

CZOLGOZ'S BODY

Preserved in a Cast of Plaster of Paris.

Instead of Being Destroyed by Quicklime as the Authorities Intended.

(New York Herald.)

It is possible that if the body of Leon Czolgoz was exhumed today it would be found well preserved in a plaster of paris cast instead of having been dissolved and disintegrated by the action of the quicklime and vitriol with which it was covered when interred in the prison burial lot at Auburn, on Tuesday afternoon.

It had been determined by Warden Mead and Superintendent Cornelius V. Collins to bury the body in a bed of quicklime, so that not a trace of the assassin should remain as a possible incentive to relic hunters.

To make certain, Warden Mead, a few days before Czolgoz was executed, placed a piece of raw beef in a jar containing an equal amount of quicklime, but when the warden opened the jar he was surprised to find the meat practically in the same condition.

Warden Mead and Superintendent Collins then decided to add to the mass of quicklime over Czolgoz's body a quantity of vitriol.

This was done. When the body was interred on Tuesday afternoon a layer of quicklime had already been placed in the grave. On this the coffin, the lid of which had been removed, was laid, and the body was then covered with two barrels of quicklime.

Over this a carboy of vitriol, or sulphuric acid, was poured, two more barrels of quicklime were thrown in, and over all the earth was shoveled until the grave was filled.

It was anticipated that as a result of the action of the sulphuric acid and quicklime the body would be dissolved within twelve hours, but it is improbable that this has been the case.

When quicklime and sulphuric acid are combined, the chemical result is plaster of paris and water. This is the chemical formula:

CaO plus H2SO4 equals CaSO4 plus H2O.

CaO is the quicklime, H2SO4 the sulphuric acid, CaSO4 the plaster of paris resulting from the chemical combination, and H2O the water left over, which, in the course of time, would evaporate.

"It is entirely possible that Czolgoz's body is incased in a plaster of paris cast," said Professor Charles F. Chandler of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and of the University of New York, last night.

"Plaster of paris would result from the combination of the sulphuric acid and quicklime, but to have the effect of each of them as a solvent entirely neutralized it would be necessary that they should have been combined in exactly the right proportions.

"There is undoubtedly a large amount of plaster of paris surrounding Czolgoz's body if he was buried in the manner described by the newspapers, but there was undoubtedly either too much sulphuric acid or too much quicklime, probably the latter, to make a perfect chemical combination of the entire mass. There would be enough of either the quicklime or sulphuric acid left over to dissolve the body in the course of time.

"In order to make a plaster of paris cast it would be necessary that there should be ninety-eight parts of the acid to fifty-six parts of the lime; that is, if the acid were absolutely pure. The vitriol of commerce, however, contains about six and one-half parts of water to ninety-three and one-half parts of pure acid.

"A carboy, as I remember, contains about one hundred and fifty pounds,

which would not be sufficient to entirely neutralize the quality of quicklime with which the body was covered. Quicklime would not, under any circumstances, dissolve the body in twenty-four hours, but there is undoubtedly enough of it left to do the desired work in the course of time."

This letter bearing on the matter has been received by the Herald. To the Editor of the Herald:

I have just been reading about the cremation of the assassin Czolgoz, and the way Warden Mead expects to destroy the body. If your account is correct, Warden Mead evidently did not know that his modus operandi will cause the body to be kept forever preserved in a matrix of sulphate of lime of plaster of paris, and that he might as well have placed the body in alcohol.

Of course, the action of the oil of vitriol on the lime will produce intense heat, but probably the body will be preserved by that very fact, as the vapor produced around the body will act as a protective layer or cushion between it and the surrounding quicklime plaster of paris.

All this is very elementary, and a tyro in chemistry could have pointed that out to Warden Mead. His purpose would have surely been attained with the use of a strong solution of caustic soda or potash, the latter having been used by a certain criminal in Chicago to effectively destroy the body of his wife.

DON'T GO HOME. If you have not got at least one bottle of Kendrick's Liniment in the house, don't go home without it. There is nothing better (if equal) to Kendrick's as a household remedy.

LORD MAYOR OF LONDON.

Title First Bestowed by Edward III. in 1354—Some Interesting Historical Information—The City of London.

The new sheriffs of London were sworn in on Saturday, 23rd Sept., and the new lord mayor elected. After those important events the shrievalty breakfast took place at the Grocers' hall, where a company of nearly three hundred assembled. The sheriffs elected on Midsummer day last were Alderman J. C. Bell and Alderman Howard B. Mansel, M. A., head of the large publishing firm that bears his name. The next lord mayor in rotation is Sir Joseph C. Dinsdale, alderman of the Cornhill Ward, and the junior representative of the city in parliament. He is a banker, was knighted at the end of his year of office as sheriff in 1894, is a past master of the Grocers' Company, and a past grand master of the Free Masons of England, and for five years represented the city corporation in the London county council.

