

SACRIFICE SALE.

Janssens avenue, detached, 12-roomed residence, 2 bathrooms, hot water heating, built under architect's supervision; were asking \$12,000; submit any reasonable offer; must be sold.

H. H. WILLIAMS & CO.,
Realty Brokers, 26 Victoria St.

TUESDAY,
JUNE 9.

PROBS—Moderate to fresh northwesterly winds; fair and much cooler.

The Toronto World

TWELVE PAGES—WEDNESDAY MORNING JUNE 10 1908—TWELVE PAGES.

FOR RENT

Ground floor, in best wholesale of jobbing location in the city, 5000 square feet, excellently lighted space, two large vaults, splendid shipping facilities.

H. H. WILLIAMS & CO.,
Realty Brokers, 26 Victoria Street.

28TH YEAR

MARRIED WOMAN, JEALOUS, THROWS CARBOLIC ACID IN YOUNG GIRL'S FACE

Mrs. Alice Keech of West Toronto Commits a Most Deliberate Assault on Miss Eliza Webb on Parliament Street—Victim is Painfully Burned.

After writing a postcard to Miss Eliza Webb, a young laundress living at 5 St. David-street, Mrs. Alice Keech, aged 34, 75 Victoria-street, West Toronto, accosted the girl at Parliament and Oak-streets yesterday afternoon at 6.15, and, as she turned, dashed the contents of a cup of carbolic acid in her face. Constable McIntosh took the woman into custody. She is charged with inflicting bodily harm.

Miss Webb is seriously burned about the neck, mouth and cheek, but her eyes were untouched. She is in the hospital.

Mrs. Keech gave jealousy as her motive. The trouble arose over a supposed intimacy between Miss Webb and Mrs. Keech's husband.

This is the story as told by Mrs. John Perkins, 97 Parliament-street, a sister of the injured girl, who was with her when the attack was made. "My husband boarded with Mrs. Keech when we were married, about three months ago, and my sister came to know her thru going out to see me during the month we still boarded there. She is now engaged to Joseph Taylor, who boards there, and is soon to be married."

"On May 25 my sister and I were at the island. We met Mr. Keech and spoke to him. He told his wife, and when we called out there about a week ago she seemed cross and went out. A few days ago a postcard came to Lisa from Mrs. Keech, saying that by going to the house she was adding insult to injury, and that was why she had been cross. The card went on to say that if Eliza wanted to go about with married men she must leave Mrs. Keech's husband alone."

"Last night my sister and I left the Princess Laundry at 483 Parliament-street, where we were employed. We noticed that a woman was following close behind us. As she caught up she called, 'Li.' "Don't you go," said, and Eliza said to me that she would not speak to her, but she turned around and Mrs. Keech threw the stuff in her face. "I said, 'What have you done?' "She said that she had thrown carbolic acid in her face and that I could have her arrested. "I would serve you the same," she said. "I went to the policeman and he arrested her, and we took my sister to the doctor."

The injured girl was first attended by Dr. R. C. Coatsworth at 296 Parliament-street. Mrs. Keech, when arrested, had a two-ounce bottle in her hand, from which she had poured. In the glass were some torn fragments of paper, with the idea of making a false charge on the girl's face. She had purchased the acid at Howell & Co.'s drug store earlier in the afternoon, saying that she wanted it for a disinfectant. She said to the police that she had thrown the acid because of stories which she said Miss Webb had told of her husband, herself and a lodger, presumably Taylor.

She has six children. When searched at the Court-street police station a letter was found upon Mrs. Keech which she had written to the father of the girl. In it she said that she knew what she was doing was a cruel thing, but that "Jack" (presumably Perkins) had been taken from her and that now the girl was trying to take "Joe" (presumably Taylor), to whom Miss Webb is engaged. In the letter she protests that "Joe" has always been good to her and to her children and that she loves him more than anything else in the world.

Miss Webb is 26 years of age and lives with her father. She came from England only six weeks ago.

CROP BULLETIN.

Decidedly cold weather, just the thing for No. 1 wheat, has prevailed for three days. Slight frosts in a few localities have been reported, but no damage has been done.

The crops are thriving wonderfully and nature seems to be leaving nothing undone to nurture the crop at the present stage. The weather seems made to order.

THIEVES HAVE BEEN BUSY IN PULLMANS UP NORTH

Passengers Robbed of Clothing and Cash—One Man is \$2000 Out in Negotiable Paper.

NORTH BAY, June 9.—(Special).—During the past few days an organized band of crooks have been working the Pullman sleeping cars on C.P.R. and G.T.R.

T. Harris of North Bay, divisional car foreman, returning from a trip of inspection on division Saturday night and while sleeping in his berth on the Winnipeg express, was robbed of his trousers containing \$80. On the same train a man named McLeod lost three coats.

J. Canham, en route to Sprague, Manitoba, from Toronto, arrived at North Bay Sunday morning poorer by \$2,000 negotiable paper besides ready cash, watch and tickets. Canham was obliged to wait a day in North Bay to secure funds to continue his journey. The robbery occurred between Allanville and North Bay.

Two men on No. 1 express Monday night lost their trunks between North Bay and Sudbury while sleeping, but cash loss was small.

