

TAKING BODIES FROM THE RUINS

Thus Far Only Four Have Been Recovered.

THREE ARE UNIDENTIFIED.

Pieces of Human Flesh Picked Up Here and There—Question of Liability of Insurance Companies.

New York, Oct. 31.—Only four bodies have been recovered from the ruins caused Monday by the explosions in the Tarrant Drug house up to this morning. Of these only one body has been identified, that of August Schmit. The three unidentified bodies were gathered piecemeal and never will be identified. The police claim that the portions of human anatomy found represent three bodies and that two of them were men and one a woman.

Early this morning a number of bodies were found. Inspectors Tench and Kenny, of the building department, found a woman's head at the northwest corner of Greenwich and Warren streets. Later the same men found a package of tools, a man's apron and hat. Inspector Gaban, of the building department, while hunting through the ruins found two pieces of human flesh and the same inspector found another piece of human flesh and a knee joint.

Two tons of chlorate of potash and one ton of sulphur it appears were in the building occupied by Tarrant & Co., when it was demolished by fire and explosions on Monday noon.

Mr. Rogers, of Rogers and Pyatt, importers of gums, shellac and chemicals, and manufacturers of varnish, says that the statement which quoted President Main of the Tarrant company as saying that the "Rogers and Pyatt people stored much chlorate of potash with us, and this may have caused the explosion. I am inclined to think it did," was shown him at his office, said in the course of an interview:

"That statement I will not dispute with Mr. Main at the present time. We are warm personal friends. I have roundly sworn to him that he is correct in what he says, but I do not think he speaks with a clear head. I admit we stored chlorate of potash with the Tarrant company."

Mr. Rogers said that though he could not tell exactly except by looking at his books, he thinks he stored something between one and two tons, and possibly even more, though he was but guessing. He continued:

"At any rate, chlorate of potash in itself is not an explosive, nor in any way a dangerous article to store. I could get a permit from the inspection of combustibles for the fire department allowing us to carry in stock 2,000 pounds of chlorate of potash right in our own buildings here."

"But if chlorate of potash is not combustible or explosive, would it perhaps be necessary?" was asked.

"I do not know except that I am always extremely careful about every pound of chemical that comes in here. I never take a chance. I am not a chemist and cannot tell if chlorate of potash might combine with another ingredient in some form or combination of it we sell to fire works companies, who mix it with sulphur and nitrate of strontium to make red fire. There are a great many other firms who have stored chlorate of potash and other chemicals with Tarrant & Co. We had no sulphur, gun, or other combustible materials in the house at the time of the fire."

The Shoelkopf, Hartford and Hanna company, it is learned, likewise used Tarrant & Company's storehouse for chemicals of all kinds. A representative of the firm said in answer to a question:

"No, thank heaven, we had no chlorate of potash in the wrecked building. Our loss consisted merely of dyestuffs."

"Is chlorate of potash explosive under certain circumstances?"

"Allow a little starch or sugar or flour or charcoal or any other organic substance to mix with it, and it is only a question of time when spontaneous combustion will take place."

Edmund D. Congdon, representing the Standard Fire Underwriters & Reinsurance Company, of Chicago, was making up a list of chemicals he had lost in the wreck, when questioned about the explosions.

"We had no chlorate of potash in store at the time," he said. "We had, however, a number of chemicals that were inflammable, among them ten 20-pound barrels of sulphur, and I should say about the same quantity of benzoyl pitch. Other chemicals we lost consisted of blue vitriol, arsenic, acids of antimony and acids. I do not know whether we had any sulphur, but I believe it is possible that it could have caused fire or explosion, though not knowing what else was in the warehouses. I am unable to say if a chemical combination might not have taken place and caused an explosion, or, perhaps, spontaneous combustion."

It has been decided by Fire Chief Croker and Fire Commissioner Scannell to investigate all of the wholesale drug establishments in the city. Chief Croker said in the course of an interview:

"I know that nearly all of these wholesale drug companies keep explosives in such quantity as to render them powder magazines to all purposes. They are a constant menace to public safety and I propose to see that storage houses are maintained at a safe distance outside the city."

"In this particular case there has been paid to the requirements of the law. Experience in this case has proven an expensive teacher, but we will profit by this lesson."

Protracted litigation between insurance companies may ensue, relative to the amount of money in the ruined buildings. Plate glass insurance companies deny their liability for the many shattered windows, which were shattered throughout the wrecked area in the downtown business section, and their officials have refused large claims. They have referred claims who suffered loss to the fire insurance companies. The latter have declined either to pay or take the matter under consideration.

Plate glass insurance companies say they are protected under clause 4, in the policy, which provides that "this company is not liable to make good any loss or damage which may happen by or in consequence of any fire (whether on the premises or not)." Many prominent fire underwriters hold that damage to buildings caused by explosion to buildings—detached or remote from a building where a fire and explosion occur—is not covered by a fire insurance policy. The New York standard policy reads:

"This company shall not be liable for a loss caused by explosion of any kind unless fire ensues, and in that event for the damage by fire only."

For a amendment proposed to Section 3 of Article 13 of the Constitution, providing that

the taxes of the indigent poor may be reduced or abated.

A general amendment proposed to Section 3 of Article 13 of the Constitution, providing that the taxes of the indigent poor may be reduced or abated.

For a amendment proposed to Section 6, Article 10 of the Constitution, relating to the control and maintenance of Public Schools.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 6, Article 10 of the Constitution, relating to the control and maintenance of the Public Schools.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

For a amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct Legislation by the people.

Argued. A amendment proposed to Section 1 and 22, Article 6 of the Constitution, relating to Direct