

## Cabled Across.

Princess Mary to Marry Her First Love After All.

French Socialists Add to the Panama Canal Contention.

Lamented Death of Berlin's Big Pet Gorilla.

A Deadly Duel at Monte Carlo—Anti-Monarchical Action of the Parisian Municipal Council.

### Cholera's Victims.

HAMBURG, Dec. 28.—Two new cases of cholera and one death are reported to-day.

### Five Men Killed.

LONDON, Dec. 28.—The arch over the smithy in the Fordham steel works collapsed yesterday. Five workmen were killed and several injured.

### Millions for Dresden's Schools.

BERLIN, Dec. 28.—The municipal authorities of Dresden have resolved to spend 20,000 marks in gradually improving the city's public buildings. Six million marks will be spent in improving the school system of the city.

### Dublin's Sensation.

BERLIN, Dec. 28.—Considerable doubt is entertained among residents here as to Kevans, the man arrested at Nenagh, county Tipperary, being the author of the explosion in this city. The police, however, apparently think they have the culprit.

### Seed That Might Sprout Too Rapidly.

BERLIN, Dec. 28.—The peasants and agricultural laborers in the district around Oettingen are afraid to plow the fields on account of the many bombs and shrapnel imbedded in the soil during the last army campaign. They have appealed to the Bavarian Government for help, and the War Office has sent a detachment of engineers to search for the shells and clear the ground as far as possible.

### Sixteen Indians to Be Shot.

CITY OF MEXICO, Dec. 28.—Sixteen Indians who were taken prisoners in the massacre at Tamocho, have been brought here by a detachment of troops. The prisoners will be shot after they have been questioned by the Government authorities in regard to the uprising in which they participated and which has not yet been quelled.

### The Steamer Business.

LONDON, Dec. 28.—The Liverpool correspondent of the Daily News thinks there are no grounds for believing that the steamship companies will give up their strategic trade. They expect that the United States Government will relax shortly the stringent quarantine regulations when it has been shown how much easier it is to watch a few reporters instead of the whole Canadian frontier.

### Mary's Accommodating Love.

LONDON, Dec. 28.—Court gossip claims that the new affianced of Princess Mary was really her first choice, but that while he was not her apparent, the dual pace and manner of the matrimonial signpost pointed toward her. The same gossip pretty authoritatively says that the Marchioness of Blandford, who was divorced from the Duke of Marlborough before his accession, is to be made by letters patent the mother of the new Duke, Duesse Dowager.

### A Deadly Duel.

LONDON, Dec. 28.—The name of the American who killed Count Peter Romanoff in the duel at Monte Carlo was Jay Brocton. The two men fought in the grounds of a private villa. The conditions were 25 paces, with liberty to advance to within two paces of each other and to keep on firing until one or the other should fall. Both came calmly to the mark and on the word being given they fired with deadly intent, at the same time starting to advance. The second bullet from Brocton's pistol struck Romanoff just above the heart. The count reeled and fell in a few moments expired.

### Anti-Monarchical Course of the Paris Council.

PARIS, Dec. 28.—The municipal council of Paris by a vote of 54 to 12 to-day, resolved to erect a monument to commemorate the execution of Louis XVI., to demolish the explanatory chapel erected in 1820-25 to the memory of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, and to place on the site of the chapel a bust of Lepelletier St. Fargeux, with a suitable inscription referring to his action in voting for the death of Louis XVI. The Royalist members loudly protested against the council's course. The prefect of the Department of the Seine reserves his decision.

### The French Crisis.

PARIS, Dec. 28.—The effort of M. Anselme to draw Premier Ribot into a trap has failed, and it is not considered likely they will resort to violence. The rumors concerning the death of Baron de Reinach, and theorizing in regard to it were proved this morning to have been utterly baseless. The report made by Dr. Beaudouin, who had charge of autopsy, was made public to-day, and declares that the analysis of viscera revealed not the slightest trace of poison.

### The Extreme Socialists are now taking an active part in the Panama canal, the leaders at a meeting to-day advocated a union of all factions of the party with a view to common action. A resolution was passed to the effect that the people should be summoned to the Palais Bourbon on the day that the chamber reassembles and that an appeal be issued to the army not to take arms against the people. This action on the part of the extremists does not cause serious anxiety to the Government, but new orders have been issued to the police to keep a careful watch on Socialist agitators.

