, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 25th session, volume 1.

15. Ibid., p. 4.
16. Sacramento Bee, May 14, 1955, 42/6, 75 Years Ago Column.
17. Statutes (1880), Chapter 102, p. 107, Approved April 16, 1880; Statutes (1881), Chapter 101, p. 120, Approved May 12, 1881; and Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 19, 1880, June 30, 1881, and April 21, 1883.
18. Sacramento Bee, June 20, 1955, 38/6, 75 Years Ago Column.
19. Sacramento Bee, July 7, 1880, 3/1.
20. Sacramento Daily Record-Union, August 2, 1880, 3/3.
21. Sacramento Bee, July 14, 1880, 3/1.
22. "Report of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate and Assembly," pp. 7-8, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 25th session, volume 3; and Statutes (1883), Chapter 41, p. 79, Approved March 9, 1883.
23. Sacramento Daily Record-Union, September 11, 1883, 5/2 and December 24, 1883, 3/2; L. G. Meade to LeGrande Lockwood, June 17, 1871, typescript copy received from Mimi Findlay of the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation; and personal communication with Mimi Findlay, October 1979.
24. Sacramento Daily Record-Union, August 22, 1883, 3/2 and August 24, 1883, 3/1.
25. Ibid., December 18, 1883, 3/1 and December 24, 1883, 2/2 and 3/2.
26. Ibid., December 24, 1883, 2/2.
27. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Years Ending June 30, 1888," p. 5, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 28th session, volume 1; and Statutes (1887), Chapter 170, p. 215, Approved March 18, 1887.
28. Ibid., Chapter 94, p. 110, Approved March 12, 1887.
29. Capitol Commissioners, "Minutes," June 30, 1887.
30. John Eitel to Governor Waterman, September 19, 1887, Correspondence Received, 1871-1898, F:3580:18, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Agreement with C. M. Bombaugh, Contracts, F:3580:75, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1888," p. 5; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1894," p. 6, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 31st session, volume 1.
31. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1888," p. 5; and Statutes (1887), Chapter 4, p. 3, Approved February 17, 1887.

32. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1888," p. 5; and Sacramento Daily Record-Union, August 10, 1887, 3/3.
33. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Years Ending June 30, 1890," pp. 10-11, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 29th session, volume 1.
34. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1888," p. 6.
35. Ibid., p. 14; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1890," p. 10.
36. "Biennial Message of R. W. Waterman," January 7, 1889, pp. 30-31, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 28th session, volume 1.
37. Statutes (1889), Chapter 285, p. 445, Approved March 21, 1888; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1890," p. 10.
38. Ibid., pp. 11-12.
39. Statutes (1891), Chapter 270, p. 504, Approved April 6, 1891; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1892," p. 3, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 30th session, volume 1.
40. Ibid., pp. 3, 4.
41. Ibid., pp. 4, 8.
42. Eden Wadsworth Diaries for 1873 and 1891, Eden Wadsworth Collection, California State Library, Sacramento, California; and Daily Bee, January 2, 1892, 8/1.
43. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1892," pp. 3, 4.
44. Ibid., p. 4.
45. Ibid., p. 3.
46. E. G. Waite to Dr. N. E. Chapman, n.d. (Evidence indicates it was written after the storm of November 1892; copy of letter in Capitol Restoration Project files.)
47. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1894," p. 3, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 31st session, volume 1.
48. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1892," p. 5.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., pp. 6, 7.
51. Ibid., p. 9.

52. Ibid., p. 10; and Sacramento Daily Record-Union, September 1, 1892, 3/3.

53. Ibid., September 1, 1892, 3/3, December 28, 1892, 3/4, December 29, 1892, 3/2, and January 2, 1893, 3/2; Daily Bee, December 28, 1892, 1/4; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1892," p. 10.

54. Ibid., p. 9.

55. Daily Bee, December 31, 1892, 5/4-5.

56. Ibid., April 21, 1892, 1/5.

57. Ibid., December 31, 1892, 5/5.

58. Statutes (1893), Chapter 242, p. 531, Approved March 25, 1893.

59. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1894," p. 4; Daily Bee, October 20, 1893, 4/2; and Specifications for Painting, Graining and Polishing the Exterior of the State Capitol of California, December 6, 1893, Board of State Capitol Commissioners.

60. Daily Bee, October 20, 1893, 4/2.

61. Ibid., December 31, 1892, 5/5.

62. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1894," p. 5.

63. Statement of Mrs. Nick Hemmriga to the State Library, March 7, 1958, Information File, California State Library.

64. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1894," pp. 4, 5; and Daily Bee, October 20, 1893, 4/2.

65. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1892," p. 5; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1894," pp. 4-5.

66. Ibid., pp. 3-4.

67. Ibid.

68. Sacramento Daily Union, June 21, 1871, 3/1.

69. Journal of the Senate, 20th session, December 5, 1873, pp. 49-50.

70. Penal Code, Sections 1 to 210. Historical discussion in West's Annotated California Codes (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1970), 342-344.

71. Statutes (1880), Chapter 83, p. 80.

72. Controllers Claim #5870, Charles Mund, October 12, 1889, Roll H10, Controller's Office, California State Archives, Sacramento, California; and Donald W. Wheaton, "Spotlights on the Political History of California from 1882-1898," California Historical Society Quarterly 5 (September 1926), 285.

73. Journal of the Assembly, 30th session, January 3, 1893, p. 12, January 4, 1893, p. 14, and January 9, 1893, p. 37; and Daily Bee, January 4, 1893, 1/1 and 1/2 and January 5, 1893, 1/5.
74. Evening Bee, January 13, 1893, 1/5.
75. Journal of the Assembly, 30th session, January 13, 1893, p. 82.
76. Saturday Bee, January 14, 1893, 1/3-4.
77. San Francisco Evening Post, June 9, 1899.
78. Journal of the Senate, 30th session, March 11, 1893, p. 1093; Journal of the Assembly, 30th session, March 11, 1893, pp. 1083-1804; and "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments," Approved March 14, 1893, Statutes (1893), p. 657.
79. Sacramento Daily Record-Union, March 13, 1893, 2/1.
80. Ibid., March 13, 1893, 3/1-4 and March 15, 1893, 2/1-4.
81. Ibid., March 14, 1893, 1/3-4, March 16, 1893, 6/3-6, March 17, 1893, 3/1, 4/1 and 4/5, March 18, 1893, 3/3-4, March 20, 1893, 3/1, and March 21, 1893, 5/3.
82. Ibid., April 13, 1893, 1/5 and May 27, 1895, 4/2.
83. Ibid., May 15, 1893, 3/3 and May 27, 1895, 4/1.
84. Ibid., March 30, 1894, 2/1-2; Morning Call, November 16, 1893, 1/7; and 102 Cal Reports, 113. Articles on Lower court activity in Sacramento Daily Record-Union, May 20, 1893, 3/1, June 7, 1893, 4/1-2, June 9, 1893, 4-1/2, June 10, 1893, 5/1-5, June 17, 1893, 5/1-4, June 22, 1893, 5/3, and June 23, 1893, 4/1-4.
85. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1896," pp. 6, 7, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 32nd session, volume 1; In the Matter of Awarding the Contract for Tiling the Corridor on the Lower Floor of the State Capitol of the State of California, May 25, 1896, Correspondence Sent, 1860-1896, F:3580:15, Board of State Capitol Commissioners; Statutes (1895), Chapter 211, p. 277, Approved March 28, 1895; and "Second Biennial Message of Governor H. H. Markham to the Legislature of the State of California," January 7, 1895, p. 17, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 31st session, volume 1.
86. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1896," pp. 5, 7.
87. Ibid., p. 6.
88. Ibid., pp. 6, 7.
89. Ibid., p. 7.

Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 1898," pp. 5, 6, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 33rd session, volume 1.

91. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1896," p. 14; "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1898," p. 5; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California for the Fiftieth and Fifty-first Fiscal Years, Beginning July 1, 1898, and Ending June 30, 1900," p. 6, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 34th session, volume 1.

92. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1898," pp. 10, 11.

93. "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1900," pp. 3, 9.

94. Ibid., p. 6; and Statutes (1899), Chapter 118, p. 152, Approved March 20, 1899.

95. Ibid., Chapter 144, p. 180, Approved March 22, 1899; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1900," p. 7.

96. Ibid., pp. 7, 8, 9; "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California for the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Fiscal Years, Beginning July 1, 1900, and Ending June 30, 1902," pp. 6, 9, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 35th session, volume 1; and Statutes (1899), Chapter 148, p. 182, Approved March 22, 1899.

97. San Francisco Chronicle, August 20, 1901, 3/2; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, June 30, 1902," pp. 5, 6.

98. Sacramento Daily Record-Union, July 6, 1901, 3/4.

99. San Francisco Chronicle, December 7, 1902, 5/7.

100. Sacramento Daily Record-Union, January 15, 1903, 4/1; Statutes (1903), Chapter 27, p. 30, Approved February 14, 1903, p. 30; and "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of California for the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Fiscal Years Beginning July 1, 1902, and Ending June 30, 1904," p. 5, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 36th session, volume 1.

101. Ibid., p. 6.

102. Ibid., pp. 6-8.

103. Eighteenth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health, of California, for the Fiscal Years from July 1, 1902, to June 30, 1904 (Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, Superintendent State Printing, 1904), p. 25.

104. Evening Bee, January 22, 1903, 3/4.

105. C. F. Curry, comp., California Blue Book or State Roster, 1909 (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1909), p. 722; and Sacramento Daily Record-Union, February 10, 1903, 8/1-3 and February 11, 1903, 8/1-4.

106. "First Biennial Message of Governor George C. Pardee to the Legislature of the State of California," January 2, 1905, p. 45, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 36th session, volume 1.

107. Journal of the Senate, 36th session, February 8, 1905, pp. 588-590.

108. Ibid., February 16, 1905, p. 750, March 3, 1905, p. 1315, and March 6, 1905, p. 1305; and Statutes (1905), Chapter 183, pp. 177-178, Approved March 18, 1905.

CHAPTER IV

MAJOR REMODELING (1905-1908)

The remodeling which took place during 1906, 1907, and 1908 was the single largest and most extensive change made to the capitol until the present restoration project. The responsibility for the remodeling fell to the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, rather than to the Secretary of State acting alone. Although by law contracts could not be let until January 1, 1906, the Commissioners decided to do all preliminary work before then so that actual construction could begin as soon as possible. During the summer of 1905, the process was started to select an architect for the job. H. A. Schulze, President of the State Board of Architecture, was hired as a consultant to advise the Capitol Commissioners as to the best method of selection. His recommendation was to invite prequalified architects to enter the competition according to the rules adopted by the American Institute of Architects. Each competitor was required to cover the same points in their designs which included sanitation of the building, fireproofing the building, the best use of all the space in the building, improvement of the Senate and Assembly Chambers, creating new space for committee rooms, and the installation of a new elevator system. On September 30, 1905, the San Francisco firm of Sutton and Weeks won the competition upon the recommendation of Schulze.¹ A report on what the remodeling would encompass, plus reproductions of the plans, were published in a local newspaper.²

In their report of December 1906, the Board of State Capitol Commissioners summarized the plans of Sutton and Weeks as follows:

The successful plans call for the elimination of the old stairways in the building, thus gaining space for twelve additional rooms. The old elevator is removed and two electric elevators are placed in the main corridor on either side of the rotunda. Two new stairways are provided for, adjacent to the elevators. The main entrance to the building is rendered more imposing by three doorways, and the removal of the front stairways gives room for a spacious vestibule, which will be decorated with marble. The old roof with its menacing wooden beams, which were rotting in places, is to give way to a modern fireproof covering supported by steel trusses. The ceilings of the Senate and Assembly Chambers are lowered about seven feet, which, with the raising of the roof, permits a fourth story to be added whose space will be converted into rooms for legislative committees and the State Library. The side galleries in the legislative chambers are eliminated and a new gallery with the proper incline is provided for. The lowering of the ceilings together with the removal of the side galleries will make far better proportioned rooms of the two chambers and will greatly enhance their acoustic properties. Legislative lounging and smoking rooms have been provided for, leading off from the lobbies and connecting with the main corridor by a separate hallway.

The basement is provided with area ways which will render it light and airy. There will be new heating, ventilating, lighting, and plumbing systems, and a telephone exchange. These are the main features of the improvements.³

Throughout January and February 1906, the plans were copied and advertised according to the California building laws so that construction bids could be solicited.⁴ Finally, on March 16, 1906, the bids, in eleven different categories, were opened in the presence of Governor Pardee and the other Commissioners. A quick calculation indicated that the total of the lowest bid in each specification category exceeded the appropriation by at least \$40,000. In order to determine what work could be legally eliminated under the terms of the appropriation, the matter was referred to the Attorney-General for his opinion. Within a few days, the problem was further complicated when Walker Brothers, who were bidders for both the masonry and carpentry contracts, discovered that they had made one of their bids \$40,000 too low. The error seemed to be of a bona fide nature, but it further increased the disparity between the original estimates and the actual bids. The commission decided to take no legal action against the firm.⁵ The public and the press felt some apprehension that the project would be delayed, but the Capitol Commissioners were confident that the tangle could be unraveled. By the end of March, the first three contracts were signed. John Hays of Los Angeles received the contract for excavation, masonry, terra cotta, and concrete for \$68,886. Others were C. A. Palm of Sacramento for iron work at a cost of \$46,137 and James Campbell of San Francisco for carpentering, plastering, and electrical wiring for \$112,900. The Commissioners were later able to negotiate a reduction of those bids at a savings of about \$65,000 to the state.⁶ The first week in April, an additional four contracts were let: heating and ventilating to Russel-Vail Engineering Company of Stockton for \$17,500; roofing, tinning, slating, and galvanized iron work to Roebing Construction Company of San Francisco for \$54,150; painting to George J. Smith of San Francisco for \$9,746; and to Bryan Elevator Company. Again, the Commissioners were able to enter into amended contracts with these firms at a savings to the state. Additional contracts were given to Robert Dalziel, Jr., Co. of Oakland for plumbing and gasfitting; A. Merle Co. of San Francisco for stairways and ornamental grills; and Columbia Marble Co. of San Francisco for marble work and tiling. In their final negotiated form, these contracts totaled \$315,291.00, leaving a balance of \$37,534.00 to cover the architects' fees, superintendent's salary, and miscellaneous expenses. On April 5, 1906, S. W. Getchell, a carpenter and builder from Oakland, was hired as superintendent of construction at \$175 a month.⁷ In order to appease labor interests, Governor Pardee assured the Building Trades Council that only California labor and materials would be used in the remodeling. Pardee's action was in response to a petition sent by the council to the Governor.⁸

Work began on April 8, 1906, only to be subjected to the trauma of the San Francisco earthquake ten days later. A survey of the building indicated that no damage had been done. After consultation with some of the major contractors, Albert Sutton favored moving quickly ahead on the job before building supplies became scarce due to a demand created by earthquake damage repair.⁹

By mid-May, the excavation of the areas around the building to admit light and air into the basement was nearly complete. The next step was to break larger openings through the foundation walls and to build retaining walls around those areas, about ten or twelve feet from the building. The foundation openings were cut through by the use of compressed air drills.¹⁰

At the end of April 1906, the work of erecting a construction elevator on the outside of the building, on the north side, began. The carpenters finished the frame for it by mid-May. The elevator, which extended from the ground to ten feet above the highest fire walls, was used for taking down the existing fire walls as far as necessary, for removing the statuary on the balustrade, for bringing down old material that was being removed, and for carrying up new construction material to the attic area. An additional elevator was planned near the south end of the building.¹¹

On the interior, preliminary work began on the north side of the building. Offices which would be disturbed during the remodeling, especially those on the third floor, began to be relocated to other spaces all over Sacramento. Directly affected were the offices of the Education Department, the State Board of Health, the Supreme Court Clerk, the Board of Lunacy, the offices and Chambers of the Court of Appeals, the State Engineer, the State Board of Examiners, the State Forester, and the Commissioner of Highways. Unnecessary furniture was stored at the S Street warehouse of John Breuner.¹²

It is hard to imagine that work as usual continued in the capitol during remodeling, but some offices remained opened. According to a local newspaper, the scene in the building's interior was confusing:

Scores of men are at work removing the property and fittings such offices as have been forced to take to new and but temporary quarters. Material taken down out of the stairways is piled in the halls; the great registers have been dismantled and their iron, marble and bronze fittings encumber the passage ways. The north end stairways have been taken out completely, and the vault beneath them formerly used by the State Printer, and once by the State Controller, has been removed and the masonry exposed from the ceiling of the third floor to the foundations of the basement, all the intermediate floors having been cut away.

The north stairway of the front has been taken down and a great well-hole, so to speak, created similar to that on the north. In the south half of the building nothing has as yet been done, and it will not be touched until all the other work is well under way.

