

OAK HALL Yonge St. Branch

LOOK AT THESE SUITS For \$12 10.00-8.50-8.00 and 7.50

The best of the wine at the last of the feast—the biggest bargains at the end of the sale—we shut up shop on Saturday night—to-day we will sell 47 Men's Fine Canadian and Imported Tweed, Fine Serge and Worsted Suits, all this season's newest goods that were marked regularly at 7.50-8.00-8.50-10.00 and 12.00 for..... 5.00

We're not growing desperate, for the sale has been a phenomenal success—but everything is slated to go and "price cuts no figure"—to gain our ends.

4 Days more to get such chances at Oak Hall, Yonge St. Branch

HAMILTON NEWS

MUST HAVE "THE KILLIES"

Great Enthusiasm Shown at Meeting in St. Andrew's Hall, Hamilton, Last Night.

TO ASK GOVERNMENT FOR \$10,000

It will cost from \$40 to \$50 to clothe each man—Committee Appointed.

Hamilton, Jan. 20.—Judging from the enthusiasm shown at last night's meeting in St. Andrew's Hall, there is little doubt that the Killie Regiment will be an established thing in the near future. The hall was filled beyond its seating capacity with stalwart Scots, among whom were many of the city's most prominent men, and it was the unanimous opinion that the plan must be carried through no matter what obstacles may crop up.

A. W. Lodge opened the meeting with an address dealing with the requirements of the regiment and the obstacles that stand in the way of its formation. With regard to the suggestion that the union might object to their men joining the Killies, he thought it needed no consideration. It was the unanimous opinion that the plan must be carried through no matter what obstacles may crop up.

Many fear that the establishment of a new corps will have the effect of draining men away from the I.R.C. This had not been the case in other cities. In Toronto the other regiments have been strengthened by the formation of the 48th Highlanders. With regard to the cost Mr. Lodge said it would be between \$40 and \$50 per man, exclusive of arms.

It is intended to ask the government for a \$10,000 grant, the balance to be raised by subscriptions. Short speeches in praise of the formation of the corps were then made by Dr. McEwen, Capt. Hendrie, Rev. Neil McPherson, A. Dynes, Mayor Morden and others.

The following gentlemen were appointed as a committee to ask for subscriptions, and attend to the other needs of the proposed regiment: Hon. William Gibson, Mayor Morden, Adam Brown, P. D. Cresser, F. C. Bruce, M. P. S. Barker, M. P. J. Tietzel, William Armour, W. Clement, Capt. Logie, Dr. McEwen, Sheriff Middleton, H. Carscadden, M.L.A.; J. J. Cameron, G. H. Milne, P. Crowe, K. C.; W. D. Long, J. Chisholm, V. Leggett, Major Hendrie, J. Knox, Colin McLeod, R. A. Lyall, S. Washington and A. Dyer.

A deputation will go to Ottawa to wait on the Minister of Militia.

GIVEN THREE YEARS.

Hamilton, Jan. 20.—The case of Gerald Douglas, who was charged with having in his possession a die for a bogus 25-cent piece, was brought up this morning. Douglas was arrested for stealing two milk skins from the Lawry tannery, Dundas, on Jan. 15. Upon search the die was found, and the more serious charge laid against him. This morning he pleaded guilty.

Mr. Harry Veal, Carlton street, Toronto, writes: "My wife was troubled with catarrh, tried many remedies, but was largely alleviated, but all were failures. She then tried CATARRH CURE, and was cured. It is a wonderful cure for all catarrhs, and is sold by the Giffiths & Macpherson Co. Limited, Toronto."

Catarrh Cured

MEN!

APPEAL IN SOUTH OXFORD

C. H. Watson, K.C., for the Liberals, Argued that Charges Had Been Proven.

DISAGREEMENT ON TWO CHARGES

This Morning Mr. Blake Will Be Heard—North York Protest Saturday.

The appeal in the South Oxford election case was begun yesterday morning at Osgoode Hall before the judges of the Court of Appeal. G. H. Watson, K.C., appeared for the petitioners, and S. H. Blake, K.C., and Edmund Bristol for the respondents. At the trial last autumn, Mr. Justice Street and Mr. Justice Britton could not agree on a finding on the charge alleging that the respondent, Donald Sutherland, paid \$1 to Richard Lloyd, hostler of the Queen's Hotel at Tillsonburg, for his vote, the former holding that there was no guilty offence proved, but Mr. Justice Britton held the contrary opinion.

There was also a disagreement on the charge that Mr. Watson, for Mr. Sutherland, had paid \$2 to W. G. Collins of Ingersoll for illegal purposes. Mr. Watson argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved. Mr. Watson argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson first took up the personal charge against Mr. Sutherland. Two charges were put against him, the first, in the course of a diligent canvass, had in the presence of two witnesses, asked Lloyd whether he was a reformer or not, and the second, that he had bribed Lloyd to vote for him. Then, his horse and buggy being waiting, he slipped four large bills into the hand of Mr. Watson's mind, was conclusive proof of wrongdoing. A long review in the court, giving the background of the previous trial, including the change of face by Young, alleged to have been present when Lloyd was bribed.

When first called, Young had declared he had overheard the conversation regarding the vote; recalled, he remembered that he had seen Lloyd at the time, and had, therefore, heard nothing. This denial, the Liberals claim, was such that it was an attempt to get the witness to testify to his first statements in the interests of the respondent. Mr. Watson first strengthened the case against Mr. Sutherland, and the contradictory evidence given by Young on his own behalf should bear no weight. Mr. Justice Street remarked that, in view of his opposed statements, it was a business matter to call Young to the witness stand.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

Mr. Watson then took up the charge of bribery. He argued that the charge was proved, but Mr. Justice Street held that the charge was not proved, and Mr. Justice Britton held that the charge was proved.

PRINCESS

MR. MARTIN HARVEY

DAN DALY

THE NEW CROWN PAUL

GRAND TORONTO

STODDART

THE BONNIE

TWELVE

Ontario Jockey

KING'S PLATE

Summaries

San Fran

A meeting of

was held yester

to extend the

from the usual

this year's race

commence on a

exception of the

day. The race

will be held on

the 21st inst.

at 11 o'clock

at the track

ARTICLES FOR SALE

GOOD MEN SHOULD BE STRONG

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached

Manliness as Well as Virtue Demanded by Types Reached