### Demise of Berlin's Big Gorilla.

BERLIN, Dec. 28.—The gorilla brought from Africa via Liverpool last fall for the Berlin Scientific Institute died on Tuesday at the Aquarium. This was the largest gorilla ever brought to Berlin. He was 8 years old, and had lived in captivity as the pet of an African chief for six years. He

caught cold while being transferred from Cologne to Berlin, as the car in which he traveled was unheated. When he reached this city he was suffering from a cough and toothache. On the following day he had no appetite and was unable to sleep. Severe depression, shyness and sulkeness were the next symptoms of his illness. Three days after his arrival Dr. Hermes entered the cage to treat him. The gorilla sprang at him and Hermes fled without bolting the door. The gorilla sprang out, and for twelve hours climbed in the trellis-work near the apex of the glass dome. Hunger eventually induced him to return. At first the gorilla was fed with bananas, and it was two days before it could be persuaded to eat dates. When a chimpanzee was introduced into his cage the gorilla stalked for an hour and then bit his companion savagely on the shoulder. Afterward he utterly ignored the chimpanzee. When greatly excited the gorilla beat his breast with his hands; usually he was surly and impassive. This is the fourth gorilla that the management of the Berlin Aquarium has lost.

## FRIGHTFUL DISASTER!

An Explosion of Dynamite at Long Island City.

THAWING DYNAMITE THE CAUSE.  
LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., Dec. 28.—The New York and Long Island Tunnel Company is building a tunnel between this city and New York City depot. A great deal of dynamite is used. Last night it exploded, blowing up the tunnel and killing three men and wounding several others. The explosion occurred at about 10 o'clock. The dynamite was being thawed in a large room. The fire burned for some time, and the result was the terrible and disastrous explosion.

ADDITIONAL LIST OF INJURED.  
John Hopkins, will probably die.  
Edward J. Delaney, badly cut and burned.  
Mary Grame, cook, will probably die.  
An unknown Italian, will die.  
Mrs. Henry, postoffice employee, badly injured.  
Mary Ryan, postoffice employee, severely hurt.

DECEASED BY A FIRE OF GLASS.  
LONG ISLAND CITY, Dec. 28.—Those in the vicinity at the time of the explosion say that the shock which followed was like an earthquake. The three persons killed were all in their homes near the scene of the explosion. O'Brien, who was killed, had his throat cut from ear to ear and his face was badly mutilated by flying glass. He was lying on a sofa when the explosion took place. A pane of glass was smashed directly over him and a large piece acted as a guillotine.  
All of the killed sustained fractures of the skull and were horribly cut by glass from the broken windows. Gray's refrigerator factory on Fourth street, opposite the tunnel leading, was almost completely wrecked. The cupola of St. Mary's R. C. Church, on Vernon avenue and Fifth street, was shattered into pieces by the concussion.

Three of the victims of the explosion died at St. John's Hospital at 12:30 o'clock. They are John Hopkins, John Delaney and Barber Rocco, whose wife was also killed. Mrs. Greene's death is expected every minute. McIntire, who was in charge of the dynamite when it exploded, is reported to have been killed. He was found at his home and was placed under arrest, charged with criminal negligence. Shortly after noon the firemen succeeded in getting the flames under control in the Davern flats.  
The number of killed now foots up to five, but it is probable other deaths will swell this total before the day is over. McIntire says he had placed four feet square through which steam pipes ran for the purpose of thawing them out. He says he cannot account for the explosion.

REVISED LIST OF VICTIMS.  
Late developments show that the explosion cost the death of six persons, including two others and wounding twenty more. The following is a complete list of the killed and wounded so far as could be ascertained up to 9 o'clock to-night:  
DEAD.  
Mary Grayden, aged 21, a waitress.  
Henry O'Brien, grocer's clerk, aged 33.  
Mrs. Rocco, wife of Pietro Rocco, a barber.  
John Hopkins, aged 22, proprietor of a restaurant.  
Nicola Lodone, brother of Mrs. Rocco.

PARTIAL LIST OF WOUNDED.  
Mrs. Julia Henry, postoffice employee; Peter McIntire, foreman on the tunnel works; Mrs. Mary Maher, aged 50, of 27 Jackson avenue; Daniel Maher, aged 40, of 27 Jackson avenue; Mary Creighton, aged 19, of 27 Jackson avenue; probably died; Ed. Delaney, aged 17, waiter in Hopkins' restaurant, will probably die; Peter Rocco, aged 40, barber; Joseph Wain, aged 14, 25 Jackson avenue; Minnie Davern, aged 10, of 27 Jackson avenue, serious injuries; John Davern, father of Minnie Davern; John W. Davern, reporter, same address; Miss Gattilda Ryan, aged 19, a bookkeeper; John Purcell, plumber; Wm. Johnson, plumber; Dan Murphy, laborer; Mrs. Mary Rogers and son, John Rogers, of 56 Vernon avenue; Max Hayes, baker, of No. 48 Vernon avenue; Mr. and Mrs. Frank Widery; Mrs. Kate O'Brien, wife of Henry O'Brien who was killed; Wm. Henry O'Brien, of No. 126 Oakland street, Green Point; John Palmer, of No. 44 South First street, Williamsburg; Mrs. Stein and daughter, 3 years old; Aid. James Comiskey.