One of the hardest tasks of the present is the removal of the State Library above the ground floor containing the law library, which will not be disturbed. All books, records, and documents above that floor and to the roof of the building must come out and be stored elsewhere, mainly in the Masonic Temple. It is not difficult to fancy what a great work this involves. All the books and documents have to be taken from shelves and lockers, carefully dusted and packed, the boxes lowered to the ground floor, and then carted away. As one worker on the job remarked, "If any

one doubts that the heaviest thing on earth is a box of books, let him tackle this job." Quite largely the task has been completed, and all the newspaper files and heavy tomes in the upper floor, on the north end, have already been removed.

The area outside the building was equally chaotic:

Cement works are broken up, debris is piled here and there, great mounds of earth, broken masonry, concrete work and the like disfigure the view, obstruct passage and make a walk around the building most uninviting;...¹³

One of the first major areas of work during the remodeling was the roof. The roof was badly deteriorated, as dismantling it testified, and it needed to be replaced for that reason alone. In addition, the attic space was being heightened to accommodate more office space. The new roof was to be higher than the old one and the ceilings of the chambers below were lowered. By mid-summer 1906, attention turned from interior demolition to the reconstruction of the roof. By late June, the old roof was removed and the job of removing the beams of the roof trusses, which spanned the building from east to west, began. The beams, made of Oregon Pine, were 12 by 14 inches and the ends were set into the walls about 14 inches. After more than 35 years, they were badly affected by dry rot. It was the assessment of James Campbell, the carpentry contractor, that it was quite surprising that the roof had not fallen in due to the heavy weight of the copper and sheathing on the weakened beams. In August, photographs of each of the legislative chambers, in a state of demolition and, literally, without a roof overhead, appeared in The Sacramento Union and Sacramentoans were given an inside view of the extensive nature of the remodeling.¹⁴

By September, the work of readying the building for a new roof was underway. The necessary brick work had been completed around the roofline that month. The next step was to install the ten-ton steel trusses which were to be placed over the Senate and Assembly Chambers to support both the new fourth floor and the roof. A total of seven trusses were to be installed. Each was cut into two sections and pulled to the top of the building by hand. By October, the contractor's crews were well at work on the roof over the Senate Chamber. They exerted great effort to get as much of the roof finished before the rains began.¹⁵ They lost their race with the weather, however. During the first week in November a light rain hit Sacramento which caused streams of water to pour into the capitol. Areas that were not directly saturated were damp and cold despite the gas heaters which were installed to provide warmth during the remodeling. Then during December, hard rains hit which caused considerable interior damage. The brick masons were blamed because during construction they frequently dropped bricks through the open roof area. These tore holes in the linoleum on the third floor below which allowed rain water to seep through to the lower floors. On the third floor, water stood from one to three inches deep. Problems in acquiring the steel, caused by the San Francisco earthquake, delayed the installation of a roof, even a temporary one, over the chambers.¹⁶ Despite these setbacks, Superintendent Getschell was able to report in January that the roof on the capitol would be finished within three weeks. By the 22nd, the roof was completed over the Senate

Chamber except for a coat of heavy felt paper and the finishing of tar and gravel. The steel work over the Assembly Chamber was installed awaiting a coat of concrete. The last area to be worked on was the roof over the apse. Getschell was quoted as saying,

The roof over the Capitol when finished will be absolutely fire and waterproof. Yes, it has taken a long time to do the work, but when finished there will be no finer job anywhere in this state.¹⁷

The initial time constraint required the work to be completed before January 1907. However, due to delays in acquiring materials, the time for the project was extended. The Commissioners were forced to announce that the capitol would not be in a condition to house the next session of the Legislature. When they did convene on January 7, 1907, it was in the newly constructed Red Men's Hall on 10th Street, between I and J streets, facing the City Plaza. The quarters were cramped for the 80-member Assembly and there was little room for spectators and lobbyists. Governor Gillett's inaugural ceremony, on January 9, was held at the Clunie Theater, at 811 K Street, where facilities were available to accommodate the crowd of 700 persons. In November of that year, Gillett called the Legislature into two extra sessions, the first on the 19th, the second on the 23rd. Then, the Senate met in the Union-Republican Clubrooms at 10th and K Streets, while the Assembly convened in the Turn Verein Hall at 912 K Street.¹⁸

One of the important issues which came before the Legislature's regular session was the question of the removal of the seat of government to Berkeley. On February 21, 1907, George R. Lukens of Alameda introduced the bill into the Senate. It passed that body exactly one week later and on March 2, the removal bill passed the Assembly. Despite eleventh hour protests from a committee of Sacramento businessmen and the Lodi Board of Trade, Governor Gillett approved the act on March 6. The text of the bill, as approved, read as follows:

Section 1. On and after the first day of January, A.D. nineteen hundred and nine, the seat of government of the State of California shall be changed from the city of Sacramento to the town of Berkeley, and it is hereby declared that on and after said date the town of Berkeley shall be the seat of government of this state.

Section 2. The question of such change of the seat of government shall be submitted to the people of the state at the general state election to be held in the month of November in the year nineteen hundred and eight....¹⁹

As incredible as it now seems, removal was being seriously considered in the midst of a one-third of a million dollars renovation of the capitol building.

Predictably, local newspapers mounted an anti-removal campaign. In early April, the Evening Bee announced that the Committee on Resolutions of the General Committee of Sacramentans had laid the foundation for a fight. "Those foundations," the paper wrote, "are of the eternal granite of American manhood--a manhood that will not permit itself to be slapped in the face by

corporate piratical political power...." The Building Trade Council of Sacramento also joined the campaign against removal to Berkeley. After inspecting the renovation that was currently taking place in the capitol building, they determined that the workmanship was of such good quality that it in itself was an argument against removal. Breuners, a local store which had a long-time relationship with the capitol as suppliers of furnishings, was so opposed to the removal proposal that they sponsored a newspaper contest for suggestions for new letterhead which would include a catchy phrase endorsing the capitol in Sacramento.²⁰

The Evening Bee offered the theory that the campaign for removal was spearheaded by both the Berkeley Real Estate Syndicate and the Southern Pacific Railroad. Despite the "clean bill of health" given to the building by the Building Trade Council of Sacramento, those two groups argued that a new capitol would soon have to be erected and that from a business point of view, it should be done soon. The Bee, a supporter of Democratic Party politics, credited Southern Pacific's involvement in the removal campaign as a punitive measure against Sacramento. In the gubernatorial election of November 6, 1906, Sacramento had supported the Democratic Party candidate, Theodore A. Bell; the Southern Pacific, very involved with the Republican Party, had supported the successful James W. Gillett.²¹

The matter finally came to a vote at the general election held on November 3, 1908. On the morning of the election, the Sacramento Union greeted its readers with the front page headline, "Say 'No!' to Berkeley's Insolent Appeal." Sacramentans were jubilant when the votes were counted: the measure lost by a vote of 165,630 to 87,378.²²

Meanwhile, towards the end of 1906, attention began to focus on the interior of the building. The original appropriation called for general improvements on each floor of the interior, as well as approximately \$18,450, specifically for painting and decorating. Albert Sutton, however, recommended to the Capitol Commissioners that the scope of the project be increased, primarily for interior embellishments. He felt that while the building was dismantled additional work could be done more cheaply than after the building was reassembled. His recommendation included the following:²³

First -- I would recommend that an appropriation of \$50,000 be made for the re-decoration of the building throughout. The ceilings of the two legislative chambers in particular will be ornate and require and are entitled to considerable decoration.

Second -- I recommend that the Dome, from the ground floor to the apex of the arch, be re-decorated with marble scagliola and ornamental plaster in keeping with the main entrance when completed. How chilling it is to step from a rich, well-treated vestibule into a cold, gloomy, unattractive dome or rotunda, by comparison. The entire impression of the building which starts out good, is spoiled. For this an appropriation of \$60,000 should be made.

Third -- I recommend that the walls of the corridors throughout the building be wainscoted with marble, which would be covered by an appropriation of \$60,000.

Fourth -- I recommend that the present wooden floor throughout the building be removed and concrete flooring be substituted, as is common in all first-class buildings. This will cost \$18,000.

Fifth -- I recommend that the concrete floors be covered with battleship linoleum in place of carpets, which always appear unclean and are unsanitary. The former will last a lifetime, while the latter only from two to four years. An appropriation of \$20,000 would be made to cover this change.

Sixth -- I recommend that an electric lighting and power plant be installed. At the present time the State is paying at the rate of 5 cents for its electric lights, and with the new system of wiring must be added an electrician to its corps of employes, whereas with their own plant they can manufacture the same current at the rate of 2-1/2 cents, with no more than the increase of one electrician to its staff of employes. A plant could be installed without affecting the present system of wiring in any way, and would require an expenditure of \$10,000.

Seventh -- I recommend that a modern burglar-proof vault door with time lock be substituted for the present one to the Treasurer's vault. This will require an outlay of \$2,500.

Eighth -- I recommend that all of the administrative offices in the building be equipped with modern steel furniture, for which an appropriation of \$100,000 will be required. The recent fire in San Francisco demonstrated that the best protection is none too good.

In reference to my recommendation for the steel furniture it might not be amiss to call attention to the fact that the State of Massachusetts has equipped its Capitol Building with steel furniture at an expenditure of \$204,000, and the State of Georgia is doing likewise at an expenditure of about \$105,000. Other governments can be cited, if necessary, which have followed in the footsteps of Massachusetts and Georgia.

Ninth -- I recommend that an underground system of electric light wires, with ornamental cast-iron poles, be provided for lighting the grounds, which will require an expenditure of \$7,500.

Tenth -- I recommend that an appropriation of about \$10,000 be made for installing the necessary light fixtures which will be required on the fourth story, and for such new light fixtures as may be necessary in the basement, first, second, and third floors, and the refinishing and repairing of the present light fixtures.

The Capitol Commissioners agreed with Sutton's recommendations and appeared willing to ask the next Legislature (1907) for the necessary \$338,000.²⁴

On February 25, 1907, Senator Belshaw introduced Senate Bill No. 880 -- "An Act making an appropriation of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000), to be expended by the Board of Capitol Commissioners for making alterations,

repairs, improvements, and for otherwise completing and embellishing the State Capitol, being an additional appropriation for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of an Act entitled, 'An Act authorizing and directing the Board of Capitol Commissioners to remodel and repair the State Capitol building, making the same fire proof, rendering all space therein available, and making an appropriation therefor,' approved March 18, 1905...." The bill was approved by Governor Gillett on March 11, 1907.²⁵ While \$20,000 was only a small fraction of the amount wanted, it did provide for some extra interior work which would not otherwise have been done.

In March, not only did the Commissioners have some additional money in hand, but the enormous job of putting a new roof on the building was nearly completed. These two factors enabled attention to be turned to the interior of the capitol building. By mid-March, crews were at work on the third floor tearing up flooring, ripping out partitions, and laying telephone wires. By the end of the month, the fireproof floors were being laid on the new fourth floor.²⁶

During the summer of 1907, contractors were feeling a financial pinch due to a lack of available materials and funds. Because of the demand for materials and labor after the 1906 earthquake, their cost had gone up until the contractors on the capitol job were losing money. Several firms were interested in discontinuing their work, but they were already so financially involved that it was more advantageous for them to complete their work at a loss than to quit and forfeit everything. To relinquish their contracts would mean that the state would save money and the contractors would be losers of that amount. Because the state signed the contracts before the 1906 disaster, they saved somewhere between \$50,000 and \$100,000. The scarcity of labor made progress slow and in June 1907, it was felt that another year would be needed to complete the work.²⁷ Another problem which caused delays during the summer of 1907 was labor difficulties. An iron workers' strike in San Francisco delayed the acquisition of iron for the stairways. In addition, other structural steel was held up on the Santa Fe Railroad, which required a personal investigation by Secretary of State Curry, who got the matter cleared up. Then, in July, the cement workers struck for several days.²⁸

Despite the fact that materials and labor were scarce, work on the building was progressing at the most rapid rate since the remodeling began. By the end of August 1907, the heating apparatus was installed in the building, with the exception of some detail work that could not be completed until other work on the building was completed. A thorough testing was done to the equipment, under the supervision of A. Van Pelt, a representative of architect Sutton. The equipment operated very satisfactorily.²⁹

New elevators were installed in the capitol by the Bryant Company and by October 1907, the new elevator in the south wing was in running condition. Although intended for passenger service, the cage was left off during the remodeling so that it could serve as a freight elevator. The second elevator, in the north wing, was installed shortly after and the two were accepted by the Capitol Commissioners at their meeting of December 11, 1907. However, within only a few years complaints were made about the slowness of the elevators and they were replaced.³⁰

The A. Merle Company of San Francisco got off to a belated start in installing the new stairways in the building and then proceeded to do the work slowly. In December 1907, much of the interior of the capitol was completed, yet the job of constructing the stairway had not begun. On the 12th, the Capitol Commissioners warned the contractors that unless their work was completed in two weeks, they would be fined \$100 a day for every day the work was delayed. The next week, it was announced that A. Merle Company would have the job done within two months. On the 23rd, the contractor still had not actually commenced construction. By that time, much of the interior was remodeled and some employees were waiting for a convenient way of getting to their offices on the upper floors. Finally, on December 26, the company began the work.³¹

Meanwhile, during the late summer and fall months, many of the spaces in the building underwent redecoration. Great effort must have gone into this project. According to a description written just following the remodeling,

The rooms of all the state officers are beautifully and uniquely decorated and furnished, no two being alike. The walls of the rooms are tinted and the ceilings and friezes are decorated with the seal of the state and with flowers, such as roses, magnolias, and wild flowers, or scroll work touched up with gold leaf as the central idea; or they are painted to represent a piece of tapestry or an oriental rug. The furniture is either mahogany, black walnut, or oak. The furniture and decorations, and the carpets, hardwood, or recolith floors, as the case may be, are arranged so as to produce a harmonious and pleasing effect.³²

Much of this decorating work, as Superintendent Getchell later explained, was extra work, not originally called for in the plans and specifications for the remodeling. In all, a total of 22 rooms on the third floor and seven on the second floor were "tinted". An additional four on the second floor were "decorated". The most extensive work was completed on the first floor which included the decoration of three rooms of the Governor's, three rooms of the Secretary of State's, three rooms of the Treasurer's, four rooms of the Controller's, three rooms of the Attorney General's, two rooms of the Board of Equalization's, and three rooms in the Judges' Chambers. Tinted only, and not decorated, were two rooms of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, one room of the Appellate Court, the corridors of the first, second, and third floors, and the galleries under the Senate and Assembly.³³

The Governor's office was given special attention. Some construction work took place there as well as redecoration. The east wall of the Governor's old, small, private office was moved out into former corridor space, enlarging that area into a reception office. The old "front office" was turned into the Governor's private office. The marble mantles were torn out, as they were all over the building, and were sold by the contractor for \$1.00. Superintendent Samuel Getchell hired a San Francisco decorator, by the name of Hall, to design the rooms. The intent was to copy the office of the Secretary of the United States Senate. By mid-November, the decorators had finished the Governor's private office and the reception area. The results sound very beautiful:

The main feature of the decorations in the Governor's private and business offices is the California poppy in cloud and sky effects on the ceiling and frieze of the walls, which are tinted a delicate green with a five-foot base of pure white lincrusta decorated with gold leaf scrolls. The walls of the Governor's reception room are tinted a dark red, the decorations on the ceiling and frieze being paintings of California wild flowers. The furniture in the Governor's rooms is mahogany with the exception of the record cases, which are of hand carved black walnut. The carpets in the Governor's private and business offices are red Wiltons, and in the reception room the carpet is a rich green velvet. Oil painted portraits of former Governors of California are hung in the several rooms of the State offices; most of them, however, are to be seen on the walls of the Governor's offices.³⁴

One of the major parts of this decorating effort, as well as in the other parts of the building, was painting. The contractor, George J. Smith of San Francisco, began the job during the fall of 1907.³⁵ In October a painting crew was in full operation on the building's exterior. In a race against the fall rains they had the first coat applied by the end of October. Their initial painting efforts on the dome over the cupola gave the local citizenry a momentary shock. A local newspaper explained,

During the last week the dome of the Capitol has been painted green and the fact had occasioned no little inquiry as to whether or not it is the intention of the Capitol Commissioners to have the dome tinted that color instead of gold, as it always has been.

Inquiry to-day elicited the information that the present coat is only a temporary one and will be replaced by the old, familiar gilt.³⁶

This, no doubt, referred to the dome over the cupola, not the larger dome. The larger dome had been painted slate green after 1893. The dome over the cupola, however, had been gold leafed for many years. The job of painting the outside of the capitol was completed by December and attention turned to the interior.³⁷ Beginning in February 1908, the painting effort had a temporary setback because of the financial failure of the contracting firm. In April, the Capitol Commissioners were forced to take charge of the work and complete it with the state funds still available, which amounted to about \$4,750. In June, the rooms on the new fourth floor were completed and many were occupied. Painters were also at work on giving the walls of the corridors their first coats. The job was expected to be finished in July. Some detail work continued for several months, including painting the ballisters and rail in the rotunda; repairing and tinting the walls and ceiling in the Senate lobby; staining and varnishing the lincrusta in the Senate lobby; painting the Senate and Assembly Cloak rooms; and schellacking, marbleizing, and varnishing the new columns in the Senate and Assembly chambers.³⁸ As these paint details suggest, work was completed first on the capitol offices, leaving the less critical spaces, such as the rotunda and legislative chambers, until last. There was no legislative session held during 1908 to interfere with the work there.

