

SERMON.

The Call of the Hour.

By The Rev. A. H. C. MORSE

The Rev. A. H. C. Morse, pastor of the Strong Place Baptist Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., preached on "The Call of the Hour." The text was from Matthew XIII: 51-52. Mr. Morse said: "The method of Jesus was 'Socratic.' He taught by illustration and fastened the subject upon the minds of his hearers by means of illustrations. In the instance before us He had been teaching His disciples. When He had finished the theory He asked them if they understood all the things which they answered 'Yea.' Very well, then, for the practice. 'Every one who has perceived these things as a householder who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.' This is a great principle, with its lesson for the present. These are unusual days, and our times are unlike any period of our country's immediate fathers. We do not live in their homes, nor travel in their conveyances, nor think in their categories. We have different ideas than they of respecting man and his Maker, sin and righteousness, the scripture and the Sabbath of rest. It is hard to think that our days have followed so hard upon their days, and that we have taken from their customs, and that our religious ideas are to theirs as children. Now it seems to me that it is the duty of the disciple to get back to these things, to the old, to the old, to the old, and then to come forth and declare His message. And Jesus intimates that back of all these things, and over them is the kingdom of God which is not of this world, but which is something far larger than our ideas of the kingdom upon the earth. It is vastly more than your largest conceptions of the church, visible or invisible. It is the kingdom of God which is manifested in His dealings with men in all this dispensation. Nay, it is more than this. It is the sovereign sway of God in all His vast creation. And the thing which He has come to preach in these days is the kingdom of the heavens, for it has its message to every century and to every condition of life. The responsibility which is laid upon us to-day is to declare it—to listen to the voices which do not hear in the crowd, to look with unclouded vision upon the lines of beauty and glory that indicate the method of the divine government, to see the things unseen, and then turn back and speak of that to our own particular day. That I conceive to be the call of the hour. That is what it means to bring forth things new and old. Now, the new and the old are essentially one. The old is the new, the new is the old. The old is the principle, the new is the application. The old is the past, the new is the present. We hear a great deal about a 'new theology.' Well, if the new theology contradicts the old it is not true. But also if the old theology contradicts the new it is not true. Theology is the science of God. It is as old as the first man who thought upon his Maker. Moreover, it is a living science, and it has blossomed in every century from the time that the first rude altar was reared in the desert till now, when we worship in churches with music and prayer and ceremony. 'The new and the old.' They are the principles which are as old as God, and as new as the youngest babe. Methods and manners and men change, but the principles remain the same. God is a king. He sits upon His throne and exercises His government, and sometimes He does some marvelous things. We have seen some strange things since the beginning of the twentieth century. They have not been the affairs of one nation, but they have been world-wide. England and France and Germany and Russia and China and Japan and the United States and the islands of the sea have all felt the jar as He has walked among the nations. We ought, then, to realize that He is seated on His throne, that He is king, and active king; that nothing escapes His notice, and that the problems that vex our hearts do puzzle Him in the least; and that through all the mystery and all the agony and all the wars He is king, and that He sits unseated at every council of peace. The Lord has not given over the government of this world to the king of emperors, to czar or president. Nor do I think He has given over the government of cities to mayor and aldermen. The Lord who made the world is still its ruler. This is an old truth that calls for an increasing emphasis. And surely in view of all that has been unearthed it is not amiss to reaffirm that righteousness is a requirement of God. Oh, the subtlety of His temptation and boldness of sin! How fight upon the street and men kill each other in the dark. Children gamble with their pennies, and rich men, with their coffers filled, still strive to win an awful greed. Policemen are not enough to keep the city straight. We must have a legislative commission to sit in the offices of the big corporations to keep them from fleecing the bread and butter from the widows and orphans whose living