

THE DESERET EVENING NEWS.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

VOL. V.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH TERRITORY, THURSDAY EVENING, JULY 11, 1872.

NO. 197.

Pioneer Paper of the Rocky Mountain Region.

THE EVENING NEWS.

(Published every evening except Sunday.)

THE DESERET NEWS.

SEMI-WEEKLY.

(Published every Tuesday and Saturday.)

DESERET NEWS WEEKLY.

(Published every Wednesday.)

TERMS FOR THE WEEKLY:

One Copy, one year, \$10.00
Six months, \$6.00
Three months, \$3.50

TERMS FOR THE SEMI-WEEKLY:

One Copy, one year, \$8.00
Six months, \$5.00
Three months, \$3.00

TERMS FOR THE WEEKLY:

One Copy, one year, \$5.00
Six months, \$3.00
Three months, \$1.50

OFFICE:—Cor. South and East Temple-sts.

ASUS M. CANNON, General Business Agent.

THE NEWS BOOTH AND JOB PRINTING OFFICE

Has superior facilities for the execution of all kinds of Book and Job Printing.

BOOK BINDING AND PAPER RULING

GEORGE Q. CANNON,

EDITOR & PUBLISHER.

OUR SUBSCRIBERS in the country can at any time ascertain the date on which their subscription expires by referring to the numbers attached to their name on their paper.

1 & 3 means first day, fourth month, third year, or April 1st, 1872, 15-7-2 means July 15, 1872, &c., &c.

Those names having no number, close with the end of the volume.

Subscribers understanding this will be able to renew their subscriptions prior to that time so that their papers may continue without interruption.

(SPECIAL TO THE DESERET NEWS.)

By Telegraph.

PEN WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH LINE.

EASTERN DISPATCHES.

CHICAGO 10.—The news of the nomination of Greeley and Brown at Baltimore created little comment here, as the result was anticipated. The Times editorially announces its adherence to the former position, and says it will not support Greeley, but will work for the liberal State ticket and to secure a similar representation in Congress.

The Tribune hails the result as a proud triumph of the love of country over partisan prejudice and personal preference, and declares it is a great blow to the opposition.

BALTIMORE 10.—S. J. Bayard in his address on taking the chair at the anti-Greeley convention, to-day, denounced the National Convention as the culmination of a conspiracy to destroy the Democratic party, and said the Democratic masses were not represented there. The committee appointed yesterday to prepare an address, submitted their report, in which they assert that the action of the Democratic National Convention in the adoption of a platform in the main features distinctively Republican, and in the nomination for the Presidency of the most bitter and implacable enemy of the Democratic party, is a virtual dissolution of the Democratic organization and an unconditional abandonment of its principles; that by such action it has been false to its obligations and duty, and that its action binds no Democrat to support its ticket, which on the contrary should be repudiated by all true Democrats. The address then proceeds at length to define true Democratic principles, as handed down by the fathers, and appeals to all true Democrats to rally to their support, by forming State organizations, and in other ways doing all in their power to secure the overthrow of the Democratic party. The committee also recommends a convention to be held at Louisville, Ky., on Saturday the 3rd of September, 1872, to take such steps as may be deemed prudent and essential. The address was adopted, and a resolution was adopted for the appointment of a committee to secure the attendance of delegates at Louisville.

A motion to proceed with the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President was tabled.

WESTERN DISPATCHES.

SAN FRANCISCO 10.—The tide lands today at prices ranging from 9 to 35 dollars per lot, the average price very low, in fact a mere fraction of what was realized for lots in similar localities two years ago.

Stock is very active to-day, the morning board aggregated 7,388 shares, the afternoon board 13,965, total 21,353, with free sales in open board. Prices were heavily dealt in, going up to 44, and closing at 39.

Edith O'Gorman, the "escaped nun," and her male companion, are said to have left the city rather unexpectedly. The negroes are very active in the public schools in the city, for the admission of their children on Monday, and being refused will bring an action of mandamus to test the right to exclude them.