While the painting was still continuing plans were being made and carried out to reoccupy the capitol. In October 1907, the Capitol Commissioners met for the first time for the purpose of apportioning the rooms in the building. At that time, the Commissioners were still hoping to complete the building by January 1, 1908. On the 12th, the commission announced the new room assignments which were awarded

with a view to comfort and convenience. All the legal departments, such as the Attorney-General, Supreme, Appellate Court, and their attaches, have been put together. The various medical departments are grouped, as are the Commissions and offices nearly related to each other.³⁹

By the end of November 1907, the offices on the third floor of the capitol were ready for occupancy. Last minute details included the installation of electrical plugs which were somehow left off the plans for the third floor. Incredibly, it was reported that "The state officials who are to occupy these rooms on the floor have agreed to pay for the plugs out of their own pockets."⁴⁰ On November 26, those officials who had been displaced during the remodeling began to return to the capitol. This exodus began just in time because the \$10,000 appropriated to pay rent for temporary office quarters was nearly exhausted.⁴¹ Before the remodeling was completed, however, the fund finally became depleted and the next session of the Legislature appropriated \$4,533.46 to pay for the deficiency.⁴²

By the first of the year, 1908, the reoccupation of the building was essentially complete except for the legislative chambers. Painting and minor repairs continued in that area for several months. In late May 1908, the Sacramento Union reported, "It will be a few months before the structure can be said to be complete, but it is in its present stage a surprise, and a most agreeable one."⁴³

The building had had many changes made to it. The addition of the fourth floor and the removal of the front interior stairs helped to create enough space to nearly double the number of the original 73 rooms. For example, the Secretary of State's new private office was just to the right of the front vestibule, where the southernmost of the original front stairs once rose.⁴⁴ A new roof was installed; the building was painted and decorated inside and out; new elevators and fireproof stairs were installed; the front vestibule was redesigned with an application of Utah marble and the installation of new entry doors at the west entrance; the chambers had been structurally altered by lowering the ceilings, removing parts of the visitors' galleries, and installing new plaster columns to replace the original ones of cast iron; the original marble fireplaces were removed from the building; marble mosaics were laid on the second floor corridor; and new mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems were introduced, including much needed ventilation. The exterior of the building remained essentially unchanged except for the removal of the Ransom stone balustrade and statues atop it; the addition of windows in the newly created fourth story; and the painting of the dome roof a solid color, eliminating the white ribs. The accolade expressed by the State Board of Health indicates the sanitary improvements made to the building during the remodeling. They wrote,

It is a satisfaction to speak of the fine condition of our State Capitol. The building is clean, well ventilated and heated, and sanitary conditions are perfect. It is an honor to the State, and is unsurpassed by any like building in the country.⁴⁵

On a more humorous note, the Union reported,

The many improvements being made to the state capitol building has set the janitors wondering who will do all the work. Just now they are worrying about who will be selected to shine the copper case of the new revolving door that has been placed at the west entrance....⁴⁶

In his report of August 31, 1908, Superintendent S. W. Getchell gave a final accounting of the remodeling project. A total of \$332,739.16 was expended for 12 contracts; \$16,202.53 for architects' fees; and \$23,983.31 for the labor and materials to construct a temporary winter roof during construction, for Getchell's salary and for miscellaneous items.⁴⁷

Finally, on January 4, 1909, the Legislature convened in its newly designed and redecorated chambers. The rooms were decidedly more austere than before. According to Secretary of State Curry,

In accordance with custom, the Senate chamber is furnished in red and the Assembly in green, the desks of the members are of black walnut, and those of the presiding officer and clerks are of hand-carved mahogany. Neither one of these rooms is decorated, and the ceilings and walls of both are white with the exception of the lobbies under the galleries, which are painted green in the Assembly and blue in the Senate. A five-foot lincrusta border above the marble base is painted red in the Senate and green in the Assembly chamber.⁴⁸

One sign of the change of the times was that the portrait of John A. Sutter, which had long graced the Assembly, was replaced by one of Abraham Lincoln, no doubt an effort to either counter accusations of California provincialism or to show Republican loyalty. Despite the setbacks caused by the San Francisco earthquake, financial difficulties, and the politics of removal, the capitol remodeling was complete.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners to the Thirty-seventh Session of the Legislature of California, 1907," pp. 6-7, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 37th session, volume 1.
2. Sacramento Union, October 15, 1905, 1/1-7.
3. "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissions, 1907," p. 7.
4. Sacramento Union, January 9, 1906, 9/7; Controller's Claim #8376, Making Blue Prints of Capitol Plans, January 26, 1906, Roll H30, Controller's Office, California State Archives, Sacramento, California; Controller's Claim #10545, James McClatchy Co., Bill for Advertising Notice to contractors in connection with Capitol improvements, February 7, 1906, Roll H30, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #10545, The Builder and Contractor, Los Angeles, Bill for Advertising Notice, March 1, 1906, Roll H30, Controller's Office; Claim #10545, San Francisco Call, Bill for Advertising Notice, February 8, 1906, Roll H30, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #9486, Burt Hudson, Photographing Capitol Improvement Plans, February 12, 1906, Roll H30, Controller's Office.
5. Sacramento Union, March 17, 1906, 7/3, March 21, 1906, 7/3, and March 29, 1906, 4/3.
6. Ibid., March 22, 1906, 7/4, March 29, 1906, 4/3, and April 4, 1906, 5/3-4.
7. "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, 1907," p. 8; Sacramento Union, April 4, 1906, 5/3-4 and April 6, 1906, 5/4; and Evening Bee, April 5, 1906, 5/1.
8. San Francisco Examiner, March 30, 1906, 2/6.
9. Sacramento Union, April 19, 1906, 9/2 and April 24, 1906, 10/1.
10. Ibid., May 1, 1906, 4/4, May 13, 1906, 20/3, and May 23, 1906, 12/1.
11. Ibid., May 1, 1906, 4/4 and May 13, 1906, 20/3.
12. Ibid., May 3, 1906, 10/2; and Controller's Claim #7001, John Breuner, October 5, 1906, Roll H31, Controller's Office.
13. Sacramento Union, May 13, 1906, 20/3.
14. Ibid., June 22, 1906, 5/1 and August 10, 1906, 1/6-7.
15. Ibid., September 20, 1906, 12/1 and October 13, 1906, 5/2.
16. Ibid., August 1, 1906, 10/1-2, November 3, 1906, 3/4, November 6, 1906, 4/3, and December 27, 1906, 12/1.
17. Ibid., January 22, 1907, 5/5 and March 12, 1907, 9/3.

18. "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, 1907," p. 9; Sacramento Bee, May 8, 1975, B3/1-3; and C. F. Curry, comp., California Blue Book or State Roster, 1909 (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1909), p. 562.
19. Ibid., p. 722; Sacramento Union, February 22, 1907, 3/4 and 9/2, March 3, 1907, 1/6-7 and 11/1-2, and March 7, 1907, 1/4-5 and 9/4; and California, Statutes (1907), Chapter 98, p. 121, Approved March 6, 1907.
20. Evening Bee, April 4, 1907, 4/1-2, April 9, 1907, 12/2, and April 13, 1907, 7/4-7.
21. Ibid., April 22, 1907, 4/3-4 and April 23, 1907, 4/3-4.
22. Sacramento Union, November 3, 1908, 1/7 and 2/4; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 722.
23. "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, 1907," pp. 12-13.
24. Sacramento Union, December 22, 1906, 1/6-7 and 7/2-3; and San Francisco Call, January 14, 1907, 2/5.
25. Statutes (1907), Chapter 176, p. 205, Approved March 11, 1907.
26. Sacramento Union, March 12, 1907, 9/3 and March 28, 1907, 12/3.
27. Ibid., May 28, 1907, 9/2 and June 6, 1907, 5/4-5.
28. Ibid., June 13, 1907, 16/1, July 9, 1907, 7/5, July 26, 1907, 2/1-2, and July 28, 1907, 10/5.
29. Evening Bee, August 23, 1907, 8/2.
30. Ibid., October 9, 1907, 2/1 and January 20, 1913, 1/5; and Sacramento Union, July 9, 1907, 7/5 and December 12, 1907, 3/3.
31. Ibid., December 12, 1907, 3/3, December 18, 1907, 4/4, December 23, 1907, 5/3, and December 27, 1907, 10-2.
32. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 21.
33. S. W. Getchell to the Honorable Board of State Capitol Commissioners, August 31, 1908, in "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners to the Thirty-eighth Session of the Legislature of California, 1909", in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 38th session, volume 1.
34. Sacramento Union, October 30, 1907, 7/2 and November 17, 1907, 9/3; Evening Bee, September 30, 1907, 8/5 and November 16, 1907, 19/1; and California Blue Book, 1909, p. 21.
35. Sacramento Union, October 8, 1907, 7/3.
36. Evening Bee, October 24, 1907, 12/1.
37. Sacramento Union, December 11, 1907, 12/2.

38. Ibid., February 3, 1908, 10/2, February 5, 1908, 10/2, April 4, 1908, 10/1, June 3, 1908, 7/3, and December 6, 1907, 12/1; and Controller's Claim #13013, A. S. Baker, Work done December 8, 1908-December 19, 1908, work done December 14, 1908-January 3, 1909, and work done October 24, 1908, Roll H36, Controller's Office.

39. Evening Bee, October 7, 1907, 5/2 and October 12, 1907, 1/6-7.

40. Sacramento Union, November 15, 1907, 7/1.

41. Ibid., October 24, 1907, 7/3, November 10, 1907, 10/1, November 26, 1907, 10/4, and November 28, 1907, 5/1; Evening Bee, November 26, 1907, 11/2; Controller's Claim #14712, Globe Transfer, Van and Storage Company, May 1, 1908, Roll H33, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #9049, Globe Transfer, Van and Storage Co., December 31, 1907, Roll H33, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #10442, Globe Transfer, Van and Storage Co., January 27, 1908, Roll H33, Controller's Office.

42. Statutes (1909), Chapter 11, p. 6, Approved February 5, 1909.

43. Sacramento Union, May 24, 1908, 16/1.

44. Sacramento Union, May 24, 1908/ 16/1.

45. Twentieth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of California for the Fiscal Years from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1908 (Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, Supt. State Printing, 1908), p. 26.

46. Sacramento Union, July 17, 1908, 5/2.

47. Getchell to Senate and Assembly, August 31, 1908, in "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, 1909," pp. 5-6.

48. California Blue Book, 1909, p. 21.

CHAPTER V
UNDER A PROGRESSIVE GOVERNMENT
(1909-1921)

The purpose of the major remodeling of the capitol had been, of course, to provide more space in the building for offices. This was a reaction to a growth in state government which, in turn, reflected the growth of population within the state. However, within only a few years after this structural change to the capitol, California state government was rocked by a whirlwind of Progressive reforms which expanded the role of state government, involving it in areas and issues where it had never before been involved. New regulatory boards and commissions were established, such as the Industrial Audit Board and the Commission of Immigration and Housing, and some existing ones were reformed and given new authority, such as the California Railroad Commission.¹ One result of this era of reform was that state government literally needed more room. The state responded in three ways: construction of new state buildings in Sacramento, the capital city; construction of state buildings in major population centers outside of Sacramento; and reorganization of existing space and even the eventual creation of additional space within the capitol itself.

The remodeling of 1906-1908 was the last "major" remodeling effort on the building until the major restoration beginning in 1976. Changes to the building thereafter were mainly of a minor nature. But, they were nearly continuous, the result of an ongoing effort to modernize and reshift spaces within a seemingly shrinking structure. By the 1970s, the inside of the capitol bared little resemblance to its former self.

The Legislature had reoccupied the building scarcely two months after the remodeling when that body passed Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 18 which appropriated \$4,500 for better heating and ventilating of the Senate and Assembly Chambers, committee rooms, and other rooms on the third and fourth floors. The work was to be completed prior to the beginning of the next session in January 1911.²

To add some conveniences to the capitol for its employees, a lunch counter was purchased by the state and installed, presumably, early in 1909. The counter (48 inches high, 17 feet 6 inches long, with a panel front, interior fittings, and a walnut finish) was slated for a lunchroom somewhere in the capitol building.³ Apparently this establishment lacked the notoriety of its predecessor, the Well.

The Legislature, which convened in January 1911, was controlled in both houses by the newly elected Progressives. This change in political makeup had an effect on the responsibility for the supervision of the capitol. Beginning in 1860, the capitol construction and maintenance was supervised by a five member Board of State Capitol Commissioners, which included the Governor, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, and two private citizens. In 1870, the commission was reduced to the three constitutional officers. The Secretary of State assumed responsibility for the building, while the commission as a whole managed Capitol Park. Under this system each Commissioner was allowed to

personally select people to maintain the building and park as political patronage appointees. In April 1911, this system underwent major revisions and a new professional position, the Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds, was created by the Legislature. This position was to be filled and the person to serve at the pleasure of the Governor, as a civil executive officer. The superintendent, in turn, hired employees to carry out the work.⁴ In his first Biennial Message to the Legislature, in 1913, Progressive Governor Hiram Johnson made a point of mentioning this new professionally run operation:

The wisdom of this course has been amply shown in the improved service in the building and the immensely improved condition of the beautiful park that surrounds our Capitol. The present Superintendent has proved himself in every respect qualified; and the new departure by which his office was created and the old commission abolished, like all of the measures designed for efficiency, has amply justified itself.⁵

In 1921, the office of Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds was placed under the jurisdiction of the newly created Department of Finance.⁶ It stayed there until 1963 when it was placed in the Department of General Services. From 1911, and for some 35 years, the primary responsibility for the building fell to this Progressive-created office. Beginning in the 1940s the Legislature took an increasingly assertive role over responsibility for the building although the work was usually carried out by buildings and grounds staff.

George G. Radcliff, the first superintendent, set about to coordinate and centralize many services provided to capitol employees, including purchasing of supplies, creation of a capitol typewriter repair service, mimeograph service, installation of an ice storage plant in the basement, and coordination of water and electricity for the building, including the installation of a modern electric pump in the basement to replace the steam pump used to lift water to two storage tanks in the attic.⁷

In addition to housekeeping functions, the superintendent oversaw all of the improvements and maintenance for which the Legislature chose to appropriate money. One early exception to this rule was an appropriation of \$600 made in 1911 to construct cases or cabinets in the rotunda of the capitol for the display of "certain colors, flags, guidons, and standards carried by California soldiers in the war of the rebellion, the Spanish-American war, or other active service". This special exhibit was planned under the supervision of the Secretary of State and the State Adjutant-General, with the control and custody of the articles to be strictly under the latter.⁸

Not long after Radcliff's tenure began, a major decorative element was added to the capitol building. This was the decoration of the first floor of the rotunda with a large mural. Many years before, Gordon Cummings, a capitol architect during the construction years, recommended that the ceilings and panels of the capitol dome be painted with images connected with the history of California.⁹ Since no appropriation was made at the time it was not immediately realized. Nearly fifty years later, in 1913, the Legislature appropriated \$10,000

for the purpose of decorating the rotunda of the main or ground floor of the State Capitol building. The decoration of said rotunda shall consist of mural paintings with appropriate and harmonious ceiling designs, and the mural work shall depict historical epoch periods of California.¹⁰

A contract was to be administered and the job supervised by the State Board of Control.¹¹ On October 15, 1913, Arthur F. Mathews, a well-known San Francisco artist, was selected to design and execute the artistic work. He was experienced as a muralist, having decorated panels in the Masonic Temple, Union Trust Company Building, Mechanics' Library, and Cooper Library, all in San Francisco.¹² The Board hoped the work would be completed in time for the Pan-Pacific Exposition in 1915, when many visitors were expected to visit California and the state's capital.¹³ In September 1914, Mathews was paid a second installment of \$2,500 "on account of completion of preparation of walls, Etc.", and in October Superintendent Radcliff reported to Governor Johnson that the work had just been completed.¹⁴

The mural, painted on canvas and then attached to the rotunda walls, was comprised of twelve panels, each quadrant of the rotunda containing a triptych unified by a historical theme. The four themes, each roughly representing an epoch in California history, were: the coming of the "White Gods"; the Spanish and Mexican occupation; the Anglo-American occupation; and the achievements of "civilization" in California at the present time and in the future.¹⁵

The rotunda was an area which seemed to be set aside for the display of artwork and historical objects. It housed, of course, the statue of Isabella and Columbus, in addition to the mural. Sometime after the installation of the mural, glass-topped "coffin-type" exhibit cases were placed below the panels, which contained photographs, artifacts, books, Indian materials, and other "Californiana". A news item, written in 1928, announced that "An interesting exhibit of early California material is still maintained in the rotunda of the Capitol", indicating that it had been there for some time.¹⁶ During the 1940s, at least, the exhibits were supervised by the State Library and the material came from their own collection and from the State Indian Museum.¹⁷

Patriotic exhibits apparently had a long history in the capitol. As early as 1863, the Secretary of State was in possession of certain flags carried by Californians in the Civil War. Secretary B. B. Redding declared they would be "displayed in a conspicuous position in the Assembly Room".¹⁸ Photographs taken around the turn of the century show the flags displayed in exhibit cases in an unidentified room in the capitol. In 1911, as mentioned above, the Legislature appropriated \$600 "for the display in the State Capitol of certain colors, flags, guidons, and standards carried by California soldiers in certain wars and active service." The statute called for the cases or cabinets to be installed in the rotunda.¹⁹ The flags remained in cases on the second floor of the rotunda until their removal June 4, 1976. Other patriotic items were also displayed in the rotunda. On February 12, 1928, Governor C. C. Young unveiled two bronze tablets which were hung in the

rotunda area. The plaques, one inscribed with Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and the other with John A. Logan's Memorial Day order, were donated to the state by the Womens' Relief Corps, an auxiliary of the Grand Army of the Republic.²⁰

From about 1912 until about 1930, when major occupation shifts were made in the building following the opening of Office Building 1 and the Library-Courts Building, changes to the capitol were small when looked at job by job. But, taken in their entirety, the building was severely altered. These changes were usually the result of a maintenance problem and often dealt with painting, flooring repairs, elevators, and minor remodeling of office spaces.