The scene of the explosion is the most thickly settled portion of Hunter's Point. At least twenty families were rendered homeless by the disaster, most of them losing everything they possessed except the few things on their backs. Loss by fire to the row of buildings is estimated at \$25,000.

### Another Dynamite Disaster.

THIRTEEN VICTIMS.  
GREENSBURG, Pa., Dec. 28.—By an explosion of dynamite in a quarry near this place to-day one man was killed and twelve were righteously wounded. Some of those injured will die. They were all Italians.

### Why Not?

QUEBEC, Dec. 28.—Miss Lea Drolet, of Quebec, will petition the Legislative Assembly at next session to authorize the Pharmaceutical Association to grant her a license to practice chemistry in the Province of Quebec.

### Mr. Brennan's Pillars ready in the house.

Mr. Brennan's Pillars ready in the house.

## THE FORWARD MOVEMENT.

Strong Facts and Figures in Support of Seven O'Clock Closing of Bars.

Letter from Rev. Mr. Aylward on the Consumption of Intoxicating Liquors in London—A Licensed Victualler's View—The Question of Good Hotels—Rev. Mr. Gundy Reviews the Question—To-Morrow Night's Citizen Mass Meeting.

Remember the meeting in the City Hall to-morrow (Friday) evening, at 7:30, when it is expected that Bishop Baldwin, Rev. Dr. Antiff and Rev. W. J. Clark, in addition to candidates and other citizens, will speak. Mayor Spencer will take the chair at 7:30.

If we understand one of the arguments against 7 o'clock saloon-closing aught, it is that you cannot have good hotels if you do not allow the sale of liquors thereat after 7 p.m. Is that so? And if so, what then? The true question is, What is right? All other questions, including the quality of hotels, will settle themselves. So long as there is a demand for food and bed accommodation, depend upon it the supply will follow. In the principal cities of the world the tendency is all towards what is called the "European plan," that is, you pay so much for your room, and take your meals wherever you like, or wherever you happen to be. Were every bar in Ontario closed to-morrow, no one need go bedless or supperless for lack of suitable accommodation.

### Important Letter from Rev. Robert Aylward.

To the Editor of the Advertiser:  
The enclosed is a letter I have addressed to the editor of the Free Press, but as it contains information which may be of interest to your readers as well as to those of my figure, I will ask you also to be good enough to publish it. Yours truly, ROBT. AYLWARD.

### To the Editor of the Free Press:

A few days ago I made a statement in your columns to the effect that London was spending \$240,000 a year on strong drink. An "Inquirer" appears to-day in the Free Press, and writes to ask "from what authority" I get them, and "whether they are authentic." Now, sir, I have no objection to state, and to state plainly, on what "authority" I make my assertion, and I am on the subject. I will take the liberty of saying a few other things pertinent to the same.

1. My authority for stating that London is spending \$240,000 every year on strong drink is as follows: According to the last Dominion census—remember the people of Canada are spending every year on strong drink the sum of \$37,885,255, or nearly \$8 a head for every man, woman and child in the country. Now, putting the population of London at 300,000, and assuming that 70 per cent. of the population are of legal age, it follows as a matter of fact that we are spending \$240,000 a year in this way. Anyhow, sir, these figures are either right or wrong. If right, surely it becomes every citizen's duty to ask himself, "What is the cause of this?" Nearly a quarter of a million dollars a year in strong drink! But if wrong, they are either above the mark or below it. It above it—that is to say, if London is taking less than its full complement of liquor—then you have no one to thank for it but the temperance people. But if below it—that is to say, if London takes more than its full complement of liquor—you have no one to blame for it so much as those engaged in the traffic.

2. But, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over the inland revenue reports for 1891 I find that there were only 57,063 gallons of spirits entered for consumption in London last year, valued at \$74,298." Now, sir, I propose now to say a little about the "Inquirer's" own figures. I presume his own are correct. At any rate they should be since he obtained them from the Dominion revenue reports. This is what he says: "In looking over