The unanimous nomination of Greeley and Brown caused some little stir here to-day, the expectation being that there would be a much stronger opposition. The Bulletin says this action insures a close contest, and the corner the Republican leaders make up their minds to that fact the better. The Examiner, after a bitter opposition until to-day, holds the names of Greeley and Brown, and endorses the ticket and platform, and predicts their success.

The committee of 100 held a long, stormy, and not very orderly session this afternoon. The first action of the committee was to adopt a resolution, adopted by a vote of 39 to 7, is as follows:

Resolved, that in the present exigency of our officers, the interests and future prosperity of our city demand that this committee of 100 should, with unanimity of purpose, adopt as its policy, first, that the speedy construction of the 35th parallel railroad substantially on the basis of the arrangement made by Messrs. Russell, Hopkins and Hager, is the most practicable and speediest method of retrieving this community from the present state of uncertainty, and will settle the whole question of San Francisco, being the terminus of the railroad leading to the Pacific coast.

Several substitutes and amendments

for the second resolution, condemning any further concessions to the O. P. R. R., under the guise of a compromise offer, and pending their discussion the meeting adjourned to Wednesday.

VALLEJO 10.—The ship Evelyn left to-day, with 1400 tons of wheat, bound for Liverpool.

The steam dredger is working at deepening the water around the railroad wharf, in order to accommodate ships of the largest class.

WATSONVILLE, Cal., 10.—The little son of Mr. Magill was accidentally shot in the stomach last evening, by the careless handling of a derring in the hands of another boy. He is still alive, though the wound is considered dangerous.

GILBOY 10.—A salute of 50 guns was fired to-night, in honor of the nomination of Greeley.

YREKA, Cal., 10.—Williams, the escaped murderer, after hiding six days in the mountains, has been taken up to the authorities on Monday night, and unless the sentence is commuted, he will be executed on the 28th inst.

THE NARROW GAUGE RAILWAY CONVENTION.

The late railway convention at St. Louis appointed a committee to report upon the "peculiar merits and advantages of the narrow gauge railway system." From the report of that committee we extract some facts showing that construction of the narrow gauge railways of the most experienced and practical railway men in the country. We are forced to abbreviate and give their conclusions in the fewest possible words.

First, the conclusion is reached that in rough and mountainous countries where heavy ores such as gold, silver, lead and copper are to be transported, and where it is not necessary to run time or fast lines, the construction of railways of three-foot gauge costs no more per mile than one-fifth such roads as Pennsylvania Central, and Baltimore and Ohio.

Second, that in such rolling country as exists where most railways are constructed, narrow gauge roads cost no more than half as much as the ordinary broad gauge.

Third, in the prairie country, where the land is level or only slightly undulating, the three-foot gauge costs no more than three-fifths as much as the ordinary roads.

Fourth, the narrow gauge also refers to the fact that narrow gauge enterprises are much more easily set on foot than the construction of broad gauge roads on account of the lower cost of building them.

On the comparative cost of operating the two kinds of roads the following tables are furnished:

PASSENGER CARS.

	Broad Gauge.	Narrow Gauge.	Difference.
Weight of cars in lbs.	30,000	12,000	18,000
No. of passengers full load.	53	31	20
Pounds dead weight per passenger.	678	383	295

Pounds dead weight carried on roads in Massachusetts and New York in 1870.

	Broad Gauge.	Narrow Gauge.	Difference.
Massachusetts.	1,860	2,781	921
New York.	2,781	1,860	921

In this case the narrow gauge coach, weight 12,000 pounds, carries, with full load, 31 passengers, with a dead weight of 12,000 pounds, or 383 pounds per passenger; while the broad gauge coach, capacity 53 passengers, weighs an average of 30,000 pounds, giving a dead weight of 30,000 or 678 pounds, or difference of 355 pounds per head in favor of the narrow gauge.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

A difference of 26,000 pounds, or 13 tons, in favor of the narrow gauge, or 2,000 pounds per head for each passenger.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds, or 1,384 pounds per head for each passenger, as against 223 pounds per head by the narrow gauge. Of course the travelling public pays for this excess of unnecessary dead weight, amounting to many millions of dollars per annum.

Assuming the weight of the broad gauge car to be only 15 tons or 30,000 pounds, the difference in favor of the narrow gauge car will still be 18,000 pounds,