The elevators in the capitol became a controversial issue. Although the current elevators were installed in 1907, by 1913 many legislators complained that they were too slow. Superintendent Radcliff announced that the two elevators had been second-hand when they were acquired and had come out of the Monadnock Building in San Francisco, one of the few buildings to survive the 1906 earthquake and fire. They had been removed from that building because they were too slow. Radcliff was not sure if the state knew it was getting used merchandise at the time.²¹ During the 1913 session of the Legislature, an appropriation of \$10,000 was approved for new elevators and their installation, and bids were advertised in The Builder and Contractor.²²

By the end of 1914 new elevators, provided by the Pacific Gurney Elevator Company of San Francisco, were installed. Ralston Iron Works remodeled the elevator grills and the Randall Elevator Door Company installed pneumatic door opening devices.²³

Bids were opened September 4, 1914 "for remodeling of the State Library and construction, erection and installation of an electrically operated passenger elevator in said State Library...."²⁴ By September 1917, a total of four elevators were in operation in the building and subject to inspection by the Industrial Accident Commission.²⁵

In August 1928, drawings were completed for framing an elevator shaft. The next May the Legislature appropriated \$80,000 "for repairs, improvements and equipment at the State Capitol Building, Sacramento, including the installation of two new elevators...." The act was declared to be an emergency measure for the following reason:

Because of the obsolete and worn out condition of the elevators in the State Capitol it is necessary that they be immediately replaced with new elevators. Without such replacement the safety of the public will be seriously imperiled.²⁶

The next July the Department of Public Works issued contracts for installing new elevators. The San Francisco Chronicle reported,

Two elevators, capable of 350 feet per minute, are to be installed by the Pacific Elevator and Equipment Company, San Francisco, in the Capitol at a cost of \$22,170, installation to be within 120 days.²⁷

When the job was completed it totaled \$35,008.07.²⁸ First floor plans which appeared in a 1942 publication indicate one elevator in the north-south corridor of the north wing, one at the north side of the apse, in the former State Library quarters, and two in the north-south corridor of the south wing. The southernmost of these two was located in the stairwell which was eliminated in the 1906-1908 remodeling.²⁹ When, exactly, a third elevator was added to the first floor south corridor is not certain.

In June 1913, a second major appropriation was made by the Legislature at that session for the capitol building. A total of \$12,000 was made available for painting the building's exterior.³⁰ The bids were opened in September for painting and refinishing the capitol and for re-gilding the roof of the lantern on the dome. The competition was won by Schneider, Chappel and Jones, and by the end of November they received their final payment. In 1917, they did an additional \$1,700 amount of painting on the building.³¹ In 1914, the granite on the building and steps was sandblasted.³² Repairs were made to the roof when, during the summer and spring of 1916, the framework of all 45 skylights were puttied and painted by the capitol engineer and fireman. During that fall, the water storage tanks in the attic of the capitol were washed, had the rust removed, and were given a coat of red lead and oil.³³ In 1925, another \$15,000 was appropriated for cleaning the granite, repairing the roof, and painting the building.³⁴

In an increasingly overcrowded office building, which had a fair amount of foot traffic through it, wear and tear was evident in the building and it required continuous maintenance. We know that in 1912 the state acquired 44 yards of Battleship linoleum from the firm of Clement and Dunn of Sacramento, perhaps to revitalize some worn office or corridor.³⁵ During December 1914 and January 1915, the floor area in the rotunda was repaired. Henry Wicks provided 127 tiles (not specified, but probably ceramic tile for the second floor) and the Carlaw Brothers repaired marble tile in the rotunda and vestibule. Apparently also related to the same job was a small amount of plastering in the rotunda.³⁶ In 1915, a new door was installed at the main entrance to the capitol and in 1918, nine radiators of various sizes were furnished to either supplement or replace the existing heating system.³⁷

A certain amount of minor redecorating and remodeling also took place during this time. During the 1913 session the Senate discussed the merits of a proposal for San Quentin Prison inmates to construct new desks and chairs for their members. Those Senators in favor declared that the existing desks had already outlived their usefulness. Those opposed were concerned that the capitol had "already been architecturally butchered", and apparently did not want the same fate for their furniture. The proposal passed the Senate but was never carried out.³⁸

The Treasurer's office was another area which needed physical improvement and the Legislature of 1915 appropriated \$3,000 for that purpose. Treasurer Friend Richardson reported that the money

has been used in adding to the safety of the vault and remodeling and improving the working conditions in this office. While the appropriation was a small one, it has been expended in such a manner as to make a marked

improvement in the physical condition of the office. A modern counter, new grill work, efficient lighting, and other necessary improvements have been made.³⁹

In 1916, several of the capitol offices received new carpets, with Superintendent Radcliff promising the same for several other offices soon. Interior painting was continuous in the over 140 rooms and in 1916, several of the committee rooms on the fourth floor were painted and tinted, again with a promise from Radcliff that some offices on other floors would also be repainted and touched up. That same year, a United States Post Office substation was installed in Room 23 on the first floor for the convenience of the capitol employees.⁴⁰ In 1921, yet another appropriation, this one for \$8,500, was made "for repairs, improvements and alterations to and on the Capitol building and grounds."⁴¹

By 1916, the staff required to operate and maintain the capitol building, Capitol Park, and the Governor's Mansion had grown to 45 people. They included policemen, elevator attendants, telephone operators, a lawn-mower driver, porters, gardeners, a typewriter mechanic, engineer, teamster, fireman, and electrician, as well as the superintendent and his clerk.⁴²

FOOTNOTES

1. Walton Bean, California, An Interpretive History (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1968), pp. 326-339.
2. Controller's Claim #11567, Scott, Lyman and Stack, January 26, 1910, Roll H38, Controller's Office, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.
3. Controller's Claim #13690, Suter-Havener Mill and Manufacturing Co., February 19, 1910, Roll H36, Controller's Office.
4. California, Statutes (1911), Chapter 340, pp. 571-573, Approved April 1, 1911; California Progressive Campaign Book for 1914: Progressive Administration in California Under Hiram W. Johnson (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 30; and "First Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds of California" (July 1, 1911 to July 1, 1914), p. 5, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 41st session, volume 3.
5. "First Biennial Message of Governor Hiram W. Johnson," January 6, 1913, p. 29, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 40th session, volume 1.
6. George H. Moore, comp., California Blue Book, 1942 (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1942), p. 138.
7. "First Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds," p. 19.
8. Statutes (1911), Chapter 357, p. 619, Approved April 5, 1911.
9. Gordon P. Cummings to Board of State Capitol Commissioners, in "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners," 1864-1865, p. 23, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, volume 2.
10. Statutes (1913), Chapter 155, p. 237, Approved May 20, 1913.
11. Sacramento Union, October 15, 1913, 1/3.
12. Sacramento Bee, October 15, 1913, 1/1.
13. Ibid., October 3, 1913, 5/4.
14. "First Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds," p. 14; and Controller's Claim #6945, Arthur F. Mathews, September 14, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office.
15. "The Murals in the State Capitol," in News Notes of California Libraries 23 (April 1928), pp. 173-174.
16. "Exhibit," in News Notes of California Libraries 23 (April 1928), p. 173.

17. Workers of the Writers Program of the Work Projects Administration in Northern California, comp., California's State Capitol (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1942), pp. 60-61.
18. B. B. Redding, Secretary of State, to George S. Evans, Adjutant General, November 9, 1863, copy in General Services Central File, Folder 54.03.04, Sacramento, California.
19. Statutes (1911), Chapter 357, p. 619, Approved April 5, 1911.
20. San Francisco Chronicle, February 13, 1928, 11/2.
21. Sacramento Bee, January 20, 1913, 1/5.
22. Statutes (1913), Chapter 538, p. 918, Approved June 7, 1913; Controller's Claim #10117, The Builder and Contractor, October 18, 1913, Roll H47, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #21111, The Builder and Contractor, March 12, 1914, Roll H47, Controller's Office.
23. Controller's Claim #1072, Pacific Gurney Elevator Co., June 23, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #5732, Ralston Iron Works, August 27, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #9934, Ralston Iron Works, October 14, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #11585, Ralston Iron Works, November 6, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #11645, Pacific Gurney Elevator Co., November 2, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #11646, Randall Elevator Door Contract Co., October 13, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #12500, Pacific Gurney Elevator Co., November 19, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office.
24. Controller's Claim #8605, Commercial News Publishing Co., August 31, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office.
25. Controller's Claim #24303, Industrial Accident Commission, February 1, 1918 (for work completed September 24, 1917), Roll H66, Controller's Office.
26. Statutes (1929), Chapter 339, p. 669, Approved May 18, 1929.
27. San Francisco Chronicle, July 18, 1929, 24/3.
28. Drawings in Office of State Architect, Sacramento, California, Framing elevator shaft, August 15, 1928, File No. 12-L-32, no work order, and New elevators, July 26, 1929, File No. 12-L-32, work order number 118.
29. WPA, California's State Capitol, p. 64.
30. Statutes (1913), Chapter 603, p. 1128, Approved June 16, 1913.
31. Controller's Claim #7014, Sacramento Bee, September 3, 1913, Roll H47, Controller's Office; Controller's Claims #9840 and #9841, Schneider, Chappel and Jones, November 17, 1913, Roll H47, Controller's Office; Controller's Claims #12481, Schneider, Chappel and Jones, November 26, 1913,

Roll H47, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #8703, Schneider, Chappel and Jones, November 16, 1917, Roll H66, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claims #22784, Schneider, Chappel and Jones, February 19, 1918, Roll H66, Controller's Office.

32. Controller's Claim #24499, "Notice to Contractors," June 1, 1914, Roll H47, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #23808, "Notice to Contractors," March 12, 1915, Roll H47, Controller's Office.

33. "Second Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds of California" (July 1, 1914-July 1, 1916), p. 18, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 42nd session, volume 2.

34. Statutes (1925), Chapter 178, pp. 326-327, Approved May 18, 1925.

35. Controller's Claim #15965, Clement & Dunn, March 8, 1912, Roll H41, Controller's Office.

36. Controller's Claim #14908, Henry Wicks, December 15, 1914, Roll H50, Controller's Office; Controller's Claim #18381, Carlaw Brothers, January 14, 1915, Roll H50, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #20863, T. J. Parish, January 25, 1915, Roll H50, Controller's Office.

37. Controller's Claim #27077, George W. Martin, June 30, 1915, Roll H55, Controller's Office; and Controller's Claim #18318, Holbrook, Merrill & Stentson, December 20, 1918, Roll H73, Controller's Office.

38. Sacramento Bee, January 27, 1913, 5/6.

39. "Biennial Report of the State Treasurer, State of California, for the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Fiscal Years, July 1, 1914 to June 30, 1916," p. 11, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 42nd session, volume 6.

40. "Second Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds of California," p. 18.

41. Statutes (1921), Chapter 409, p. 603, Approved May 25, 1921.

42. "Second Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds of California," p. 2.

CHAPTER VI

THE CAPITOL EXTENSION MOVEMENT (1904-1937)

By the very end of the 1920s and into the 1930s, two phenomena were taking place which affected the interior spaces of the capitol. The first was the completion of the capitol extension buildings -- the Library and Courts Building and Office Building 1; the second was the sudden growth of state government during the early years of the Great Depression.

The impetus to construct an extension complex came from two sources. The first was an obvious reaction to overcrowding within the capitol building which resulted from the surge of growth in state government which followed the Progressives into Sacramento. The second reason was more complex. It represented the efforts of a group of Sacramentans who had ties with the Chamber of Commerce and who lobbied to have all state offices in Sacramento. They wanted to return those offices to Sacramento which were already in Los Angeles and San Francisco and they fervently opposed any further of what they considered decentralization of state government. In order to accomplish this, they urged the construction of new office buildings near the capitol. These Sacramentans also had visions of creating a great civic complex in Sacramento, centered at the capitol. Both returning and maintaining all state offices in Sacramento and creating a civic showplace would obviously benefit the economic and political well being of the capital city.

As early as 1904, in a time of great overcrowding in the capitol, Secretary of State Charles F. Curry recommended,

The erection of a building on the Capitol grounds, to be occupied by the State Library and the Supreme Court; or the construction of an extension to the present building, between the Senate and Assembly Chambers, and in harmony with the architecture of the Capitol; or a portion of the attic could be fitted up for the use of the State Library and the rest for the use of legislative committees.¹

At that time the state's solution to the problem was to remodel the capitol and to renovate the attic, increasing the useable office space in the building to its maximum. This remodeling apparently did all that could be done to expand the capitol building and attention turned to the capitol extension movement.

In 1910, James Gillis, State Librarian, detailed the inconveniences which both library employees and patrons encountered in their quarters in the apse. In his report to the State Board of Library Trustees he stated, "The time has come when California might well consider following the example of several other states in the matter of providing a building for the State Library."² In his last formal address before leaving office in January 1911, Governor James N. Gillett re-emphasized the problem:

Not only has the work increased in all the State offices, but likewise there is hardly an officer, department, board, or commission that is not in need of additional room; the Controller and other officials have no private offices in which to conduct the important affairs of State. Many needed additions have been made by the State Capitol Commissioners during this administration, but the State has outgrown its Capitol building, and it is not large enough to house its courts and its State Library, together with its various other departments centered therein.

Echoing Gillis' concerns, Gillett further encouraged the Legislature to consider the construction of "an appropriate building" somewhere on the capitol grounds to house the Supreme and Appellate Courts and the State Library -- those agencies currently housed in the apse.³

The new Progressive Legislature apparently agreed with Gillis and Gillett and in March 1911, they established a commission, comprised of the State Library Board of Trustees (which included State Librarian Gillis) and the justices of the District Court of Appeals, Third District, to "investigate and ascertain the necessity of erecting a building for the proper housing of the state library, the supreme court and the district court of appeal, third district."⁴ This was farsighted thinking on their part because the growth of state government brought about by Progressive regulatory reforms passed that year added greatly to the overcrowded conditions in the capitol.

Gillis and George G. Radcliff, Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds, were the real movers behind this commission and guided much of its thinking. Together they recommended to the commission the construction of two buildings: one for state offices and the other for the library and courts. Unlike earlier recommendations, they proposed to construct the building on the two blocks of land immediately west of Capitol Park, which they hoped would be donated to the state by the City of Sacramento.⁵

The commission adopted the plan proposed by Gillis and Radcliff and announced it publicly on October 30, 1912.⁶ Sacramentans were ecstatic. Under lengthy headlines, the Sacramento Bee, in a show of local boosterism, reported,

The first definite step toward restoring to Sacramento the Capitol [sic] of California, those offices which were removed to San Francisco in violation of law, and also to relieve the congested condition of the present outgrown Capitol building, was taken this morning when recommendations for the acquisition of two blocks of land, facing the Capitol, and the erection of two structures--a State Library building and a State Office building--were adopted by the Special Commission named by the last Legislature to investigate and report on the need for a new Library and Courts building.⁷

The proposal called for the citizens of Sacramento to pass a bond issue in order to finance the acquisition of the site for the buildings. Throughout this planning process a special committee of Sacramento civic and business

leaders had been meeting with the state committee, to ensure the city's interest in the project. In November 1912, the city's committee began holding public meetings with Sacramentans focusing on commercial and civic groups, to review the state commission's plans and to formulate a definite program to follow in the city bond issue campaign.⁸ James Gillis was elected secretary of this committee.