The first municipal institutions of London were received from the Romans, and they have endured in their main features to the present day. In Saxon times it was in reality an independent state, and William the Conqueror only gained possession of the city by force of arms. About eight years after he granted a charter, which is still preserved, addressed to William the Bishop, Godfrey the Portreeve, and all the Burgesses, promising that they shall be "lawworthy" (i.e. possessed of privileges), as they were in the days of Edward the Confessor. The portreeve, however, received the Norman title of bailiff, and the office was changed to mayor, the first holder of the title being Henry Fitzalwyn, who filled the office for 24 years. On his death a new charter was granted by King John in 1214, directing the mayor to be chosen annually, as has ever since been done. The title of lord mayor was first bestowed in 1354 on Sir Thomas Legge by Edward III. Aldermen were first

SUPREME COURT.

Judgment Against Dunn of New Brunswick—A Clergyman Loses His Case.

(New York Sun.)

A glance at the map will show that the Turkish island of Mytilene, the Lesbos of the old Greek days, would, if permanently occupied by France, not only enable that power to capture at will the great port of Smyrna on the mainland of Asia Minor, but would also give her a naval station of pre-eminent strategic value with reference to the Dardanelles, the Aegean and the Levant.

To understand why so permanent occupation of the island is contemplated by the French, it may be useful to recall some facts which followed the last Russo-Turkish war, and the treaty collections thus assumed by Great Britain with regard to the Ottoman empire.

What had Lord Beaconsfield in mind when, during the Russo-Turkish war, he announced in London that at Berlin, not only had the Crimean war, but also the Russo-Turkish war, been brought to a close, and that the treaty collections thus assumed by Great Britain with regard to the Ottoman empire, were to be discussed?

At that time, the Sultan of Turkey was a weak ruler, and the Sultan's empire was a vast, but a very loose, collection of provinces, which he had inherited from his father, the Sultan Mahmud II. The Sultan's empire was a vast, but a very loose, collection of provinces, which he had inherited from his father, the Sultan Mahmud II.

The court gave judgment also in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

FRANCE, TURKEY AND ENGLAND.

(New York Sun.)

A glance at the map will show that the Turkish island of Mytilene, the Lesbos of the old Greek days, would, if permanently occupied by France, not only enable that power to capture at will the great port of Smyrna on the mainland of Asia Minor, but would also give her a naval station of pre-eminent strategic value with reference to the Dardanelles, the Aegean and the Levant.

To understand why so permanent occupation of the island is contemplated by the French, it may be useful to recall some facts which followed the last Russo-Turkish war, and the treaty collections thus assumed by Great Britain with regard to the Ottoman empire.

What had Lord Beaconsfield in mind when, during the Russo-Turkish war, he announced in London that at Berlin, not only had the Crimean war, but also the Russo-Turkish war, been brought to a close, and that the treaty collections thus assumed by Great Britain with regard to the Ottoman empire, were to be discussed?

At that time, the Sultan of Turkey was a weak ruler, and the Sultan's empire was a vast, but a very loose, collection of provinces, which he had inherited from his father, the Sultan Mahmud II. The Sultan's empire was a vast, but a very loose, collection of provinces, which he had inherited from his father, the Sultan Mahmud II.

The court gave judgment also in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

The court also gave judgment in the appeal heard yesterday of Dunn versus the King. The judgment was in favor of the appellant, and the court concluded that the appellant was not liable for the loss of his property.

DIAMOND SHOAL LIGHTSHIP.

She Is Being Provided With a Light That May Be Seen Forty Miles Away.

(New York Sun.)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 8.—An experiment of great interest to the light-house system of the world is to be made on the Diamond Shoal lightship when she is placed on her station next December. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The cluster of white electric lights now shown from the masts of the lightship have a visibility of only thirteen miles, and it is proposed that shipping passing Hatteras may be able to pick up the lightship three times the distance by the use of the new system. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

The apparatus now being fitted to the Diamond Shoal lightship at Baltimore will project a beam straight toward the sea, which will be visible to mariners in the rough waters of Hatteras. The lightship is expected to project a great 13-inch beam of light from the sea to the sky, which will be visible to mariners from thirty to forty miles.

ACROSS THE BAY.

Chas. Eaton's Great Apple Crop—Potatoes for Havana—Smallcrop Substituted.

(New York Sun.)

CORNWALLIS, N. S., Nov. 12th.—Two fires recently occurred in Cornwallis. The first was at the garage of Fullerton Bros., at Port Williams, the other at the mill of Elijah Fox in Peraux. Both fires burned the entire buildings.

The Cornwallis creamery at Canning is closed for the winter months. The scarcity of after feed has caused a small amount of milk to be sent in by the farmers, and the owners have decided to close the business. John Sedgewick, manager of the creamery, will attend the agricultural college at Guelph, Ontario, during the winter months.

Charles Eaton of Upper Canada, raised something over four thousand five hundred dollars worth of apples this year.

On Wednesday the marriage took place of Miss Mary Eaton of Canada, and Thomas Kincaid, of Upper Canada.

Alexander Menzie, of Kentville, recently rented his residence in