they hold in trust. It is wrong, then, to call aloud for righteousness, and to shout that the wages of sin is death. But why should men not do these things if they are strong enough? Is not might the criterion of right? Only one marks the line of rectitude? Only one is the line of God, the line of His will? And what is right for Him is also right for us, and what is wrong in Him is sin in man. Righteousness is righteousness. And righteousness is the obligation of the man who is made in the image of God. But men shrug their shoulders and say, 'But a man must live.' By no means must. There is no necessity that I should live. But now that I am alive, the one obligation is that I be right. Righteousness or rightness is an inexorable demand, and there can be no situation, nor any complication of circumstances that can be an excuse for sin. In many instances, however, we can conceive of a condition which it would be right for God to compromise. Righteousness and holiness and straightness are words that need to be soundly abused. But I say that these things are as old. What then, say the things that are new? We are looking for a great revival. Shall we strive in the line of our fathers? It will never come in that way. The day of the Hippodrome meetings filled with men seeking the kingdom is past. Our age has become too much materialized for that. True, we can fill immense churches with crowds, but they are already evangelized. They are Christian people talking the places that ought to be filled by strangers. How, then, is it to be done? We have got to grapple with this question in another way. We must leave our churches and go to the tents in summer, and into the streets in winter, and into the theatres on Sundays, and in every way preach the gospel. Great is the problem in this city. Hard are the conditions about all the churches. These conditions must be met, not by disbanding and not with fear, but with the stout, courageous heart that wins. What should we do with the foreigners? He treads our streets, he does our work, he outnumbers our people. And he will live with us, he will put us down unless we lift him up. This is true not only of this city, but of the entire land. 'Oh, America, wide open and unguarded stand thy gates and through them pressed a wild and motley throng. Have care! lest they trample the crucified stars be torn and trampled in the dust. For so of old the vandals and the Goths invaded Rome, and where the temple of the Christian God stood, they raised an idol, made her lair.' This is the message of the morning. I cling to the things that are old. I fling out the things that are new. I call into your ears the battle cry. In this great struggle, it is we, the men of this generation, who are the real heroes of the campaign of the autumn upon us? DR. FRANK CRANE'S EPIGRAMS. The best idea of God is the child's idea of God. There has been in modern times a great advance in all educational methods, and in what new thing can we say? Well, we can emphasize its madness. If on the street the policeman tells us to stop, we are most of us wise enough to do so. We must be wiser than the policeman, and we must be wiser than the child. The opposite of reverence is vulgarity; an irreverent person is vulgar in the heart of him. The next generation after a generation of filippic and vulgar display. The only permanent roots of real honor lie in a sense of God. No man or woman is good in the dark, except they have the sense of God. A child should be taught to think of God as Law and as Love; as Law, He gives certain calamity on those who do not obey His law; as Love, He has so arranged the universe that a man who keeps His laws and such a man alone will find certain happiness and success. Without the preservation of public worship the sense of God surely disappears from a people. The mass of workmen and the majority of the cultured classes today neglect church; as sure as result follows the children of this generation will witness some social, commercial or political calamity. A republic of godless men is an impossibility. As between a cruel notion of God and no notion of God, I should choose the former; the descendants of Jonathan Edwards managed better than the children of Rousseau; these carried out an American Revolution, those a French Revolution. By these marks we can know that God has touched the heart: when a little thought gives way to a large thought; when willingness to use a lie is replaced by a loyalty to truth; when fear is changed to courage; when conscientiousness begins to extend also into the dark; when anger is mastered by self control; when peevishness becomes sweetness; when jealousy and love are transformed into real happiness in another's welfare; when we find pleasure in duty; when love of ease disappears before a desire to satisfy our sense of duty; and when filippic and verbiage is replaced by reverence.—From sermon preached by Rev. Dr. Frank Crane, at Worcester, Mass.