Sacramento would stand to benefit greatly if the extension buildings were erected and, especially, if offices were returned to Sacramento from San Francisco. Some of these offices were the State Engineering Board, the State Highway Commission, and the State Fish and Game Commission, who were renting space in downtown San Francisco buildings.⁹ As the Sacramento Bee put it,

Not only would it bring the State offices back to Sacramento; it would also compel those having business with the State to come here to transact it, thus stimulating the business and growth of the Capital, as the law intended.¹⁰

Thus, economic motives stimulated and guided Sacramento's fervent desire to see the capitol extension buildings a reality.

In December 1912, a minor problem arose: whether or not the city had the power to acquire property by bond issue and then turn it over to the state. The City Charter contained a discrepancy between the initiative provision and the clause relating to bond issues.¹¹ Clearing the issue, the next June, Sacramento Assemblyman Inman pushed a bill through the Legislature authorizing and outlining the procedure by which a city or county could donate or grant real property to the state.¹²

At the beginning of 1913, the campaign to get the bond issue on the city ballot gained momentum in Sacramento. On January 4, George W. Peltier, chairman of the citizens' committee which was in charge of circulating the petition for the "Greater Capitol Extension" plan, announced that 3,500 signatures had been collected. Another 500 were needed but Peltier was confident that they could easily be acquired. The petition was to be turned over to the city commission asking that body to call a special election to determine whether the voters approved of bonding the city for the \$700,000 to purchase the two blocks. Sacramentans were hoping to have their election as soon as possible in order to head off a bill introduced in the Legislature by the San Francisco delegation asking the state for a \$1 million appropriation for a state office building in the Civic Center of San Francisco. That city was willing to donate the property on the condition that the building be constructed there.¹³

Sacramentans did get their bond issue on the ballot and on April 5, 1913, voted 8 to 1 approving \$700,000 in bond sales to finance the city's acquisition and donation to the state of two blocks, bounded by Ninth, Tenth, L and N streets, for two capitol extension buildings.¹⁴

Meanwhile, the State Legislature took action. In February they agreed to appoint a joint committee

for the purpose of ascertaining the advisability of submitting to the people of the state the question of bonding the state for the purpose of making needed additions and improvements to the Capitol, asylums, hospitals and other public institutions of the state.¹⁵

What followed in the Legislature had both negative and positive effects on the Sacramento effort. Despite Sacramento's efforts to the contrary, the Legislature agreed to the concept of erecting a state office building in San Francisco by the terms outlined above. In June they voted to put a \$1 million bond issue before the voters in the statewide general election on November 1914 to finance the project.¹⁶ However, in June, the Assembly also agreed to put a \$3,000,000 bond issue on the same ballot to construct and equip state buildings in Sacramento, provided that a suitable site be acquired without cost to the state.¹⁷ To the relief and dismay of both Sacramentans and San Franciscans, both measures passed.

Meanwhile, Sacramento had entered an era of modern city planning and the advice of several professional planners was sought. Most of these planners agreed that Sacramento should consider a civic center with the capitol at its center, that being the capital city was prestigious and something that Sacramento should take advantage of. Thus, for several years, Sacramento city planning became intimately involved with the state's plans to expand state offices beyond the walls of the capitol and whether all state business should be conducted in Sacramento.

Quite early in the century, the Women's Council of Sacramento engaged Professor Zueblin of the University of Chicago who gave five town planning lectures. They were held in the Assembly Chamber. Several years later, a state planning commission noted that "This use of legislative halls for the inauguration of the modern city planning movement in Sacramento was prophetic of the state's continued interest in the problems of her Capital City."¹⁸

In November 1908, Charles Mulford Robinson offered Sacramento the second of its planning reports. His advice included, "Sacramentans should see in it an obligation to make their city worthy to be the capital--so noble, so beautiful, that there will never be thought of moving it again." He added, "And in all the cases there has been recognized the fact that the problems of a capital city are not quite the same as those of an industrial community, that there should be about it more of the grandiose, the spectacular and splendid."¹⁹

Then, in 1913, in the midst of the political activity over the city and state bond issues, the Chamber of Commerce retained Dr. Werner Hegemann, a German city planner. In October, his report became public. His main suggestion was to create a civic center in Sacramento centered around the capitol and its grounds. He recommended, "Decorate the Capitol grounds and its surroundings, i.e., as the civic center of the city and the state; i.e., as a kind of sacred entity ruled by special ordinance." Hegemann's plan also called for a height limit for buildings around the capitol grounds, so as not to "destroy the scale and diminish the size of the Capitol building", and the creation of a promenade in the middle of M Street.²⁰ By the end of 1913, the city had

engaged a total of three noted city planners, all of whom addressed the capitol and the role of Sacramento as the capital city; the city had passed a bond act to finance the donation of two blocks of property to the state; Sacramento Assemblyman Inman successfully got a \$3,000,000 bond issue on a statewide ballot to finance two new state buildings in Sacramento, and in November 1914 that state bond issue passed.

In 1915, the state officially got involved in this joint city-state planning for Sacramento. The Legislature passed a bill creating a state capitol planning commission composed of the Governor and State Librarian, both of whom served as ex-officio members, and three members to be appointed by the Governor, one who was to be a recognized expert in city planning.²¹ Soon after their appointment by Governor Hiram Johnson, this state commission took the position of urging Sacramento's City Commissioners to officially adopt as a city master plan one drawn up by Dr. John Nolen, a city planner from Cambridge, Massachusetts. Like others before him, Nolen urged that serious attention be given to the image of Sacramento as the capital city and to the capitol building. He wrote,

That steps should be taken without unnecessary delay to make Sacramento more and more worthy of its unique position in the state as the state capital. As a step toward this end, it is recommended that provision be made for the extension and protection of the Capitol grounds, and for the direct extension east of Capitol Avenue to its termination in the proposed El Dorado Circle and El Dorado Park.²²

The plan was adopted by the city in 1916.

Although the election of November 1914 saw the passage of the bond act to finance the capitol extension buildings, the title to the two blocks west of the capitol was not transferred from the city to the state until October 12, 1917.²³ On the first of November, competition began for the selection of an architect. A jury, called the Sacramento State Buildings Board, composed of Governor William Stephens, Chief Justice F. M. Angellotti, Chairman Marshall De Matte of the Board of Control, and architects Sylvian Schnaittacher of San Francisco and William M. Kendall and Henry Bacon of New York, selected the San Francisco architectural partnership of Weeks and Day as the first prize winner on September 26, 1918.²⁴

Meanwhile, the world war slowed the construction efforts. It was against government policy to begin a project of such magnitude during wartime. While the state went ahead with the architectural selection, those in the competition were notified that construction depended on the war situation. The probability was that nothing would be done until after the war ended.²⁵

On November 29, 1918, only eighteen days after the armistice, headlines announced that work would resume on the capitol extension buildings. State Architect G. B. McDougall was instructed by the Building Board to proceed with the terms of the architects' contract and for them to prepare plans and specifications.²⁶ On the next March 21, the Board approved their preliminary sketches. However, a problem with funding was developing. The

state was unable to sell the four percent bonds due to changes in the money market caused by post-war conditions. It became apparent that an additional kind of funding was needed to continue with the project. This was considered by the Legislature and on May 27, 1919, Governor Stephens signed the Inman bill appropriating \$300,000 so that construction could begin.²⁷ Also, much to the chagrin of Sacramentans, the Governor signed a bill appropriating an additional \$350,000 for finishing the state office building in San Francisco.²⁸

Again, in 1921, the Legislature made another bail-out appropriation -- this time, \$400,000 to be used to "pay commissions for services rendered in the procuring of bids for all or any portion or portions of the state bonds...."²⁹ Finally, on November 17, 1921, the Bank of Italy (now the Bank of America) purchased the bonds and on November 26, the Board gave authorization to accept bids on certain parts of the construction work. Contracts were let on February 24, 1922, totaling \$1,758,000 and on October 26, 1922, for \$900,000.³⁰

Work began at the site in March 1922. The cornerstone for Office Building 1 was laid October 1923; the Library-Courts Building, March 1924.³¹ The two classical styled buildings were designed to be nearly reflections of the other on their exteriors. Each building has five floors and a basement; a sixth floor cafeteria has been added to Office Building 1. Edward Field Sanford, Jr., of New York, was selected to design the sculpture for the facades of the buildings.³²

Construction proved to be slow and more costly than originally anticipated. Inflation, no doubt, had eaten into the funding. In 1925, the Legislature appropriated another \$300,000 for the installation of a heating plant and for grading and planting the grounds around the buildings.³³ The validity of this action was questioned by State Controller Ray L. Riley on the grounds that the title of the law appropriating the money referred to the new state buildings, while the body of the act referred to the capitol building. The question was referred to the California Supreme Court. They rendered the opinion that the capitol extension buildings -- Office Building 1 and the Library-Courts Building -- were part of the capitol. They wrote,

That the new buildings still in course of construction are separated by a short space from the old unit is an immaterial circumstance. They occupy lands adjacent to those occupied by that unit and they are as much a part of it as though they had been merely wings or annexes of the original structure.³⁴

This was a designation that was never extended to other state buildings in Sacramento or elsewhere in the state with the exception of the later annex built onto the east side of the capitol.

In 1926, by a vote of 650,282 to 311,619, the state electorate approved another bond issue which provided \$8,500,000 for completion of these buildings, as well as funding for construction of a state building in Los Angeles and buildings for the University of California at Berkeley and Los Angeles.³⁵

Despite the efforts of Sacramentans to lure state offices back to the capital city, a state building was being planned and built in San Francisco at the same time that the new Sacramento buildings were going up. The electorate statewide voted in favor of a \$1 million bond issue in 1914 to finance the construction of a building in San Francisco. In 1919, this amount was supplemented by an additional \$350,000 appropriation from the Legislature; in 1921, another \$206,000 was added to the building fund. The building, completed in 1923, was located in San Francisco's Civic Center. In 1930, two six-story wings with two-story links were added. Two years later another six-story structure was completed, known as the Compensation Insurance Building. It was built by private capital and purchased by the state. By 1942, another nearly six-story building was occupied by the state in rented office space.³⁶ Likewise, in Los Angeles, there was a need for state buildings. The population was increasing in the south state area and the long distance from Sacramento necessitated local access to state offices. While state employees had had offices in Los Angeles almost since statehood, growth was slow until after the turn of the century. The large sums of money spent for rental showed the need for state owned buildings. In 1926, a bond issue ensured \$1,250,000 towards construction. On July 29, 1932, the building was officially opened.³⁷ Despite the back-to-Sacramento movement, by the time the capitol extension buildings were completed in Sacramento, a building was already constructed and occupied in San Francisco, and another was funded for in Los Angeles. The real effect of the extension buildings was to relieve the overcrowding already in the capitol building and to consolidate many of the offices in Sacramento which were scattered around town in rented spaces.

By 1928, the capitol extension buildings were completed at a price tag of \$5,100,000 and departments had moved into their new quarters. Most of these were ones which were already located in Sacramento outside of the capitol in rented space. The library and state courts, of course, moved out of their historic locations in the apse of the capitol.³⁸ The completion of the extension buildings and the removal of the library and courts from the apse led to changes in the capitol. The legislature anticipated this happening and, in their 1925 appropriation for the extension buildings, included funding for the rearrangement of the capitol. In June 1928, the Bee reported,

With the volumes of the state law library now being moved from the Capitol building to the new library and courts building of the extension group, A. R. Heron, division of finance, states that it will be possible to commence proposed alterations in the old building within a short time. The old library quarters, on the first floor immediately off the rotunda, will be remodeled for offices for the State Controller.³⁹

In 1929, over \$42,000 was appropriated for alteration and improvement work in the capitol, exclusive of work on the elevators.⁴⁰ Added to the 1925 appropriation, this allowed for a significant amount of remodeling within the building. In January 1931, outgoing Governor C. C. Young summarized the remodeling and renovation which had taken place over the past two or three years. He said,

This latter work has comprised an enlargement and shifting of quarters on the lower floor for Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, and Treasurer, as well as a renovation of the Senate and Assembly Chambers, together with improvements in the committee rooms on the fourth floor. New elevators have been installed, illumination for the dome has been devised, and California is now able to boast of a Capitol which, while one of the oldest in the country, is at the same time one of the most satisfactory and beautiful.⁴¹

One of the first work projects under this phase of remodeling was the illumination of the capitol dome. On the evening of September 1, 1928, city, county, and state officials, along with representatives from civic and commercial organizations, were invited to gather in Capitol Park to witness the event. The Bee reported,

Bathed in a flood of brilliant light, the dome of California's Capitol is a thing of rare beauty and a revelation to the thousands of visitors who are in Sacramento for the State Fair.... The system of flood lighting, which is the same as that used for illuminating the dome of the national Capitol at Washington, was installed under the direction of the department of finance. The system is so arranged that all shadows are eliminated and by manipulating the various switches multi-colored beams can be played upon the dome to give it a most dazzling appearance.⁴²

As Governor Young indicated, changes had occurred in the interior of the building, mostly the rearrangement of offices following the exodus of 1928. The Treasurer now occupied the entire west front of the capitol north of the rotunda, including the northwest corner room on the first floor.⁴³ The original vault for that office, located next to the rotunda, was no longer large enough. In 1929, a new walk-in vault was constructed. It provided 260 square feet of secure space and cost \$30,500.⁴⁴ To protect the contents of the vault, a new burglar alarm was installed by District Telegraph Company of San Francisco.⁴⁵ The Secretary of State moved down the hall and occupied virtually the entire southeast corner of the first floor, the area formerly occupied by the offices of the courts. The Governor's office expanded northward to the rotunda, occupying the area formerly given to the Secretary of State. Perhaps the biggest expansion of all was the Controller's office which took over the first three floors of the apse and much of the northeast corner of the first floor. Since it is the Controller's office which issues warrants for all state expenditures, the physical expansion of this office is very indicative of the growth of the state government in general, and specifically growth brought on by the expanding rôle of government during the Great Depression.

This remodeling, with the exception of the apse, had affected mostly the first floor. However, beginning in 1931, the Legislature began to focus attention on the upper floors of the ~~capitol~~, in areas they occupied. In May 1931, both houses agreed that the committee rooms were "entirely inadequate to meet the

present needs of the Legislature when any considerable number of people are present." Specifically, they were concerned about "poor and insufficient lighting and total absences of any ventilating system...." They resolved that the chief of the Bureau of Building and Grounds, the state architect, and the Director of Finance be "directed to make a survey and an estimate of the cost of reconstruction of the committee rooms."⁴⁶ Little must have come from this request because four years later both houses resolved to select a joint committee to meet with the Department of Finance and the State Building Commission "for the proper remodeling and refurnishing of legislative committee rooms and offices for members of the Legislature...."⁴⁷ Apparently this request was to be above and beyond the usual yearly appropriation of \$30,000 for the maintenance of the capitol and other state office buildings.⁴⁸ In November 1935, the renovations became a reality when a joint interim committee gave approval to a \$30,000 appropriation specifically to improve legislative facilities on the second and fourth floors. According to a local newspaper, plans included the

relocation and enlargement of the legislative counsel bureau, construction of two waiting rooms for senate visitors and the remodeling of the committee rooms. Acoustic equipment is to be installed. The tentative plans also contemplate a reallocation of space on the fourth floor to provide office quarters for senators.⁴⁹

This last item was significant because private office space was new to the capitol. Historically, legislators had to conduct business from their desks on the floor or out of their personal private quarters outside the capitol. Photographs of the chambers taken from this time and earlier show members' desks piled high with books and papers, indicating that business was carried on right there.

Two years later, Governor Merriam signed a bill appropriating \$50,000 out of the General Fund to

be used for the construction, repair, improvement, equipment and furnishing of Assembly Chamber, committee rooms and of offices for the members of the Assembly in the State Capitol, including ventilating system facilities and connections, suitable, adequate, clean, and hygienic women's rest rooms, and for such other construction, reconstruction, repair, improvement, or equipment in the State Capitol or State office buildings in Sacramento as may be necessary to provide adequate space for Assembly committee rooms and offices for members of the Assembly in the State Capitol, and the remainder shall be used to subdivide Room 404-C of the State Capitol into smaller offices for the Senate.⁵⁰

Like the improvements called for two years previous, in 1935, this is an indicator that the Legislature was becoming more professional and more full time, prophetic of things to come.

