

\$16,500

Corner Adelaide, Bluff street; 15 rooms; hot water heating; every improvement; finished beautifully.

H. H. WILLIAMS, 10 VICTORIA ST.

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR

EPISODES OF THE DEBATE. MR. ROSS' REPLY TO THE PREMIER'S SPEECH.

"WOULD IF I COULD, BUT CAN'T"

If the Government is Unable to Give Prohibition This Session It Will Consider What Means Are Available for Further Action.

Here is the premier's reply to the ministerial debate touching temperance legislation. It was delivered by Rev. Dr. Rankin at 415 Wednesday afternoon. The minister exhibited his keen disappointment to the World, but declared to the World that he had nothing to say—that the communication would come up for discussion at 10.30 a.m. Monday at the board rooms in the Wesley Building.

Toronto, April 6, 1904. My Dear Sir: In reply to the deputation which I had the honor of meeting yesterday, I desire to express my concurrence in the views presented by the different speakers, but nothing short of the prohibition of the sale of liquors in hotels and the strict control over sales, for purposes not recognized as proper and legitimate, would fully protect society from the evil effects of excessive drinking, so far as legislation can be invoked for that purpose. Your decision in reference to such a measure as against amendments of the license laws I understand to mean that you are not favor at present any other form of temperance legislation. IF THE GOVERNMENT IS UNABLE TO GIVE THE MEASURE DESIRED THIS SESSION, IT WILL BE OBLIGED TO CONSIDER WHAT MEANS ARE AVAILABLE FOR FURTHER ACTION.

Yours truly, J. H. ROSS, Minister of Education.

To Rev. James Rankin, Pastor Central Methodist Church, 415 Park-road, Toronto.

Rev. Dr. Rankin's position. Extraordinary interest was manifested last night everywhere in the reply of the premier. Dr. Rankin said he did not understand at first that he had any authority to make the communication, but upon being explained that he was to be the spokesman of the deputation, he was empowered to give out the reply.

Then he announced to all those who inquired thereat that at 10 o'clock last night he would communicate the matter to the members of the press gallery at the parliament buildings.

For the Press Gallery. While the minister was conducting his regular evening service, a number of reporters were present, and at the conclusion of the services the present view of the premier upon the matter was very brief and extra-ordinary. He said that he had no authority to give out the reply, but that he would communicate the matter to the members of the press gallery at the parliament buildings.

Second Nightly Indefinite. The astonishing vagueness, not to say evasive, nature of the construction of the communication, was commented upon freely by the reporters. It was not only the vagueness of the reply, but the manner in which it was given, and the fact that it was given at all, that attracted the attention of the press.

Discussed in Hotels. Around the hotel lobbies there was much discussion of the premier's utterance. Some pretended to have thought Mr. Ross really contemplated some radical step, others that his attitude was too well known to raise any doubt as to the result. "It is a foregone conclusion that he would refuse the request."

Question in the Legislature. Just before 6 o'clock last night Mr. Whitford asked for a declaration of policy from the premier in regard to the temperance question. He asked Mr. Ross in view of what had appeared in the public journals as to an interview between the premier and a deputation of clergymen and laymen representing some of the churches, he was treating the legislature as if it were a mere advisory body to whom all declarations of policy should be made. He thought it was time to make a declaration of policy to the house.

Interviewed Again. Again at 10.30 just before the house adjourned Mr. Whitford returned to the subject of the premier's reply to the deputation. He asked Mr. Ross whether he intended to follow the usual course of procedure by taking the question into consideration on an important question or did he intend to take it up on the press board.

The premier replied that there was no rule preventing him from giving answers to his questions on public questions to a deputation. The leader of the opposition would read his reply in the morning and he hoped he would be able to do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

TEN PAGES—THURSDAY MORNING APRIL 7 1904—TEN PAGES

LIBERALS TO SIT TIGHT IN G.T.P. DISCUSSION OPPOSITION WILL TALK

Sifton Delivers a Set Speech, Punctuated by Prearranged Ap- pleuse—John Haggart Points Out Glaring Defects in Contract—E. B. Osier Ably Weighs Financial Liabilities Government Has Assumed.

In the midst of the rush and nervous strain of the present age, it is refreshing to read a document like the reply of the Premier to the Methodist and Baptist ministers on the question of prohibition. The composition of this occupied some 50 hours, a little more than the 48 hours for which the premier stipulated. Allowing reasonable intervals for rest and refreshment, the premier and his friends must have composed some six words an hour. It was worth all the time. The slightest haste or carelessness might have been disastrous, destroying all pleasing vagueness which is characteristic of so many classics, and which has furnished occupation for so many commentators and critics.

Merely in order to begin the good work of interpreting this great English classic, it appears that Mr. Ross agrees with the ministers that prohibition of sale in hotels, and government control elsewhere are the only effectual remedies for the evils of excessive drinking. He supposes that if the members of the deputation cannot get this, they will be satisfied with nothing less, and, therefore, that there is no use in introducing a license law at the present session. It says Mr. Ross, the government cannot obtain support for a measure such as will satisfy the deputation, "it will be our duty to consider what means are available for further action."