PLANNED SCHEME TO HOLD UP FATHER

How Millionaire's Son Kidnapped Himself.

Man Arrested for Holding Young Cudahy For \$25,000 Ransom.

Says Boy Arranged All.

NEW YORK, Oct. 4.—A Butte, Mont., despatch to the World says that the man calling himself Pat. Crowe, who was arrested in Butte, Monday night, by two detectives, after he had been about the city for a week, made a statement last night relative to the kidnapping of Eddie Cudahy, declaring that the proposition 'to work' the boy's father for a ransom came from the boy himself. Crowe says the boy himself first broached the subject of working on the father's feelings for a big ransom. At first Crowe paid no attention to the proposition, but it was repeated until he concluded to go into the alleged plot with the boy. A third party was with them, but he got frightened, believing the scheme was a trap. The Cudahy boy is asserted by Crowe, proposed demanding \$50,000 from his father, but Crowe and Cullahan, the second party he took into the scheme, decided to demand \$25,000. The boy of Crowe as to how the kidnapping was worked and how Cudahy drove out into a lone place and let the money agree with the first do not say. Crowe says Cudahy was a leading spirit in the adventure, and was never a prisoner. The three divided the \$25,000, young Cudahy being given \$8,000 as his share. He was then taken to his home and let a few blocks from the Cudahy house. An Omaha special to the World says that Mrs. Cudahy ridicules the statement made by Crowe that her son Eddie himself was a party to the kidnapping, and that he received \$6,000 of the father's money. 'Why, it is outrageous to say that Eddie did such a thing. What could he do with the money? Why does any one want to pay any attention to the absurd stories of this man Crowe?' Both the boy and his father had retired for the night when the news of Crowe's version of the origin of the plot reached Omaha, and Mrs. Cudahy refused to discuss the matter. She said she would not be so manifestly absurd that it was unworthy of credence. BUTTE, Mont., Oct. 4.—Pat Crowe today admitted that he was in Omaha six weeks ago and engaged in a plot to kidnap Eddie Cudahy, which an officer was shot. He says the police fired 16 shots at him before he fled, and that he opened fire to save his own life. He denies absolutely the alleged confession published in Butte last night, and refutes the statement that he had said that Young Cudahy plotted with him to extort money from Mr. Cudahy, senior.

SOCIETY WEDDING AT HALIFAX.

Bishop Worrell's Daughter Weds Charles S. Kirkpatrick.

(Special to the Sun.)

HALIFAX, N. S., Oct. 4.—The chief interest of society this week centered in the marriage in St. Luke's Cathedral, at three o'clock this afternoon, of Elsie, eldest daughter of His Lordship, Bishop Worrell and Mrs. Worrell, and Charles Stafford Kirkpatrick of Kingston, Ontario, son of the Rev. F. W. Kirkpatrick, and nephew of Sir George Campbell, Viscount E. C. Campbell. It was a year ago that the family of the Bishop came to Halifax to make their permanent home, and in that short space of time the young daughter of the household have become generous benefactors of the city. In various directions real regret has been expressed that the marriage of Miss Elsie Worrell involves her removal to Kingston, but happily this is the only regret in connection with the wedding, on which the sun of a perfect October day shone auspiciously. The cathedral was crowded with the friends of the young couple, some very elegant gowns being worn. Conspicuous among the very best of the guests were the bride and groom, the bride wearing a gown of white and satin, and the latter surrounded by a wreath of orange blossoms worn originally by Miss Worrell's mother on her wedding day, a shower bouquet of white roses and the valley, entered with her father. The pure, rich gown was admirably adapted to her general style both in color and texture. She was preceded by her two sisters, Mrs. G. H. G. and Charlotte Worrell, who also wore beautiful gowns of white shirred silk with lace baby hats, and bouquets of pink carnations. Herbert Kirkpatrick of Montreal, brother of the groom, acted as the latter's best man. Rev. Canon Crawford, grandfather of the bride, officiated, being assisted by Rev. Canon Crawford and Rev. H. P. A. Abbott. The ceremony was followed by a reception at Bishop Worrell's residence, 20 Harvey street, the entire first floor being thrown open to guests, and given a beautiful festive touch with flowers, both cut and growing, whose fragrance penetrated to every part of it. After the wedding, Kirkpatrick left during the afternoon for the wedding trip, which will be through Nova Scotia. Before going to Kingston they will pay a brief visit to Halifax. The bride's wedding gown was a very smart one of reseau green, and her hat of velvet and chenille, with foliage.