FOOTNOTES

1. C. F. Curry, "Biennial Report of the Secretary of State, Ending June 30, 1904," pp. 7-8, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 36th session, volume 1.
2. "Biennial Report of the Trustees of the California State Library for the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Fiscal Years" (July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1910), p. 17, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 39th session, volume 1.
3. "Second Biennial Message of Governor James N. Gillett," January 2, 1911, in Journal of the Senate, 39th session, p. 23.
4. "Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 14," Chapter 42 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments," filed with Secretary of State, March 10, 1911, in California, Statutes (1911), pp. 1855-1856.
5. Frank C. Jordan, comp., California Blue Book, Legislative Manual or State Roster (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1924), p. 127.
6. Sacramento Bee, October 30, 1912, 1/7 and 4/5-6; and Sacramento Union, October 31, 1912, 12/3-5.
7. Sacramento Bee, October 30, 1912, 1/7 and 4/5-6.
8. Ibid., November 26, 1912, 1/4.
9. Sacramento Union, November 26, 1912, 1/1.
10. Sacramento Bee, October 30, 1912, 4/6.
11. Ibid., December 3, 1912, 5/5.
12. Statutes (1913), Chapter 234, pp. 388-389, Approved June 5, 1913.
13. Sacramento Bee, January 4, 1913, 1/4 and 6/1; and Sacramento Union, January 4, 1913, 1/1.
14. Sacramento Bee, April 5, 1913, 1/2 and 26/4, and April 7, 1913, 1/2 and 3/5.
15. "Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11," Chapter 18 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments," filed with Secretary of State, February 4, 1913, in California, Statutes (1913), p. 1536.
16. Statutes (1913), Chapter 65, p. 70, Chapter 541, pp. 920-924, Approved June 7, 1913, and Chapter 542, p. 924, Approved June 7, 1913.
17. Statutes (1913), Chapter 235, pp. 389-394, Approved June 5, 1913.

18. "Report of the State Capitol Planning Commission Upon Its Investigation of the Planning of the Capitol of California," September 1, 1916, p. 6, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 42nd session, volume 2.
19. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
20. Ibid., p. 21; and Sacramento Bee, October 29, 1913, 4/6.
21. Statutes (1915), Chapter 757, p. 1514, Approved June 12, 1915.
22. "Report of the State Capitol Planning Commission," September 1, 1916, p. 29.
23. Sacramento Union, October 12, 1917, 1/2 and 3/1.
24. Sacramento Bee, September 26, 1918, 5/2; and California Blue Book, 1924, p. 129.
25. Sacramento Bee, September 26, 1918, 5/2.
26. San Francisco Chronicle, November 29, 1918, 3/4.
27. California Blue Book, 1924, p. 129; and Sacramento Bee, May 28, 1919, 1/3.
28. Ibid.
29. Statutes (1921), Chapter 708, p. 1201, Approved June 2, 1921.
30. California Blue Book, 1924, p. 129.
31. George H. Moore, comp., California Blue Book, 1942 (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1942), p. 142.
32. California Blue Book, 1924, p. 129.
33. California Blue Book, 1942, p. 142; and Statutes (1925), Chapter 390, pp. 726-727, Approved May 23, 1925.
34. Sacramento Bee, January 27, 1926, 22/2.
35. Statutes (1925), Chapter 161, pp. 307-315, Approved May 16, 1925; California Blue Book, 1942, p. 142; and Frank C. Jordan, comp., Statement of General Election Held on November 12, 1926 in the State of California (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1926).
36. Statutes (1919), Chapter 618, p. 1287, Approved May 27, 1919 and in effect July 27, 1919; California Blue Book, 1924, p. 131; and California Blue Book, 1942, pp. 143-144.
37. Ibid., p. 143; Statutes (1917), Chapter 401, p. 525, Approved May 14, 1917 and in effect July 27, 1919; and California Blue Book, 1924, p. 131.

38. Sacramento Bee, May 22, 1920, 12/1; California Blue Book, 1942, p. 142; and "Second Biennial Message of Governor C. C. Young," in Journal of the Assembly, 49th session, January 5, 1931, p. 30.
39. Sacramento Bee, June 1, 1928, 5/5.
40. "Report of the Division of Architecture, Fifth Biennial Report," December 1, 1930, p. 27, in Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 49th session, volume 5.
41. "Second Biennial Message of Governor C. C. Young," January 5, 1931, pp. 29-30.
42. Sacramento Bee, September 1, 1928, 10/5 and September 4, 1928, 14/4-5.
43. Workers of the Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration in Northern California, comp., California's State Capitol, ([Sacramento]: California State Printing Office, 1942), pp. 64, 70, 72.
44. California's State Treasury, California State Printing Office, May 1955, p. 3.
45. Sacramento Union, February 25, 1929, 3/3.
46. "Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 28," Chapter 64 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments," filed with Secretary of State, May 14, 1931, Statutes (1931), pp. 3116-3117.
47. "Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 42," Chapter 120 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments," filed with Secretary of State, June 14, 1935, Statutes (1935), p. 2690.
48. Statutes (1933), Chapter 278, p. 820, Approved May 11, 1933; and Statutes (1935), Chapter 341, p. 1180, Approved June 14, 1935.
49. Sacramento Bee, November 6, 1935, 5/5; no follow-up story was found, but there is an assumption made here that the work was done.
50. Statutes (1937), Chapter 795, pp. 2270-2271, Approved June 29, 1937, in effect August 27, 1937.

CHAPTER VII

THE EAST ANNEX SOLUTION (1935-1954)

The Great Depression of the 1930s had its effect on state government in California and on the capitol. On one hand, money was scarce and the electorate was in no mood to finance what it felt to be unnecessary expenditures; on the other hand, because of the depressed state of the economy and large scale unemployment, state government in California grew and expanded as it took on new services to meet the needs of the unemployed public.

In 1935, the Legislature passed an act to call a special election for August 13. The purpose was to submit to the electorate for their approval several amendments to the Constitution which had been proposed by the Legislature. One was a proposal for a \$13,950,000 bond issue for major construction and improvements. Included in this program would be the construction of a new prison in southern California, additions and improvements at state hospitals and asylums, state buildings in Los Angeles, and wings on the state capitol. However, due to strong opposition in southern California and light voting statewide, the bond issue was defeated.¹ Another indicator that money was "tight" in the state was an application by the Department of Finance to the federal government for \$100,000 to aid the California public works program in a plan to paint the capitol.²

The fact that state government was growing was indicated in more ways than just the remodeling of the legislative facilities mentioned above. In 1930, dial telephones were installed in the capitol -- the second such installation in Sacramento. Five hundred and thirty-eight telephones were installed, along with a new private automatic exchange in the basement and new switchboard equipment. By 1939, the system had increased to 1,800 telephones and was the largest private exchange in California.³

Problems associated with the Depression seemed to have an effect on the general growth of government which was reflected in overcrowded conditions in the capitol. By 1931, the unemployment rate in California was high. In January of that year the Legislature created the State Unemployment Commission, the first of several bodies to deal with the problem. By 1934, the State Relief Administration was operating, which not only received and dispensed federal relief funds, but dispensed state monies raised through the sale of bonds. While this agency did not work out of the capitol, the state relief operation was advised by various commissions appointed by the Governor and often involving other Constitutional officers.⁴ This in turn put a burden on these officers which led to increased staffing. More directly involving the occupants of the capitol was the establishment of an entirely new division in the Controller's office. When the federal government established the Works Progress Administration, it withdrew direct federal funds to California, so the state undertook the task of financing direct relief through legislative appropriations. On July 1, 1936, an Unemployment Relief Division was established in the Controller's office to handle this responsibility. By 1939, four subdivisions were established to handle the workload: the auditing section; the disbursing section; the investigating section; and the paymaster's section.⁵

In 1939, a legislative appropriation of \$75,000 enabled major remodeling work in the Governor's suite at the southwest corner of the building. While some of the work was strictly modernization, it also involved installing mezzanines in several places throughout the suite.⁶ This divided the twenty-foot high rooms into two, in an attempt to accommodate the growing Governor's staff and to alleviate the overcrowding which resulted. According to floor plans published in 1941, other offices also solved their space problem in a similar manner.⁷ If they could not expand horizontally they would do so vertically.

One result of the tremendous growth in state population and state government was the expansion of state facilities in other cities besides Sacramento, especially San Francisco and Los Angeles. Relief operations, for example, needed to be where the population centers were. This situation, however, rekindled all of the old fears of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce. Their worries surfaced in mid-1930 when it became apparent to them that Governor James Rolph, Jr., former mayor of San Francisco, was unconcerned about the removal of state offices from Sacramento. About his own situation, he was quoted as saying, "As far as the Governor's office is concerned the office is where the Governor happens to be." He also expressed displeasure at having his office in an old building which lacked modern conveniences. Rolph stated that it was only natural that state officials would want their offices near their homes. According to Sacramento press coverage, Rolph also indicated that officials moved elsewhere because Sacramento did not hand out enough "sugar" and because of their Senator, J. M. Inman, who fought continuously against the removal of any state offices from the capital city.⁸ The Chamber of Commerce felt betrayed because the city had donated two blocks of land for the capitol extension buildings in an effort to return all state offices to Sacramento. In 1933, in what was probably an attempt to poke fun at Sacramento's serious effort to centralize all of state government there, the Assembly heard a "joke" resolution to remove the capital to Monterey. Getting in on the fun were twelve other cities, including Columbia, which also vied for the honor. Despite Sacramento's efforts to the contrary, the state has continued to operate major offices in population centers throughout California and branch offices, such as those of the Department of Motor Vehicles, in many small towns in an attempt to reach the public.⁹

One remedy which would have solved the immediate overcrowded condition in the capitol and which would have soothed the fears of Sacramentans that state government was becoming decentralized was the bond issue of 1935. Although it did not pass, the idea became established to add an annex to the capitol building. The plan offered in 1935 was to add two four-story wings onto the east side of the capitol. The design would have added 100,000 square feet to the building, and at the same time, would have preserved the apse. What was important to the Legislature was that it offered private offices for its members in addition to a Governor's suite and offices for other Constitutional officers.¹⁰

During World War II there was a moratorium on state construction. Available building materials were earmarked for the war effort. However, during that time state revenues, normally slated for construction, from such sources as taxes, continued to be collected so that when the war ended the state could engage in a post-war reconstruction program. The proposed remodeling of the state capitol was slated to be financed from that fund which eventually

totaled \$154,000,000.¹¹ On April 21, 1943, the Department of Finance released a summary report entitled "Tentative Post-War Building Program to Meet the Immediate Needs of the State", which briefly described the capitol extension project. The estimated cost was \$1,500,000.¹²

The Legislature turned to C. H. Purcell, Director of the Department of Public Works, and asked for a study of the problem of increasing the size of the state capitol. He commissioned Anson Boyd, State Architect, to prepare a proposal to be considered by the next session of the Legislature. In December 1944, those plans were made public. They included expanding the north and south portions of the existing building eastward to the Twelfth Street line. The two wings were to be connected at their eastern ends creating a courtyard and allowing the apse to remain intact. The wings were to be four stories high and set back from the north and south facades of the old building so as not to distract from its picturesque west elevation. Plans also included a basement garage, the removal of the motor drive around the building, and the establishment of a capitol mall between the capitol and the Tower Bridge, with buildings set back to attain a width of 180 feet.¹³

By June 1945, with the war in Europe over, the Legislature created a Joint Committee on Remodeling the Capitol. The committee consisted of the President pro tempore and two members of the Senate and the Speaker and two members of the Assembly. They were

authorized and directed to investigate, study, and analyze, accurately and in detail, all matters pertaining to the subject of this resolution, and to advise and confer with the Department of Finance, the Department of Public Works and the appropriate officers or agencies of either thereof to the end that any plan or plans prepared or to be prepared in relation to remodeling the state capitol shall contain adequate provision for the Legislature, its committees, members, attaches, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and the fiscal and other agencies of the State whose duties are closely related to the work of the Legislature, to consider and prepare such new legislation or revision of existing legislation as may in any way bear upon or relate to the subject of this resolution, and to report thereon to the Legislature, including in the reports its recommendations for appropriate legislation.

The committee was authorized to act during the current session and, after adjournment, until the beginning of the next regular session in January 1947.¹⁴ A significant shift in authority was evident in this resolution. Before, appropriations for money for the capitol had always come from the Legislature, but the work had been supervised or carried out by some representative from the Executive Branch, whether it was the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, the Secretary of State, or the Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds. At this point, however, the Legislature was taking a definite lead in the project.

On November 9, 1945, the committee approved plans submitted by Finance Director James S. Dean and the Legislature followed up by authorizing \$1,900,000 for the annex.¹⁵ In a "Summary of Post-War Building Program"

presented by the Division of Architecture (under the Department of Public Works) in January 1946, the capitol annex, along with repairs to the old building, was given number one priority among the proposed projects. \$2,400,000 was set aside from post-war monies for the addition.¹⁶ By March 1947, the price tag for the annex was \$3,500,000. At that session of the Legislature, Randal F. Dickey of Alameda, Chairman of the Assembly Rules Committee, introduced a resolution which would immediately release \$2,400,000 earmarked in the state's post-war building fund for the two-winged annex. An additional \$1,100,000 was included in Governor Earl Warren's proposed 1947-1948 state budget. The resolution was adopted by the Assembly and sent to the Senate for concurrence on March 25. The resolution also requested that the Departments of Finance and Public Works and the Public Works Board expedite the letting of contracts so that at least two floors of the new wings would be ready for occupancy in January 1949.¹⁷ In early April 1947, the Public Works Board authorized the Division of Architecture to proceed with the preparation of plans and specifications for the \$3,500,000 expansion project, following the proposal made by Anson Boyd in 1944.¹⁸ The joint committee which had been established in 1945 had a lifetime only until the beginning of the next regular session, which commenced in January 1947. That session saw fit to establish another joint committee, organized in the same manner and with the same responsibility and authority as the first, to operate until the beginning of the 1949 regular session. It was this committee which was to provide continuity for decision making on behalf of the Legislature.¹⁹ By December 1947, new enlarged plans were approved by the joint committee. These called for a \$6,000,000 annex, five stories high, providing 280,000 square feet of space. These differed considerably from the earlier plan which called for a \$3,500,000 annex, four stories high, providing 100,000 square feet. According to Arthur Dudman, who was head of design for the Division of Architecture, the main reason for this considerable change was that the architects were not able to include into the earlier plan all the facilities requested by the Legislature. The new plan eliminated the courtyard and called for the demolition of the apse. It also provided for two large legislative committee rooms, each seating 300 people, in addition to several smaller ones. A basement garage and a penthouse restaurant on the roof was also part of this new scheme.²⁰

By April 1948, State Architect Anson Boyd was able to announce a tentative schedule for the construction. The completion, earlier anticipated for January 1949, was pushed back to March 1950, the date of the opening of the budget session of the Legislature. Construction was expected to commence mid-summer 1948.²¹ However, that was not to be the case. In early August, the legislative interim committee had only just approved the current plans and authorized Boyd to advertise for bids for the foundation and steel frame. A request for funds was submitted to the Public Works Board at their August 23 meeting. In a predicament familiar to many construction projects, Boyd disclosed that because of "rising prices in the building industry and an expansion of the size of the annex" the cost of the building had doubled to between \$7,000,000 and \$7,250,000.²²

After years of various delays, including the Great Depression, World War II, and changes in the scope of the project, ground was broken for the long awaited annex on June 3, 1949, with a new completion date set for December 1950. Necessarily, construction had to take into consideration the

Legislature meeting in the capitol. Work had to proceed as quietly as possible with the stipulation that it would have to stop if it interfered with the legislative session. J. R. Reeves Construction Company began clearing the site and excavating for the concrete foundation nine days after ground breaking, working eleven hours a day.²³ Progress had its price. Perhaps one of the least attractive aspects of the expansion was that it proceeded at the expense of one of the most beautiful parts of the capitol. The demolition of the apse by Continental Construction Company occurred during July and August to make way for the future connecting corridor between the old and the new buildings.²⁴ By the beginning of the new year (1950), construction by Swinerton & Walberg Company was visible. Aiming for completion on December 8, 1950, three crews worked around the clock pouring concrete for the basement, walls, and floors. The schedule was a tight one, calling for 376 working days beginning on November 28, 1949. R. I. Gunn, General Superintendent for the company, kept a close watch on the progress from his temporary home across the street from the capitol at the Senator Hotel.²⁵ By May, 700 workers were employed on the job. George I. Sanderlin (who had apparently replaced Gunn as General Superintendent) reported that work was on schedule: the last of 17,000 yards of concrete was to be poured June 1 and plastering was to begin within the week. All this was happening despite two strikes -- one in the steel industry and one on the railroads. It was going to be, as Richard Rodda of the Sacramento Bee described it, a photo finish. Work had progressed to the point that the swing and graveyard shifts were eliminated, leaving only the day crew.²⁶

