

Wall Paper

Effective, tasty and correct in style, without being high-priced.

O. B. GRAVES,
222 Dundas St. Ltd.

ECONOMY

For the same amount of light the Nernst lamp requires only one-half the current taken by ordinary incandescent lamps. This means the running cost of electric lights has been reduced about 50 per cent by the introduction of the Nernst lamp.

LONDON ELECTRIC CO.
Limited, 359 Richmond Street.

INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION

Our system of individual instruction in all branches of commercial and shorthand work enables us to qualify our pupils for situations in the shortest possible time.

Western Business College

110 DUNDAS STREET, LONDON.
WILLIAM C. COO, C.S.E., Principal.

Highest Grades of
**BURNING OIL,
LUBRICATING OIL**
AND ALL OTHER
PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.
THE QUEEN CITY OIL CO.
LIMITED,
Head Office—Toronto.
London Branch, York St., East.

R. K. COWAN
BARRISTER, SOLICITOR, ETC.
County Bldgs., next Court House, London.

**LONDON INSTITUTE OF
CURATIVE PHYSICAL CULTURE**
619 RICHMOND STREET.
Office hours, 3:45 to 4:45, or by appointment.

Systematic Physical Culture
Produces Superb Health—
Perfect Health Guarantees
Success.

**Artistic Picture
Framing**
At Reasonable Prices.
Colerick Bros.
212 Dundas Street.



Good things on every hand. When it's a handful from OUR FINE BAKERY, some one's going to be greatly pleased. Have you given our goods a trial yet? The best ingredients baked to perfection is our combination.

Faukes
Three Stores—200 Dundas street, 660 Dundas street, 589 Richmond street.

STAR FLOUR
BRIGHT AND STRONG.
Manufactured from the Choicest Wheat.

Milk Chocolate is one of the very purest Confections if you get it good.
Cowan's Milk Chocolate
is made with the purest of milk, with all the cream left in it. Put up in Croquettes, Wafers, Medallions, etc.

The Cowan Co., Ltd
TORONTO. 784-2

A square deal nicely rounds out a friendship.
TO PREVENT IS BETTER THAN TO CURE.—A little medicine in the shape of the wonderful pills which are known as **Parmelee's Vegetable Pills**, administered at the proper time and with the directions adhered to, often prevent a serious attack of sickness and save money which would go to the doctor. In all irregularities of the digestive organs they are an invaluable corrective, and by cleansing the blood they clear the skin of imperfections.

1/4

Of a million dollars, cash, the company's paid-up capital and reserve is an absolute safeguard of all interests committed to its care. Chartered to act as executor, administrator and trustee. Correspondence and personal interviews invited. Printed will forms free.

THE CANADA TRUST CO.
Huron and Erie Buildings,
LONDON, ONT.

Scranton Coal

We have a largest stock of our celebrated **D. L. & W. Scranton Coal** and would like you to try it this season. It lasts longer than any other coal. Try a ton and be convinced.

HEAMAN & SON
Sewer Pipe and Cement
Phone 312 Burwell and G.T.R.

DR. J. J. JARVIS, DENTIST
Dundas Street, London.
In Dorchester every Wednesday. Next visit, Nov. 7. 444-xxv

D. & H. LACKAWANA COAL
In all sizes for range, baseburner and furnace. Gives most heat, and burns clean, without clinkers. Also best hardwood.
Prompt delivery.

Brown & Cooper
ADELAIDE AND SOUTH G. T. R.
Phone 243. zxt

QUALITY STORE

CHOICE GRAPE FRUIT
10c Each.

HARRY RANAHAN
Phone 1024. 515 Richmond Street.

PEARL BROOCHES

Why is our line so popular? Because our stock is brimming over with new and beautiful designs. The price is right and the quality is guaranteed.

W. G. YOUNG
DIAMOND HALL,
214 Dundas. 674 Dundas.

LONDON AND DISTRICT

—Mr. Peter Ford, of this city, has left for Toronto, where he intends to take up his residence.

—Mr. Newton Simpson, son of Mr. Robert Simpson, of Waverley, died yesterday in a Winnipeg hospital.

—Mr. and Mrs. Ed Struthers, who have been visiting Mr. James R. Elliott, of Lansing, Mich., have returned to this city.

—At the pastors' and deacons' conference of Middlesex and Lambton, held yesterday at Stratford, Rev. W. M. Walker, pastor of the Wortley Road Baptist Church, read a paper on "The Value of Christian Experience."

—The office and workshop staffs at John Campbell & Sons' carriage factory gathered last evening to present Mr. George Connor, who had been for the past eight years shipping clerk at the factory, with a handsome gold watch and chain. Mr. Connor has severed his connection with the firm to engage in newspaper work.

—Mr. F. Bertram Lavender, a well-known civil engineer from Walsall, England, has taken up his residence in this city. Mr. Lavender is a son of Mr. F. W. Lavender, J. P., of the firm of Fairbanks, Lavender & Son, the largest wholesale saddlery and harness manufacturers in the country, and has taken an active part in politics, being a strong upholder of Joseph Chamberlain's fiscal policy.