SHIPPING NEWS.

Domestic Ports.

ST. STEPHEN, N.S., Oct 4—Ar'd, str Baines Hawkins, from Sydney, QB. CHATHAM, Oct 3—Ar'd, str Richard, from Sydney, QB. HILLSBORO, Oct 3—Cld, str Eddie, Medford, for New York. QUEBEC, Sept 23—Ar'd, str Parliament, Vipond, from Montreal (and old for Liverpool). LISLET, Sept 23—Passed, str Victorian, from Quebec for Liverpool. FATHER POINT, Sept 23—Passed, str Mongolian, from Montreal for Glasgow; Fashoda, from River du Loup for —. FAME POINT, Sept 23—Passed, str Manchester Shipper, from Three Rivers for Manchester. British Ports. LIZARD, Oct 4—Passed, str Ontario, from Montreal and Quebec for London. LONDON, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Columbian, from Boston. QUEBENSTOWN, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Teutonic, from New York for Liverpool (and proceeded). LIVERPOOL, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Ivernia, from London. LIVERPOOL, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Syria, from Halifax and St John, NF; 3rd, Mantine, from Pughwash, NS, and Sydney, CB. LIVERPOOL, Oct 4—Sld, str Manchester City, for Montreal; 3rd, str Lake Manitoba, from Montreal. NEWPORT NEWS, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Indrani, from Glasgow via St John. Sld, str Henry W. Cramp, for Boston; J. H. Hanson, for Bangor. MANCHESTER, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Mantine, from Pughwash, NS, and Sydney, CB. LIVERPOOL, Oct 4—Sld, str Welshman, for Portland, Me. ALICANTE, Sept 26—Ar'd, str Elizabeth Eleanor, from Labrador. GIBRALTAR, Sept 25—Ar'd, str William Pritchard, from Labrador. LIVERPOOL, Oct 4—Sld, str Baltic, for New York. LIVERPOOL, Oct 3—Sld, str Etretia, Mulachy, St John, NB. MANCHESTER, Oct 3—Ar'd, str Semantha (Br), Robinson, Chatham, NB. Foreign Ports. CHATHAM, Mass., Oct 4—Light northward winds, clear at sunset. Passed south, str Artemis, from Boston for Hampton Roads; str Lewis H. Howard, from Boston for Hampton Roads; str Empress, from Windsor, NS, for New York; Phoenix, from eastern port for coal port; Hannah, from do for do. Passed east, str Rossland, from New York for Halifax. Passed south, str Admiral Farragut, from Boston for Port Antonio. ROSARIO—Ar'd Sept 1, bark Benjamin F. Hunt, Jr, from Boston via Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres. DELAWARE BREAKWATER, Oct 4—Sld, str Nicamor, from Philadelphia for Sydney, CB. FREEDY ISLAND, Oct 4—Passed dawn, str Marie Palmer, from Philadelphia for Boston; Bradford C French, from do for Bangor; S S Hudson, from do for Lynn. BOSTON, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Romantic, from Liverpool; str Rotterdam, Rotterdam, Newcastle and Povey; str Patriot, from Merigonish, NS; Skata, from Harvey, NB; Prescott Palmer, from Baltimore. Sld, str Devonian, for Liverpool; str Melrose, for Hillsboro, NB; Jennie S Hall, for Brunswick, G; Henry S Little, for Baltimore; James W Paul, Jr, for Hampton Roads; Mary B Rogers, for eastern port; Mary Brewer, for Rockland, Hume, for do; H S Boynton, for Rockport, Me. Sld from Roads, str Mary Manning, for Newport News. BOOTHBY HARBOR, Me, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Ethel T Merriman, Newman, from Rockport, Me. Sld, str Stephen J Watts, Whiteley, for Bangor; Annie E Kimball, for Malbone, Me; Bernard, for Parboro, NS. GLOUCESTER, Mass., Oct 4—Ar'd, str Gazelle, from Weymouth, NS. STONINGTON, Me, Oct 4—Ar'd, str str Brigadier, from Boston; Lucy C French, from do. PORTLAND, Me, Oct 4—Ar'd, str North Star, Bragg, from New York; str Edna, Rogers, from Windsor, NS, for New York; Garfield White, Matthews, from Point White, NB, for do; Wm B Palmer, Bangor, from do; John, NE; Eleanor Perry, Jewett, from do; Chas A Sproul, from Bangor for Boston. Sld, str Lizzie Edmondson, for Northville, N. Y.; str New York for Sackville, NB; Garfield, Wm, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Edna, for do; Ruelight, for Jonesport; C W Gilmore, for eastern port; E T Hamor, for do. NEW YORK, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Bessie Parker, from Port Reading for John, NB; Bertha, from Port Reading for Newport; Frederick A Dugan, from Brunswick; Carl C Miles, from South Amboy for Rockland; Samuel H Sharp, from Virginia; Samuel B Hubbard, from Perth Amboy for Salem; Harry L Fenner, from South Amboy for Providence; Victor C Records, from Buffalo, Va.; Clarence A Holland, from Newbern, N C. Salled, str Oceanic, for Liverpool; str Benj A Vanburen, for Providence; E T Rundlett, for Hallowell; James H Hargreaves, for Hallowell; Howard A Hunt, for Virginia; Gesse Starr, for Chester; Adella T Carleton, for Rockland; Three Marys, for Savannah; Geo E Kitch, for Hampton Roads. CITY ISLAND, N Y, Oct 4—Bound south, str Horatio Hall, from Portland, Me; str Harry Knowlton, from St. John, NB; Helen P Portland, Conn; Marlon, from Clinton, Conn; Howard Russell, from Bridgport, for Salsus, for Portland, Me; Brig Cho, for Halifax. SALEM, Mass, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Storm Petrel, from Ellsworth; Ricardson, from St John for Salsus, for do. CALAIS, Me, Oct 4—Ar'd, str Leslie Cobb, from Eastport. Salled, str E M Cook, for New York; General Scott, for Plymouth; Hiram, for Boston. VINEYARD HAVEN, Mass, Oct 4—Arrived and salled, str Watchman, from South Amboy for Bangor; Rarburn, from Jersey City for Louisburg, C E. Salled, str Georgia D Jenkins (from Two Rivers), for New York; Lillian Blauvelt, from Tuckert, N S, for do; Adeline (from St John, NB), for do; Onyx (from Liverpool, NB), for do. Passed, str Rosalind, from New York for Halifax; str E M Roberts, for New York; Alice T Boardman, from Calais, bound north.