Three trunks were relieved of their valuables Monday night west of North Bay.

The C.P.R. has taken steps to protect passengers from further trouble of like nature.

OFFERINGS TO MISSIONS.

Metropolitan Church Members to Raise \$16,000.

At a meeting of the men of the Metropolitan Church a resolution was passed approving of an increase in offerings of \$50 a week to the pastor's salary and running expenses of the church, and in changing to regular weekly envelope offerings for missions to raise the \$16,000 allotment to the Laymen's Mission Fund.

Last year the Metropolitan Church contributed \$10,779 for missions. S. J. Moore said the Baptists would probably exceed their \$50,000 allotment by \$5000.

RAZOR AND REVOLVER.

LONDON, June 9.—(Special).—A. Douglas, a plumber from Buffalo, who last night terrorized diners at the Big Bell restaurant, was relieved of his razor, when he was invited to day to leave, and chased four men to the street. He was arrested. The heat had affected him.

WILL ATTEND THE WEDDING.

NEW YORK, June 9.—George Gould, who sailed to Europe, is quoted as saying: "I expect to attend the wedding of my sister, Madame Anna Gould, to Prince Helle de Sagan. The marriage is to take place with my consent and blessing and with the full consent of all the Gould family."

TO DISPOSE OF ALL MANITOBA'S APPEALS

Proclamation Issued Which Brings Parties Close to Settlement on Election Bill.

OTTAWA, June 9.—(Special).—In pursuance of arrangements between the two federal leaders, a proclamation was issued to-day by the Manitoba government authorizing the judges of the court of revision of voters' lists to postpone court from day to day until all appeals have been disposed of.

This, it is expected, will bring about a solution of the difficulty. It is claimed, however, that the proclamation is only making clear what the law provides for now, but as this was one of the strongest demands of the federal premier, Mr. Roblin was willing to concede a point.

There appear to be no serious difficulties in regard to Quebec and British Columbia, and now practically the serious thing that stands between the parties and peace is the charges of government supporters regarding the lists in the unorganized districts of New Ontario.

The opposition is said to be disposed to grant every facility to the government to enable the salaries of the civil servants to be paid. The caucus this morning left everything in the hands of Mr. Borden, but the course that will be followed by the opposition will not recede from its position in respect to the election bill. Clause 17, respecting the ballot, will be a subject of further debate.

Most of the Ontario members got back to-day, and a few from Quebec, but the excessively hot weather kept the majority out of the house. Conservatives expect that Sir Wilfrid Laurier will now be in a mood to bring the negotiations with regard to the Aylesworth election bill to a conclusion. Hon. Clifford Sifton came into the house to-night almost unnoticed, though he had returned from a tour he made a dramatic entrance.

The threatened protest of the election to the legislature of Mayor Carrick of Port Arthur seems to give some strength to the prime minister's claim that the federal lists should be made in New Ontario first.

Conservatives are hoping that they will be able to show that the northern lists are fair.

The Conservative caucus this morning E. B. Osler presided. The majority were strongly disposed to hold the government up till it is forced to go to the country. Some of the Ontario men brought reports that feeling is running strongly in their favor.

The house got into committee of supply in the morning after Geo. Taylor 'called' Hon. L. P. Brodeur for the raising of the race cry in Quebec.

Mr. Graham's intercolony estimates of \$4,327,250 on capital amount, an increase of \$1,900,000 over 1907, were discussed.

The house adjourned at 11.20 to-night after passing an item of 8448 the wages of the employees of the government railways.

LONDON SIGNS.

LONDON, Ont., June 9.—(Special).—The city council at a special meeting this afternoon signed the power contract. Hon. Adam Beck and Engineer Sotman were present.

The First Strawberries. White & Co., corner Front and Church-streets, received yesterday three crates of very fine Canadian strawberries. These are the first of the season and of exceptionally fine quality.

RAILWAY BOARD CALLED TO ORDER

Act Gives Them the Privilege of Doing That Much for the Protection of the Public, Says the Chairman.

Judgment has been given by Justice Mabee, chairman of the board of railway commissioners, and concurred in by Commissioner Mills, declaring that the right to order a viaduct in Toronto is within the jurisdiction of the board, which will continue the hearing of this matter at once if the parties so desire, or await the result of an appeal to the supreme court, if that course is decided upon.

As the railway tracks are along the Esplanade, which is a street or highway, the commission is empowered under section 287 of the Railway Act to make provision for the protection and convenience of the public, and if it was an application for a construction of the viaduct could be made one term of granting permission, "so," the commissioner says, "it seems to me clear it has the like power, notwithstanding the railway is already constructed along the highway."

Concerning the objection that the Esplanade tri-partite agreement between the railways and the city of 1892 takes the form of a special act, which, by section 3 of the Railway Act, can override its provisions, the commissioner says:

"Protection of Special Act. The tri-partite agreement between the railways and the city of 1892 is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring an agreement to be in force is not necessarily an act. The tri-partite agreement is in force and binding form a special act. After much reflection I am of opinion that it is not. So far as I am aware there is no direct authority upon the point, but it seems to me that the tri-partite agreement is not a special act. It is a contract, and that an act merely declaring