

tion and proceeded to try him on the said charge. At the conclusion of the hearing and before the Board arrived at a finding in the case Officer Disney asked permission to resign, which permission was granted, and his resignation was accepted by the following vote.

The vote upon the acceptance of resignation of Probation Officer William H. Disney was as follows:-

President Upshur, Yea,
Commissioner Morris, Yea,
Commissioner Fowler, Yea.

Complaint of S.E. Nicholson.
State Superintendent Anti-Saloon League.
Visit of M.A. Soper.

In the matter of the complaint preferred by the Anti-Saloon League with reference to the action of Captain of Detectives Pumphrey and Detective Hammersla in testifying for the defense in case of violation of the liquor law in Belair, as referred to in the proceedings of September 22, 26, October 1, 3, 6, 13, 24 and 27, 1902, a communication as follows was received from M. A. Soper, attorney for the Anti-Saloon League:-

"Baltimore, October 27, 1902.

To the Board of Police Commissioners,
of Baltimore City.

Gentlemen:-

On behalf of the Anti-Saloon League I desire to renew the request made to you this morning by Mr. S. E. Nicholson for copies of two letters of June 1902 and September 18, 1902, which Captain Pumphrey of the detective force claims to have received from Captain Titus of the New York City detective force in regard to the character of Louis Wein, a detective employed by the League.

The League appreciates your action in requiring from Detectives Pumphrey and Hammersla an explanation of their connection with the defense in certain liquor cases tried at Bel Air in September and October and in furnishing to the League a copy of their answers to certain questions suggested by it. From these answers it seems that Captain Pumphrey felt justified in appearing as a witness for the defense and in swearing that he would not believe Wein, a state's witness, under oath because of information contained in the letter named, copies of which he files as Exhibits. It is urged that unless copies of these letters are furnished the answers of Captain Pumphrey is meaningless and the League is still at a loss to know why a state's officer should be willing to give aid to the defense in a criminal trial.

You have declined to furnish the letters because Captain Pumphrey has stated to you that the information received from his brother detective in New York is confidential and improper to be disclosed to the League. I desire to inform your Board that Captain Pumphrey willingly furnished at least one of these letters to the