Toronto, April 6, 1904. My Dear Sir: In reply to the deputation which I had the honor of meeting yesterday, I desire to express my concurrence in the views presented by the different speakers, but nothing short of the prohibition of the sale of liquors in hotels and the strict control over sales, for purposes not recognized as proper and legitimate, would fully protect society from the evil effects of excessive drinking, so far as legislation can be invoked for that purpose. Your decision in reference to such a measure as against amendments of the license laws I understand to mean that you are not favor at present any other form of temperance legislation. IF THE GOVERNMENT IS UNABLE TO GIVE THE MEASURE DESIRED THIS SESSION, IT WILL BE OBLIGED TO CONSIDER WHAT MEANS ARE AVAILABLE FOR FURTHER ACTION.

Yours truly, J. H. ROSS, Minister of Education.

To Rev. James Rankin, Pastor Central Methodist Church, 415 Park-road, Toronto.

Rev. Dr. Rankin's position. Extraordinary interest was manifested last night everywhere in the reply of the premier. Dr. Rankin said he did not understand at first that he had any authority to make the communication, but upon being explained that he was to be the spokesman of the deputation, he was empowered to give out the reply.

Then he announced to all those who inquired thereat that at 10 o'clock last night he would communicate the matter to the members of the press gallery at the parliament buildings.

For the Press Gallery. While the minister was conducting his regular evening service, a number of reporters were present, and at the conclusion of the services the present view of the premier upon the matter was very brief and extra-ordinary. He said that he had no authority to give out the reply, but that he would communicate the matter to the members of the press gallery at the parliament buildings.

Second Nightly Indefinite. The astonishing vagueness, not to say evasive, nature of the construction of the communication, was commented upon freely by the reporters. It was not only the vagueness of the reply, but the manner in which it was given, and the fact that it was given at all, that attracted the attention of the press.

Discussed in Hotels. Around the hotel lobbies there was much discussion of the premier's utterance. Some pretended to have thought Mr. Ross really contemplated some radical step, others that his attitude was too well known to raise any doubt as to the result. "It is a foregone conclusion that he would refuse the request."

Question in the Legislature. Just before 6 o'clock last night Mr. Whitford asked for a declaration of policy from the premier in regard to the temperance question. He asked Mr. Ross in view of what had appeared in the public journals as to an interview between the premier and a deputation of clergymen and laymen representing some of the churches, he was treating the legislature as if it were a mere advisory body to whom all declarations of policy should be made. He thought it was time to make a declaration of policy to the house.

Interviewed Again. Again at 10.30 just before the house adjourned Mr. Whitford returned to the subject of the premier's reply to the deputation. He asked Mr. Ross whether he intended to follow the usual course of procedure by taking the question into consideration on an important question or did he intend to take it up on the press board.

The premier replied that there was no rule preventing him from giving answers to his questions on public questions to a deputation. The leader of the opposition would read his reply in the morning and he hoped he would be able to do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Whitford: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

Mr. Ross: My hon. friend cannot tell me the answer as he sees it. It is a foregone conclusion that he will not do so.

"GOING IN" FOR IT.

Mr. Ross: I shall go just as far as the fence will permit me.

Principal Merchant Declares Schools Have Been Going Down for 20 Years—Time for a Change.

The great struggle over the retention of the old curriculum for teachers was brought to an issue last night by the General Association of the Ontario Educationalists. The question was brought to a vote on the amendment to the report of the committee of nineteen brought in by the college and high school departments, which proposed the retention of Latin with a reduction of about half the amount of work hitherto set in the course. This amendment was carried by 132 to 65, and other sections having similar amendments withdrew their support.

Under the proposed amendment, Latin was also carried adding physics and chemistry and a modern language to the course, but it is understood that intention is to make the courses to a certain extent optional.

Principal Strong told the World that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle. He said that the proposed change was a radical one, and that it was not a mere matter of expediency, but a matter of principle.

ST. KITTS MAN SHOT WIFE TURNED WEAPON ON SELF

Awful Deed of Frank Gibson in Suburbs of Tonawanda—Both Will Die.

North Tonawanda, April 6.—One of the most sensational shootings known to the Tonawanda occurred here late this afternoon when Frank Gibson of St. Catharines, Ont., shot his wife, Mrs. Shanton Gibson, and then fired two bullets into his own breast. The shooting took place at the home of Burton Eckers, Gratiot, a suburb of this city, while the Eckers family was eating supper about 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Gibson has been living at St. Catharines during the last three weeks, while his wife remained with her sister, Mrs. Burton Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife. He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon Gibson reached the home of the Eckers family, where he found his wife.

He endeavored to persuade his wife to accompany him to Canada, but she refused, saying that if he would come to North Tonawanda she would live with him, but otherwise she would not. About 5 o'clock Gibson was sitting at the table with his wife and her sister, Mrs. Eckers, in Gratiot. About 5 o'clock this afternoon