

MILES OF IMPROVEMENTS.

What the Board of Works Accomplished During the Last Year.—The Last Meeting—Awarding Two Contracts.

The meeting of the Board of Works was held yesterday. The meeting commenced at 2 1/2 and lasted until 4 1/2 p.m. There were present Chairman Carleton, George Turner, Bell, Carleton, G. S. Shaw, G. S. Macdonald. Among the communications were one from D. A. Ross, C.E., asking for the position of Assistant City Engineer, and one from Messrs. Smith, Ross & Greer claiming \$75 damages on account of property flooded in Duff-street, occupied by John McLeas and James McLeas. Both letters were referred to the City Engineer.

Mr. Walker, representing the Warrington-Schultz company, requesting his application for the payment of his clients of \$4,000 part of balance due on their share-bourne-street pavement. Pending a report in the matter from the City Engineer, the Board would not act.

The contract for the construction of a sewer on Dundas-street from Front-street to Duff-street was given to J. A. Brown for \$125,000, and one on Kensington-avenue from Eglinton-street to G. G. Street for \$40,000. The crossings on King-street west and their disposal of the water, and the disposal of the water of a house on Alder-street, were the subject of a report from the City Engineer. The Street Commissioner will report on the matter.

One of the last items considered was the annual report of the Board. It contained these facts: Meetings held in 1889, 40; communications considered, 1150; petitions for local improvements, 35; applications, 350; local improvements recommended, 38; total expenditure, \$1,100,000. There was a total length of private drains constructed of 1/2 miles, brick pavements, 19 miles; asphalt, 2 miles; of rough total of 15 miles. A total of 4,62 miles of improved sewers laid in 1889. The total liabilities of the Board improvements up to date was \$250,150, including the \$42,350 drawback. The report was adopted.

At this stage Alder-street another shot in favor of the Colored street bridge scheme. A petition in support of the petition in his favor had been handed in to council and the Board concluded to recommend the work should be put on the list.

The annual levee feast followed, when Chairman Carleton blessed the ears at hearing the kindly words spoken of him by all the members. The chairman of the Board was tendered to the speaker. Regret was expressed at the retirement of the retiring chairman. The special report of the City Engineer recommended the extension of Markham-street from Oliver-street to Vermont-avenue, to cost \$50,000. It was concurred in.

Burdock Hood Bitters will speedily cleanse all humors from the blood, and cure Rheumatism, Gout, Erysipelas and Chronic Diseases of the Skin.

THE COMMISSIONERS.

Discuss Booklets, Police Matrons and the Pay of the Police.

The Police Commissioners held a long session yesterday afternoon. The revised bylaw to license booklets and vendors of newspapers was considered and left over until Saturday. The pay of the police was also discussed. The police matrons at the Prison Gate Mission and the Haven waited upon the commissioners in regard to the appointment of new matrons. It was explained to them that arrangements are being made by which the present matrons will spend more of her time at police headquarters than at present. Two constables, one of them named Grasset in their resignations. Chief Grasset was instructed to prepare for the next meeting a list of proposed names for the next year in view of the sessions set for by the police. The intention to get the additional cost would be to the city.

One great advantage of Burdock Hood Bitters over other medicines, is that it acts straight on the kidneys, the low blood, and strengthens the entire system.

Mr. Bruce Miller's Death.

Yesterday morning the Mortality Branch of the Police Bureau was informed that Mr. Bruce Miller of 37 Stafford-street was dying. It was suspected of criminal malpractice. The physician in attendance, Drs. Edall and Swannam, refused to allow the police to enter the room. Mr. Miller leaves a husband and family of small children behind.

Health-giving Herbs, Bark, Roots and Berries are in Burdock Hood Bitters which registers all the secretions, purifies the blood and strengthens the entire system.

Alexander the Target.

The czar is superstitious when he thinks that his symptoms of cutaneous poisoning resulted from wearing his German uniform. His over-sensitive sensibility as of the old prohibitionist who could never see a brewery without having a violent bilious attack. What the czar needs is a gun's wad warty wool underwear with his imperial integument.

La Grippe or Lightning Catarrh.

Mr. Burton: La Grippe or Russian Influenza, as it is termed, is in reality an epidemic catarrh, and is called by some physicians "lightning catarrh" on account of its rapidity with which it sweeps over the country. Allow us to draw the attention of your readers to the fact that Nasal Balm, as well as being a thorough cure for the ordinary cold, will give prompt relief in even the most severe cases of grippe or Russian influenza. It will not only effectively clear the nasal passages, allay irritation and relieve the head, but it also acts as a powerful antiseptic, and is peculiarly liable to attack people at this season of the year, as colds and catarrhs are so prevalent. It is a safe and agreeable remedy, and can be used by all. It will be sent post free on receipt of price 50 cents each, or six for \$2.50, by Richardson & Co., Brockville, Ont.

Comical Counts.

With a gutter-band coating in front of my nose, and a howling cat in back, I can fancy how martyrs of old must have felt. When their bodies were torn on the rack. Parvona to artists: What? You ask why I should paint my portrait. Why, sir, that I might charge \$300.00 to paint my nose.