By late summer 1950, some of the more glamorous appointments in the building began to appear and through the newspaper media the public was able to visualize the building's luxury. Marble has been a traditional material in important public buildings and the capitol annex was no exception. By August, a gray-brown marble, imported from Missouri, was being set on the first floor corridors. Black marble was selected to set off the first floor cases where exhibits from all fifty-eight of California's counties would be displayed. Even the stainless steel drinking fountains throughout the building were framed with circular shaped pieces of black marble. Granite from Raymond, in Madera County, was selected for the steps, columns for the east facade, and to face the exterior walls. Even the seven elevators being installed, including a private car in the Governor's new quarters, were quite impressive, being described as both beautiful and the latest in efficient design.²⁷

In August came a hint in a newspaper story that the job was slightly behind schedule due to a shortage of lathers and plasterers. The proposed completion date of December 8, 1950 came and went. On December 30, State Architect Boyd announced a new construction schedule. This revision called for partial occupancy of the annex the next February and March with full occupancy by April 13. Because of unforeseen delay factors, the state waived the delay penalty. Hoping to have some facilities ready for the Governor within two months, construction activity concentrated on the elaborate millwork, hardwood paneling, veneer work, and door trim for the Chief Executive's southeast corner suite. The double doorway into the Governor's reception room off of the corridor was an area of high craftsmanship. With a door frame of black and gold Montana marble, the door panels were built of pin oak, redwood burl, and citrus, all California woods. The Governor's study, featuring an Early American decor, was done in walnut. On the outside of the building, attention

was focused on the cast aluminum decorations designed by O. C. Malmquist of San Francisco. These included ten plaques on the face of the building depicting symbols of California plant and animal life. Industry, science, natural resources, commerce, and transportation were reflected in five ornamental pieces over the main east doors, along with the Great Seal of the state.²⁸

Despite the fact that the building was behind schedule, one group of state employees was already installed in the building -- the capitol telephone operators. Early in December, the staff of twenty-five had the honor of being the first to occupy the building.²⁹

By June, with construction not yet finished, work crews were called in to remodel parts of the annex just completed. According to Boyd this was caused by some changing in thinking on the part of the Legislature. In several Senate committee hearing rooms, the daises had to be redesigned and rebuilt in order to accommodate the size of the leather chairs purchased by the Senators. In the Assembly, it was decided to give all eighty members private offices, rather than requiring some to share space. In order to meet this new requirement, seven offices had to be designed into the sixth floor penthouse restaurant area. Other changes included rearranging walls on the second and third floors to accommodate the Legislative Counsel, cutting a new stairway from the second to the third floor, and replacing the cracked terrazzo flooring in the Governor's patio.³⁰

In March 1951, the second floor temporary wall blocking access to the third floor of the annex was razed. Occupants of legislative offices and the Legislative Counsel staff moved into the third floor of the annex which was on the same level as the floors of the legislative chambers in the old building. While the buildings were independent, they were to function as one unit with the aid of connecting ramps and stairways.³¹ Although partially occupied for several months, it was not until October 1951 that the three doors at the east entrance were opened to the public.³² Along with the branch United States Post Office and the penthouse restaurant, one of the last occupants of the new building was Governor Earl Warren. Formally occupied on October 29, 1951, the new suite was a far cry from the old quarters. From strictly an operational point of view, it offered the space and efficiency unable to be attained in the historic offices, including such special innovations as protection against wire tapping and a conference room equipped with a movie projector and a built-in cabinet containing a movie screen and maps which were revealed at the touch of a button. The Governor's private shower and dressing room were light years from the wash stand behind a screen in Governor Pardee's day.

In an eleventh hour change of plans, Governor Warren decided not to discard his famous cork topped desk made in San Quentin Prison and a grandfather clock which had stood for years in the Governor's outer office, bringing them both along. The desk was placed in the conference room and the clock in his private study. From the three offices occupied by Governor Henry Haight in November 1869, the office had expanded in 1927 to include much of the south corridor of the first floor and again in 1939 when a mezzanine level was installed. Some thirty offices, occupying 14,000 square feet, made up the new suite. And, with the exception of Warren's colonial decorated study, the look

was decidedly modern.³³ There were mixed emotions over the move. At his last press conference in his old office Warren confessed, "I hate to move. And I would not if there were enough room for my staff. I would much rather be in this building. I like it better."³⁴

The Governor's suite shared the first floor with State Controller Thomas H. Kuchel and his staff. The Department of Finance occupied the fifth floor. The rest of the building, the second, third, and fourth floors and part of the sixth floor penthouse, were given over to legislative facilities. With new-found breathing space, Secretary of State Frank M. Jordan, State Treasurer Charles G. Johnson, Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post, the legislative chambers, press rooms, and the state archives remained in the old building.³⁵ The final inspection occurred in mid-December 1951, just one year behind schedule, and the state formally accepted the building from Swinerton & Walberg Company.³⁶ The building was officially completed and from that time on the annex and the historic capitol functioned together as one unit -- the state capitol.

Despite the attention given to the capitol annex during the war and post-war years, the historic capitol building was by no means ignored. Regularly, the state budget appropriated funds to maintain that structure and other state office buildings -- \$75,000 in 1941 and again in 1943; \$125,000 in 1945; \$480,000 in 1948 (with a \$375,000 augmentation in 1949); and \$212,900 in 1949.³⁷

In 1947, major remodeling work was begun on the Assembly Chambers. The work involved new flooring, a new gallery floor, new plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems, as well as general alterations and repairs. Contracts totaling \$161,444.03 went to Lawrence Construction Company for general remodeling, Luppen and Hawley for mechanical work, and Grasan Electrical Company for electrical work. This work, which eventually totaled \$330,000, and work on the Senate Chambers, which totaled \$215,000, was completed in 1949.³⁸

Shortly thereafter, a contract was let to the firm of Foster & Kleiser for completely painting the interior of the inner dome. The color was changed from what was called a "dull brown" to a "light green and white polychrome combination". The job also included regilding some of the gold trim. Justin G. Child, Chief of the Division of Buildings and Grounds, noted that the inside of the dome had been painted last about fifteen years earlier.³⁹

Work took place on the building's exterior, as well. In February 1948, completing an effort which began during the 1906-1908 remodeling when the capitol balustrade statues were removed, three major pieces of statuary were removed because, according to the Division of Architecture, they had deteriorated to the point that they were a public hazard. Removed were the statue over the north portico of two women seated on either side of a shield surmounted by an eagle and the two acroteria statues displaying a woman on a rearing horse fending off a raging bull and a man mounted on a horse fighting a bear. A spokesman for the division said the statues would be stored for a time pending any decision to restore them.⁴⁰

Major post-war remodeling took place in the historic capitol building as the result of an \$812,500 appropriation in the state budget act of 1950, payable from the Post-War Employment Reserve. Because of the irregular floor levels between the old building and the new annex, the first phase of the project included new stairways with landings at each floor of both buildings. The marble stairway and filigreed brass balustrades, added to the building during the 1906-1908 remodeling project, were removed. Other plans for the appropriation included relathing and replastering part of the west portico, replacement of the wooden sashes on the windows around the dome, repair of the metal roofing at the base of the dome to prevent a serious leaking problem, installation of air conditioning, construction of a new vault for the State Treasurer, remodeling of the Secretary of State's offices, enlargement of press offices, and new landscaping for the grounds in front of the capitol. Despite the fact that the building had been thoroughly hosed off by the Sacramento Fire Department in late 1949, the exterior of the building was grimy, especially compared to the new annex, and needed to be painted.⁴¹ This was the most extensive renovation project undertaken on the building since 1906. Structural engineers from the Division of Architecture opted to proceed carefully on the brick building so as not to undermine its stability.

Building a new enlarged vault for the State Treasurer was no straightforward task in the early post-war years. Construction materials were scarce and before the job could proceed it had to be approved by the National Production Authority officials in Washington, D.C. On December 20, 1951, the go-ahead was announced for the \$182,000 vault and by mid-1952, the project was well underway.⁴² About six years later the original Treasurer's vault, once used to store the state's gold, was ripped out to make way for a cashier's office. The job was a difficult one; the vault door alone weighs 4,500 pounds. The ornamental, double leafed inner doors were acquired by the Division of Beaches and Parks.⁴³

The part of the remodeling which probably received the most public notice, because of its visibility, was the dome. By July 1953, that job was underway. The task which was described as "the most tedious" was the removal of one-sixteenth of an inch of paint, by burning, from each of the redwood window frames on the barrel of the dome. Other work included the replacement of the roof installed during the 1906-1908 remodeling, which leaked; replacement of the copper decking on one of the balconies surrounding the dome; replacement of 3 inch x 12 inch fir timbers in the attic over the west portico which were plagued with dry rot and termites; repair of the west portico ceiling; and removal of the building's 100-foot high flag pole. The seventeen abandoned chimneys, concealed in the walls since the turn of the century, were covered partly in an attempt to discourage bees from making their hives there.⁴⁴

In September 1953, work began on the cupola and gold ball. Scaffolding was erected around the cupola in order that the ball could be removed from its post and be polished without taking it to the ground. The wooden support post and decorative brackets were found to be deteriorated, so new ones were turned at a local planing mill. New gold leaf was applied to the cupola roof. In October, that part of the renovation work was completed. To mark the occasion for the future, Secretary of State Frank M. Jordan, State Controller Robert D. Kirkwood, State Treasurer Charles G. Johnson, and State Architect Anson Boyd

signed their names to a document explaining the recent work, wrapped it in aluminum foil, and placed it in the gold ball. These men represented the same state officers who signed their names to the original support post in October 1871 when the gold ball was installed.⁴⁵

In December 1953, Frank Durkee, Director of the Department of Public Works, announced that the remodeling project was almost completed. A final accounting of some of the work was also made:⁴⁶

Painting structure exterior	\$15,950
Telephone room on the second floor for use by legislators, aides, and public	3,000
Press rooms	14,910
Remodeling and redecorating Secretary of State's offices	6,467
Reroofing entire building with rehabilitation of roof structure	54,761
Repairs on dome	32,822
Repair of porticos and exterior plaster repairs	32,447
Sandblasting of granite	27,100
Expansion of treasurer's vault in basement, including lining of area with bullet proof armor and the installation of elevators, staircases and alarm systems	195,630
Construction of staircases in the north and south wings to connect the original building with the annex at all floor levels	230,802

All of this was completed just in time for Sacramento's celebration marking its one hundredth anniversary as California's capital city on February 24, 1954.

FOOTNOTES

1. California, Statutes (1935), Chapter 349, pp. 1216-1217, Approved June 24, 1935, and Chapter 350, pp. 1218-1219, Approved June 24, 1935; and Sacramento Bee, August 13, 1935, 1/5 and August 14, 1935, 1/3.
2. Sacramento Bee, December 13, 1933, 9/3. Records have not been found to date regarding this application and whether the money was awarded.
3. Sacramento Bee, February 18, 1930, 15/5 and September 9, 1939, magazine section, p. 5.
4. For a general discussion of the State Relief Administration, see Elsey Hurt, California State Government, An Outline of its Administrative Organization, volume 2: The Independent Agencies from 1850-1939 (Sacramento: Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California in cooperation with the California State Department of Finance, 1940, pp. 56-73.
5. Ibid., pp. 29-30.
6. California, Statutes (1939), Chapter 496, Item 84, p. 1842, Approved June 8, 1939; and Sacramento Bee, August 5, 1939, magazine section, p. 6 and December 30, 1939, magazine section, p. 6.
7. Workers of the Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration in Northern California, comp., California's State Capitol, (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1942), p. 64.
8. Sacramento Bee, August 20, 1930, 1/1.
9. Sacramento Bee, November 21, 1930, 40/1-2, November 24, 1930, 1/8 and 5/6, November 24, 1930, 1/7 and 5/5, August 20, 1932, 1/1 and 5/6, September 21, 1932, 4/1, and July 26, 1933, 3/6; and Paul E. Gallagher, comp., California Blue Book, 1950 ([Sacramento]: California State Printing Office, 1948), p. 427.
10. Sacramento Bee, July 31, 1935, 19/3 and August 2, 1935, 5/2-6; and "Capitol Extension," in The Architect and Engineer, August 1935, pp. 74-75.
11. Sacramento Bee, March 25, 1947, 1/6.
12. "Tentative Post-War Building Program to Meet the Immediate Needs of the State," April 21, 1943, F:3640:1342, Earl Warren Papers, Administrative Files, Department of Finance, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.
13. Sacramento Union, December 24, 1944, 1/4-5.
14. "Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 68 -- Relative to Creating an Interim Committee on Remodeling and State Capitol," Chapter 144 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments, Regular Session 1945," in California, Statutes (1945), pp. 3157-3159.

15. San Francisco Chronicle, November 10, 1945, 9/3.
16. "Summary of Post-War Building Program," January 1946, p. 2 of section titled "State Office Buildings," F:3640:3369, Earl Warren Papers, Administrative Files, Department of Public Works, Division of Architecture, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.
17. Sacramento Bee, March 20, 1947, 4/6 and March 25, 1947, 1/6.
18. Ibid., April 4, 1947, 2/1.
19. "Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30 -- Relative to Creating the State Capitol," Chapter 152 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments, Regular Session 1947," in California, Statutes (1947), pp. 3661-3662, filed June 3, 1947; and "Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 61 -- Relative to the Joint Committee on Remodeling the Capitol," Chapter 185 of "Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments, Regular Session 1947," in California, Statutes (1947), p. 3754, filed June 20, 1947.
20. Sacramento Bee, December 10, 1947, 1/3.
21. Ibid., April 9, 1948, 2/4.
22. Ibid., August 12, 1948, 2/5.
23. Ibid., June 9, 1949, 2/1.
24. Ibid., July 13, 1949, 4/2 and August 10, 1949, 1/2-3.
25. Ibid., January 28, 1950, 25/1.
26. Ibid., May 9, 1950, 31/2.
27. Ibid., June 1, 1950, 39/1 and August 17, 1950, 37/2-5.
28. Ibid., December 30, 1950, 5/2-6, January 31, 1951, 21/1-5, and December 7, 1951, 25/1.
29. Ibid., December 30, 1950, 5/2-6.
30. Ibid., June 28, 1951, 1/6 and 3/1.
31. Ibid., June 1, 1950, 39/1 and March 7, 1951, 1/6.
32. Ibid., October 8, 1951, 19/6.
33. Ibid., June 1, 1950, 39/1, October 17, 1951, 25/6, October 26, 1951, 1/6, and October 29, 1951, 17/3; and Fortnight, November 12, 1951, p. 54.
34. Ibid., June 1, 1950, 39/1.
35. Fortnight, November 12, 1951, p. 54.

36. Sacramento Bee, December 7, 1951, 25/1.
37. California, Statutes (1941), Chapter 600, Item 88, p. 2004, Approved June 5, 1941; Statutes (1943), Chapter 62, Item 90, p. 285; Statutes (1945), Chapter 644, Item 117, p. 1213, Approved June 4, 1945; Statutes (1948), Chapter 23, Item 162, p. 68, Approved April 21, 1948; Statutes (1949), Chapter 1187, Section 1, p. 2108, Approved July 25, 1949 and Chapter 700, Item 132, p. 1231, Approved June 18, 1949.
38. Sacramento Bee, November 13, 1947, 6/3; and "Authorized State Construction Program, January 1, 1943 to April 30, 1950," p. 58, Earl Warren Papers, Administrative Files, Department of Public Works, Division of Architecture, California State Archives, Sacramento, California.
39. Sacramento Bee, January 2, 1948, 28/1.
40. Ibid., February 25, 1948, 1/2-2.
41. California, Statutes (1950), Chapter 2, Item 365, p. 330; Sacramento Bee, December 16, 1950, 4/8 and October 1, 1951, 30/2-3; and Sacramento Union, December 16, 1950, 9/6-8.
42. Sacramento Bee, December 20, 1951, 37/1 and June 2, 1952, 1/6-7.
43. Ibid., February 22, 1958, D-6/2.
44. Ibid., July 13, 1953, 17/6-7.
45. Ibid., September 22, 1953, 3/3, September 28, 1953, 26/4-5, and October 17, 1953, 15/6.
46. Ibid., December 5, 1953, F-19/1-2.

CHAPTER VIII

TOWARDS A FULL-TIME, PROFESSIONAL LEGISLATURE (1951-1975)

The years between World War II and the beginning of the Capitol Restoration Project were characterized by tremendous growth in the state's population, which was reflected in the growth of state government. It was also during those years that the Legislature entered a professional status. It changed from a part-time to a full-time schedule and hired on professional staff to absorb the burden of a growing and expanding responsibility and to provide better service to a growing constituency. All of this took its toll on the capitol building and its new annex. The desperate need for space to alleviate overcrowded conditions took precedent over architectural integrity and, piecemeal, the building was once again subjected to changes and modifications. Another factor, probably more peculiar to the Legislative Branch rather than the others, was that newly elected members, newly selected committee chairpeople, and newly elected house and party leaders liked to have their offices decorated to suit their own tastes.

Between 1951, after completion of the annex, and 1958, over \$1,100,000 was spent at the capitol for repairs, remodeling, and rearranging. Richard Rodda, Bee journalist, quoted one workman:

The job never ends. The housewife who changes her mind about the furniture has nothing on legislators and state officials.