INTERESTING CASE IN EQUITY COURT.

Water for Mill Comes in Pipe Running Through Defendant's Property.

The trial of this case was begun before Judge J. H. Blaisdell at Chatham, N.S., and was then adjourned until yesterday afternoon, when the hearing was continued in this city. The case will probably occupy two or three days, as there are a number of witnesses to be examined on both sides. The question at issue is whether the plaintiffs, Andrew Loggie, Robert Loggie and Francis P. Loggie, have a right to get water for the mill at Black Brook, Northumberland Co., through the pipe which runs through the defendant's land. This pipe was laid in the year 1872, leading from a spring to the plaintiffs' mill. The defendants wish to build over the pipe line, and this suit is brought to prevent any interference with the present state of affairs. The title to the land is one question involved, and depends on certain boundaries which have been changed in recent years, while some old landmarks have also disappeared, making the determination of the lines very difficult. The first part of the afternoon was taken up by the plaintiffs putting in evidence the deeds through which they claim title. One deed was made in the year 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness called by the plaintiffs was John Blaise of Loggieville. Witness 1822 by a referee in equity to Francis E. Winslow. Strangely enough, there is no record of the proceedings in the equity court which authorized the referee to make this deed. There are no papers on record in the clerk of the court, and the question arises, whether the deed is registered, since it will be presumed that all the proceedings were regular. The plaintiffs propose to call E. H. McAlpine, the referee, to prove that the deed for sale was properly made. No copy of the decree can be found. The first witness