THE BIG SALE OF HORSES.

Stock Bidding, Good Figures and a Large Crowd at Grand's.

All sale of horses of all descriptions began at Grand's yesterday and was an immense success. The majority bringing good prices. There were a number of choice horses to be sold to the public. They are the finest lot of mares ever shipped to the Northwest. As the hay carriage team was sold to the Montreal for \$100. The Montreal points brought on the average \$25. There was a good crowd of anxious bidders. Mr. W. D. Grand was the auctioneer. Following is a list of the best horses sold with the price paid for each:

B. G. 9 yrs, 16 lbs, \$135; B. M. 6 yrs, 16 lbs, \$120; B. M. 4 yrs, 16 lbs, \$117; B. M. 3 yrs, 16 lbs, \$115; B. M. 2 yrs, 16 lbs, \$113; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$111; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$109; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$107; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$105; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$103; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$101; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$99; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$97; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$95; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$93; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$91; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$89; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$87; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$85; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$83; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$81; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$79; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$77; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$75; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$73; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$71; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$69; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$67; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$65; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$63; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$61; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$59; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$57; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$55; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$53; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$51; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$49; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$47; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$45; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$43; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$41; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$39; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$37; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$35; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$33; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$31; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$29; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$27; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$25; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$23; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$21; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$19; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$17; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$15; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$13; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$11; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$9; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$7; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$5; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$3; B. M. 1 yr, 16 lbs, \$1.

BARISTER HANDS' FATE.

The Court of Appeal Has Decided Against Him, and Has Refused to Grant a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the now famous case of Hands v. the Law Society, an action brought by Mr. J. Baldwin Hands, barrister, of this city, to restrain the Law Society from proceeding to disbar him for unprofessional conduct. The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal of the Law Society from the judgment of the Queen's Bench Divisional Court and affirms the judgment of Chancellor Boyd, which sustained the action of the Bench and refused to interfere with their decision. The offense charged against Mr. Hands was that of having misappropriated certain moneys of a client, Miss Julia Crispin, of the Law Society, and the fact that he had been struck off the roll as a solicitor. Mr. Hands then brought, of this city, to restrain the Law Society from proceeding to disbar him for unprofessional conduct. The Court of Appeal allowed the appeal of the Law Society from the judgment of the Queen's Bench Divisional Court and affirms the judgment of Chancellor Boyd, which sustained the action of the Bench and refused to interfere with their decision.

SAUL OF TARSHIS.

Was He a Married Man?—His Life and Labors and Their Results.

Hon. G. B. Woodcock repeated his famous lecture on "Saul of Tarshis" in Association Hall last night. The chair was occupied by Mr. P. H. Burton. The Hon. George R. Woodcock of Shelbyville, Illinois, is a commanding presence. His athletic figure, keen eyes and manly bearing won attention of his audience, which was retained unaltered by his eloquence and skillful climax.

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

JEALOUSY ASSURED.

The jealousy of the general practitioner of medicine in Toronto has been aroused by the success of the advertising specialist, and in the end the result will be the benefit of the patient.

The jealousy of the general practitioner of medicine in Toronto has been aroused by the success of the advertising specialist, and in the end the result will be the benefit of the patient. The success of the advertising specialist is due to the fact that he has been able to reach the patient in a way that the general practitioner has not been able to do. The advertising specialist has been able to reach the patient in a way that the general practitioner has not been able to do. The advertising specialist has been able to reach the patient in a way that the general practitioner has not been able to do.

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

The Court of Appeal yesterday gave judgment in the action brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario against the Zimara Insurance Company for the loss sustained by the burning of the laundry and kitchen of the London Asylum. The case is a test case, one of the building destroyed being intersected from the main building of the asylum, but connected with it by a covered and roofed passage. The companies opposed the action on the ground that the policy only covered the "main building" and did not include the laundry and kitchen. The Court of Appeal, however, affirms the judgment of the lower court and holds that the structure built was part of the "main building."

THE COURT OF APPEAL DECIDES AGAINST THE COMPANY.

F-L-A-T TO RENT.

With POWER SUITABLE FOR Manufacturing, Printing, etc.

First Floor, WORLD BUILDING, Melinda-street. Any amount of space desired.

W. H. STONE, UNDERTAKER.

And 514 Queen-st. west. Telephone 1021. A very open.

PERKINS, Photographer.

293 YONGE STREET. FINEST PHOTOS IN CANADA.

DIXON, THE PHOTOGRAPHER.

100 KING-ST. WEST, TORONTO. KEITH & FITZSIMONS.

LADIES' DEPARTMENT.

W. BAKER & CO'S Breakfast Cocoa. Absolutely pure and it is so.

THE TRUSTS CORPORATION OF ONTARIO.

Capital, \$7,000,000. Registered Office, 23 Toronto-street.

THE HOME SAVINGS & LOAN CO. LTD.

Office, No. 78 Church-st., Toronto. \$500,000 to loan on mortgages.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.

THE POLSON IRON WORKS CO.

Of Toronto (Limited). Manufacturers of Brown AUTOMATIC ENGINES.