—Miss Lizzie McLean, of Ilderton, returned home yesterday from visiting friends at Paisley and Chesley. While at Paisley she was present at the Falconer-Johnston nuptials, which took place on Wednesday morning last. Mrs. Falconer is a niece of Rev. and Mrs. J. Argo, Ivan. Mrs. Wm. Anderson, of Toronto, sister of Mrs. Argo, and of Mrs. Johnston, Paisley, and who was also a guest at Mr. and Mrs. Falconer's marriage, is at present visiting at the manse, Ivan.

SOJERS' THEATRE PARTY.

B Company of the Seventh Regiment held a theatre party at Bennett's Vaudeville last evening. The company was accompanied by officers and non-coms representing other companies. From the theatre the party adjourned to a down-town cafe, where they enjoyed a luncheon and a short impromptu programme.

THE BOSTOCK ARENA.

Hundreds of people who attended the performance in the Bostock Wild Animal Arena at the world's fairs or exhibitions or at Coney Island, as well as thousands who have not yet had an

TODAY
You will find us at
261 Dundas Street

LET us convince you by a trial that we merit your patronage.

FIRST QUALITY DAIRY PRODUCTS will be a special feature. For present selling we offer **CHOICE CROCK BUTTER** at, per lb. **25c**

J. & G. BLOOMFIELD

A Nerve Food and Tonic

Beef, Iron and Wine (C. & L.). Our own preparation for "unstrung" nerves and nerve exhaustion. It relieves nervousness—quiets the nerves—builds up the entire nervous system. If your nerves are "all on edge"—and you are losing health and "good looks" in consequence—put yourself up on Beef, Iron and Wine (C. & L.). Large bottles 50c.

Cairncross & Lawrence,
Chemists and Druggists,
215 Dundas Street, London, Ontario.

Sable Stoles

Special line of our own make on a new pattern from New York. **\$15**

BELTZ
PRACTICAL FURRIER

opportunity of visiting this wonderful exhibition, will be delighted to know that by special arrangement the Shuberts have secured the complete Bostock exhibition, including all the big features which have made the name Bostock synonymous with all that is best in wild animal shows, for a tour of the entire Shubert circuit, the local engagement being at the Grand Opera House for one week, with daily matinee, starting Monday, Nov. 12. The sale of seats opens tomorrow morning.

OLD BOYS TO BANQUET

Former Stratfordites to Have Dinner in February—New Officers Chosen.

Last night, at a meeting of the Old Boys' Association of Stratford, at Nordheimer's Hall, it was decided to hold a banquet in February, on a date to be selected by the international association. The other branches of the order will hold similar events on the same night.

The following banquet committee was named: S. J. Radcliffe, P. J. Edmunds, M. McGrath, F. D. Sharnan, James Fewer and Dr. Hogg.

The officers chosen for the year are: Honorary Presidents—S. J. Radcliffe and M. L. Leith. President—J. J. Callaghan. Vice-President—P. J. Edmunds. Treasurer—M. McGrath. Secretary—F. D. Sharnan. Assistant Secretary—E. Kastner. Executive—Adam Play. E. Allen, J. J. Biggs, J. S. Cummings, George Davis, George Hicks, E. Kastner, E. Schmidt, J. Solder and A. Lyons.

Attention is being directed to the invaluable service TEA performs in furnishing a desirable way of supplying the body with the required amount of water, but the good to be derived from drinking it depends on its proper selection and making. The directions given in each packet of "SALADA" is the only correct way that tea should be made.

Compliments the Grand Trunk.

The general passenger department of the Grand Trunk Railway system has just received from Superintendent of Principal R. Mathison, of the Ontario Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, Belleville, Ont., intimation of his resignation after serving 27 years as superintendent and principal of that institution. In addition to conveying his appreciation of the kindness and courtesy of reduced fares granted to the pupils, etc., of the institution during their vacation, Mr. Mathison states: "I may say that officials, conductors and trainmen on your entire system have always looked after and protected from harm any of the deaf children who were coming or going from the institution, so that not one has ever been injured in the slightest measure." He further says regarding the general baggage department, that "Not one piece of baggage has ever been lost. One trunk got astray, and after a search for it all over the various lines of your railway your officers located it in one of our clothes closets in the institution, which shows that your system of checking is perfect."

Next 15-Day New York Excursion.

Wednesday, Nov. 28, via Lehigh Valley Railroad. Tickets \$9 round trip from Suspension Bridge. Tickets good on regular express trains. For tickets and further particulars call on or write Robert S. Lewis, Passenger Agent, 10 King street east, Toronto. 7th

Chickens, Ducks, Turkeys, Geese, at Smythe's, Hyman and Richmond streets. Phone 1221.

ICE CREAM SALES ON THE SABBATH

Text of Magistrate's Finding, Which Declared Them a Violation of Law.

The following is the text of Police Magistrate Love's decision in the case of Peter P. Mandas, who was charged by Chief Williams with violating the Lord's Day Act by selling ice cream and ice cream soda:

"The complainant in this matter charges the defendant with committing a breach of the Lord's Day Act, by selling and disposing of certain goods, wares and merchandise at the city of London, on the seventh day of October last, being the Lord's Day, and upon the cause coming up for trial, the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction of the statute in question, for the reason that he was the holder of a license to sell victuals or eating house license, obtained from the city of London, that the defendant, by his counsel, admitted the sale of the goods, being ice cream and ice cream soda, but contended that such sale did not constitute an infraction