Rodda listed the major work on the annex:

1952--Construction of a walk to the entrance of the Capitol garage, \$2,821.

1954--Expansion of sixth floor area for new offices, \$23,600.

1956--Consolidation of two fifth floor Assembly committee rooms into one hearing room, \$32,000.

1958--Authorization of construction of seven, new interim committee office suites on the second floor, \$102,000.

The Assembly also has under consideration a proposal to modernize the air conditioning system in the lower house chamber at an estimated cost of \$40,000 to \$50,000.

The historic building was also subject to change. In 1955, new offices for the State Auditor General were installed at a cost of \$65,000. And, in 1957, after a structural investigation by the Legislature, a contract was let to strengthen the visitors' galleries in both the Assembly and Senate.¹

In April 1960, the Senate Rules Committee announced that major remodeling work would begin June 1. Plans called for two suites of offices on the fifth floor and the rearrangement of all the offices on the fourth floor. The committee informed the Department of Finance, occupants of the fifth floor, that it would have to give up part of its space to accommodate the expanding Senate staff. Senator Randolph Collier predicted, "The time is coming when the legislature will need all of the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth floors." Of course, he was right. Today, only the first floor of the annex is given over to the Executive Branch. The other floors, plus all of the restored capitol, are occupied by the Legislature. The Legislature is functionally more tied to the capitol building than the other branches of government because their chambers are there. The argument that legislators and their staffs should be near their place of work has been a successful one and as they have expanded it has been at the expense of offices which could function in other buildings.²

In May 1960, bids were advertised for construction of a conference room and office suites for twelve senators who had just moved to the fourth floor from the second. The vacated space on the second floor was to be remodeled for the State Controller's central files and mail room, which were being moved from the first floor in order to make room for two new agencies, the Consumer Counsel and Atomic Energy Co-ordinator. These exemplify just some of the constant remodeling which seemed to go on in 1960 and 1961 while the Legislature adjusted to its full-time status.³

Within a year more work was reported in the capitol. During the fall of 1962, the Assembly Chamber was redecorated and new carpet was laid. During the summer the notion had been entertained briefly in the Assembly to retire the members' desks which were original to the opening of the building in 1869. The idea was not popular. Instead, the old desks, the Speaker's dais, and other woodwork in the room were refinished.⁴

In 1964, the Senate Chamber underwent major changes. A \$100,000 budget transformed it into an ornate red Victorian interior featuring chandeliers and a custom woven carpet featuring the Great Seal of the State of California. Five years later the Assembly followed suit and expended \$92,000 on a major transformation in their chamber. Described as the most major remodeling there since 1939, when the electric voting boards were installed and the room was painted green, the new look featured gold and white. To improve the room's acoustics the ceiling was lowered. New ceiling lighting fixtures were hung, the walls were painted, and a new dark gold carpet was laid. A new feature was added to the Assembly Chamber: a television bay was created at the south side. This allowed camera-persons to film the proceedings without obscuring visitors' views in the gallery or walking about on the Assembly floor.⁵

The press, in general, seemed to receive more attention beginning in the 1960s. In 1964, the fourth floor space for the capitol press corps was enlarged. The next year, a new, fully equipped press conference room was added to the first floor of the annex.⁶

An exterior facelifting was given to the building in 1965, the first time in twelve years. First, the outside walls were mechanically cleaned with a mixture of steam, hot water, and detergent. Some of the granite was

sandblasted and rechinked. The walls above the granite were painted and the heavy exterior doors were cleaned and lacquered. The dome (probably the barrel) also received new coats of paint.⁷ Later that year the dome became the subject of a well publicized, front page story, not only over its color but over who had the authority to select the color. Without consulting the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization (which had assumed jurisdiction over the building beginning in the late 1940s), General Services announced it was planning on painting the dome roof white. Robert Harkness, Director of General Services, claimed that three coats of white paint was the only alternative to gold leafing, a cost difference of \$4,000 versus \$80,000. He would not consider gold paint because of its fast fading quality. Immediately, sides were drawn up. Assemblyman James Mills favored Harkness' decision while Pauline Davis and Leroy Greene stuck by the more traditional gold paint. Albert Rodda urged gold leafing. The public also seemed to favor a gold color. According to some of the more emotional proponents of the gold, the dome had been that color since it was built. That, of course, was not true. Originally a natural copper, it was painted slate green with white ribs about 1893. During the remodeling of 1906-1908, it was repainted a solid color. The gold seems to have been applied more recently, perhaps in the 1940s. The furor caused General Services to hold off until the Joint Committee had a chance to make a recommendation. The committee decided to delay taking a position until the next budget session of the Legislature. Governor Edmund G. Brown responded by appropriating \$75,000 in the state budget for electroplating, "to preserve golden tradition". Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post scrapped that plan by agreeing with General Services that no satisfactory way of electroplating the dome had been found. The solution to the dome controversy was to return to the brush and bucket technique of gold paint.⁸

The dome color question brought to the surface a more fundamental issue: whose authority was it to maintain the capitol? From the time of construction until 1945, it rested with the Executive Branch of government, first with the Board of State Capitol Commissioners, then with the Secretary of State, and finally, after 1911, with the Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds. Plans for the capitol annex rested with a special joint legislative committee. Apparently a precedent was set then and the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization assumed responsibility for the maintenance of both the historic building and the annex, with the Division of Buildings and Grounds usually carrying out the work. During this latest controversy, Assemblyman James Mills suggested that the Executive Branch was, perhaps, dodging its responsibility to maintain the building. He referred to the Government Code which seemed to indicate that the Department of Finance was the responsible agency, not the Legislature. Both the Governor's office and the Department of General Services denied Mills' claim. This latter view prevailed and the Legislature has maintained responsibility and authority over the capitol.⁹

The last major episode in the history of the capitol was the events leading to the decision to restore the historic capitol and the restoration project itself.¹⁰ In 1960, an assessment of the future of state government facilities was made in the State Capitol Plan. Four years later the Legislature began to seriously look at its own future needs and space requirements. Senator Randolph Collier actively led a movement to construct a

legislative building, a twin tower edifice, just east of Capitol Park. In 1972, this movement was sparked by the publication of Seismic Study, a report by the State Office of Architecture and Construction, which found that a moderate earthquake could cause the historic capitol to collapse. The problems of overcrowding, linked to the findings that the historic capitol was seismically unsafe, buoyed the efforts to construct a new legislative building and vacate the old building.

In 1973, Assemblyman Willie Brown introduced Assembly Bill 2572 which would allow the construction of a legislative building on the four blocks bounded by 15th, 17th, L and N streets. Meanwhile, Senator Collier was successful in setting aside \$42 million in a Capitol Improvement Fund, as part of the state's 1973-1974 budget. Brown intended to use this money for his bill. The intent was not to do any sort of reinforcement work in the old capitol until the new building was constructed. Speaker of the Assembly, Bob Moretti, supported the bill, as did John L. Burton, Chair of the Assembly Rules Committee. Governor Ronald Reagan, Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinicke, and newly appointed State Architect John Worsley threw their support behind the restoration and remodeling of the old capitol for occupation by the Legislature, with an additional, but modest, new office building. After several amendments, which included a space needs study and the provision that a public notice be given on the question, the Brown's bill passed both houses in September 1973. Governor Reagan, not wanting to support the bill, but unwilling to engage in a veto battle, allowed the bill to become law without his signature. Preliminary planning began for the project which included a space needs study and a contract with Harry J. Devine and Welton Becket and Associates for a design concept.

In June 1974, a change in political leadership occurred which greatly affected the future of the state capitol. Speaker Moretti stepped down from his post to seek the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. In the ensuing battle over his successor, Willie Brown lost to Leo McCarthy and McCarthy was very opposed to the idea of a new capitol. Using his power to assign committee chairmanships, he replaced John Burton, as head of the Assembly Rules Committee and who also served as Chair of the Joint Rules Committee, with Leon Ralph, who also questioned the plans for a new capitol and the validity of the selection process for the design contractors. Ralph established an advisory committee, made up of three architects, and asked the professional opinion of State Architect John Worsley. He wanted this committee to have the authority to award the design contract. They, too agreed on Welton Becket and Associates. In February 1975, Welton Becket provided the Legislature with three alternative designs for a new legislative building and recommended the partial restoration of the old capitol.

Meanwhile, Ralph had decided that the capitol should be fully restored for legislative use and he introduced Assembly Bill 2071 which provided for full restoration of the old building. The \$42 million in Brown's 1973 legislation was redirected for the restoration project. It passed the Legislature on June 27, 1975. The Joint Rules Committee awarded the construction contract to a joint venture of Continental Heller Corporation and Swinerton & Walberg. The restoration project began in March 1976.

I-PERM-00160/00170/00180

FOOTNOTES

1. Sacramento Bee, October 11, 1956, A-9/1, May 10, 1957, January 21, 1958, C-1/8, and January 29, 1958, E-1/1.
2. Sacramento Bee, April 5, 1960, B-4/2 and July 24, 1960, B-1/3-8 and B-4/8.
3. Sacramento Union, May 19, 1960, 13/1-2; and Sacramento Bee, July 12, 1961, C-2/1-2 and July 26, 1961, C-1/5-7.
4. Ibid., June 21, 1962, C-1/1-3, June 28, 1962, A-6/3, and September 2, 1962, B-5/3-6.
5. Ibid., December 7, 1969, B-1/1-7.
6. Ibid., October 19, 1965, C-1/4-7.
7. Ibid., February 28, 1965, B-3/1-2.
8. Ibid., November 21, 1965, A-1/2-4 and A-2/1-2, November 22, 1965, A-1/1-4, November 30, 1965, A-1/2-4 and A-6/1-2, and February 24, 1968, A-1/2-4.
9. Ibid., November 30, 1965, A-1/2-4.
10. The following discussion of events leading to restoration from James W. Dickinson, "Sacramento's Modern Capitol: A Legislative Dream Denied," December 15, 1980. A typewritten student paper on file in the Capitol Restoration Project office.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. CALIFORNIA STATE PUBLICATIONS

California Blue Books.

California. Statutes. (1850-1975).

_____. Board of Health. Eighteenth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health, of California, for the Fiscal Years from July 1, 1902, to June 30, 1904. Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, Supt. State Printing, 1904.

_____. _____ . Twentieth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health, of California, for the Fiscal Years from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1908. Sacramento: W. W. Shannon, Supt. State Printing, 1908.

_____. Board of State Capitol Commissioners. "Annual Report of the State Capitol Commissioners for the Year 1863." December 5, 1863. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 15th session.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1864 and 1865." November 1, 1865. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 16th session, volume 2.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1865 to November 1st, 1867." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 17th session, volume 3.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners from November 1st, 1867 to November 1st, 1869." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 18th session, volume 3.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1870 and 1871." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 19th session, volume 4.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1872 and 1873." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 20th session, volume 2.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners, for the Years 1874 and 1875." November 1, 1875. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 21st session, volume 3.

_____. _____ . "Biennial Report of the State Capitol Commissioners. December 1862." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 14th session.

_____. _____ . "Report of the Board of State Capitol Commissioners to the Thirty-seventh Session of the Legislature of California, 1907." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 38th session, volume 1.

- _____. Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds. "First Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds of California." (July 1, 1911-July 1, 1914). Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 41st session, volume 3.
- _____. "Second Report of the Superintendent Capitol Building and Grounds of California." (July 1, 1914-July 1, 1916). Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 42nd session, volume 2.
- _____. Treasurer. "Annual Report of the State Treasurer, for the Year 1862." December 15, 1862. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 14th session.
- _____. "Biennial Report of the State Treasurer, State of California, for the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Fiscal Years, July 1, 1914 to June 30, 1916." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 42nd session, volume 6.
- California's State Treasury. California State Printing Office. May 1955.
- Gillett, James N. "Second Biennial Message of Governor James N. Gillett." Journal of the Senate, 39th session, January 2, 1911.
- Hurt, Elsey. California State Government, An Outline of Its Administration Organization, volume 2: The Independent Agencies from 1850-1939. Sacramento: Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California in cooperation with the California State Department of Finance, 1940.
- Johnson, Hiram W. "First Biennial Message of Governor Hiram W. Johnson." January 6, 1913. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 40th session, volume 1.
- Johnson, J. Neely. "Annual Message of the Governor." Journal of the Assembly, 9th session, January 8, 1858.
- Jordan, Frank C., comp. Statement of General Elections Held on November 12, 1926 in the State of California. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1926.
- Low, Frederick K. "Governor's Biennial Message." Journal of the Assembly, 16th session, December 8, 1865.
- Markham, H. H. "Second Biennial Message of Governor H. H. Markham to the Legislature of the State of California." January 7, 1895. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 31st session, volume 1.
- Pardee, George C. "First Biennial Message of Governor George C. Pardee to the Legislature of the State of California." January 2, 1905. Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 36th session, volume 1.
- Stanford, Leland. "Message from the Governor." Journal of the Assembly, 15th session, December 9, 1863.

- Waterman, R. W. "Biennial Message of R. W. Waterman." Appendix to Journals of Senate and Assembly, 28th session, volume 1.
- Weller, John B. "Message from the Governor." Journal of the Senate, 11th session, January 9, 1860.
- Workers of the Writers Program of the Work Projects Administration in Northern California, comp. California's State Capitol. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1942.
- Young, C. C. "Second Biennial Message of Governor C. C. Young." Journal of the Assembly, 49th session, January 5, 1931.

2. PUBLISHED SOURCES OTHER THAN STATE PUBLICATIONS

- "Art News." California Mail Bag. November 1873, pp. 97-98.
- Bean, Walton. California, An Interpretive History. New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1968.
- Bowman, J. N. "Cornerstone of the State Capitol." California Historical Society Quarterly 33 (December 1954), 329-336.
- California Progressive Campaign Book for 1914: Progressive Administration in California Under Hiram W. Johnson. n.p. n.d.
- California Reports.
- "Capitol Extension." The Architect and Engineer, August 1, 1935, pp. 74-75.
- "Exhibit." New Notes of California Libraries 33 (April 1928), 173.
- Glaskan, Roy R., comp. American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections, 1775-1975. Stillwater, Minnesota: The Croixside Press, 1975.
- Hittell, Theodore H. History of California, IV. San Francisco: N. J. Stone & Co., 1898.
- "The Murals in the State Capitol." New Notes of California Libraries 23 (April 1928), 173-174.
- Ryan, Frederick L. Industrial Relations in the San Francisco Building Trades. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935.
- West's Annotated California Codes. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1970.
- Wheat, Carl I., ed. "California's Bantam Cock." California Historical Society Quarterly 9 (September 1930), 243-287. This is part of a continuing journal; this segment deals with "Journal for 1858."

Wheaton, Donald W. "Spotlights on the Political History of California from 1887-1898." California Historical Society Quarterly 5 (September 1926), 283-288.

Wright, George F., ed. History of Sacramento County, California. . . Oakland: Thompson & West, 1880; reprint ed., Berkeley: Howell-North, 1960.

3. MANUSCRIPT MATERIAL

California State Archives. Sacramento, California. Board of State Capitol Commissioners RG.

_____. California. Legislature RG. Unprocess Legislative Material.

_____. California. Legislature RG. Legislative Bill Files.

_____. Controller's Office RG.

_____. Earl Warren Papers. Administrative Files. Department of Finance. "Summary of Post-War Building Program," January 1946.

_____. Earl Warren Papers. Administrative Files. Department of Finance. "Tentative Post-War Building Program to Meet the Immediate Needs of the State," April 21, 1943.

_____. Earl Warren Papers. Administrative Files. Department of Public Works. "Authorized State Construction Program, January 1, 1943, to April 30, 1950."

_____. Information File. State Capitol Folder.

_____. Stockton Insane Asylum. "Register of Deaths," June 6, 1862-December 30, 1921. Unprocessed.

California State Library. Sacramento, California. Eden Wadsworth Collection.

Office of the State Architect. Sacramento, California. Drawings. File 12-L-32.

Sacramento History Center. Sacramento, California. Sacramento County. Assessor's Office RG. Map Books.

_____. Sacramento County. Board of Supervisors. Minutes.

4. NEWSPAPERS

Daily Alta California (San Francisco).

Sacramento Bee. Also published as the Daily Bee, Evening Bee, and the Saturday Bee.

Sacramento Union. Also published as the Sacramento Daily Union and Sacramento Daily Record-Union.

San Francisco Bulletin.

San Francisco Chronicle.

San Francisco Examiner.

San Francisco Evening Post.

5. UNPUBLISHED REPORTS AND DISSERTATIONS

Dickinson, James W. "Sacramento's Modern Capitol: A Legislative Dream Denied." December 15, 1980. Typewritten copy on file in Capitol Restoration Project Office.

Kos, Mary Grace, Sister. "California's Search for a Capital Site, 1846-1879," Ph.D. dissertation, University of St. Louis, 1962.

I-00180

