

## The Toronto World

FOUNDED 1859.  
A Morning Newspaper Published Every Day in the Year.

WORLD BUILDING, TORONTO.  
Corner James and Richmond Streets.

TELEPHONE CALLS:  
Main 5308—Private Exchange Connecting all Departments.  
Readers of The World will confer a favor upon the publishers if they will send information to this office of any news stand or railway train where a Toronto paper should be on sale and where The World is not offered.

MAIN 5308

Is The World's New Telephone Number.

MONDAY MORNING, DEC. 5, 1910.

### BRITISH ELECTORAL BATTLE.

Indecision is the only comment that can be made on the result of the first day's British electoral battle, and with the fortune of the field inclining slightly towards the Unionist forces. A net gain of three seats out of the sixty-four constituencies polled, if the same proportion is maintained in the contests still to come, will bring Mr. Asquith's majority below the hundred mark. This will aggravate rather than diminish the difficulties of his position and, unless the situation can be relieved by another conference, the outlook points to a continuance of unsettled political weather. But there may be unexpected changes in the electoral barometer and he will be greatly bold who ventures upon any confident prophecies regarding the final issue.

London and the north of England stand substantially where they did, and the only fight in Scotland, that for Perth City, reveals no alteration of sentiment in that fortress of Liberalism. The polls on the whole are less than at the last elections, a circumstance not surprising looking to the fact that they are taking place on an old register. This is usually supposed to affect adversely the reform party, and the government must either have felt unusual confidence in making the appeal or been constrained to the venture by considerations of party necessity. Considerable interest attaches to the attitude of the county constituencies that added so materially to the Unionist gains in January. Corn and other food import duties was played up then, and it remains to be seen whether Mr. Balfour's later tariff policy will affect county opinion.

### LADIES TO THE RESCUE.

More ladies have to stand in the street cars than formerly, as a result of the new regulations. This is the first sign of hope for more cars. As long as women got seats there was no strenuous objection to men standing up. Now that women are in command of the rulers of society will be satisfied themselves, and woe to Manager Fleming if he is unable to satisfy the rampant womanhood of the city.

A great man of science once said that when you introduce a new artificial element it is impossible to say how far the disturbance of equilibrium may extend. The new regulations are all right, but they have shaken the street car system to its foundation.

The shake-up was necessary and must lead to improvement. It may lead to purchase by the city.

### OUR MAYOR.

Mayor Geary is proving himself a tremendous fellow these days. He sat on the board of trade in fine style when it attempted to interfere in the improvement of the harbor and in trying to secure assistance from the Dominion Government. He let them see that Toronto does not want clever business men meddling with civic affairs.

And now he is scoring off the Street Railway Company. It seems the popular side to take these days, to denounce the new regulations, and quite to overlook the real trouble, which is the need of more cars and better cars, and the abolition of trailers.

It would serve Toronto right if the company abandoned the regulations at the mayor's desire, and abandoned also any effort at improvement.

Why does the mayor not come out for an enforcement of the agreement, better car service, and the provision of conditions suitable to the new regulations.

### BELFAST IN IRELAND.

Belfast men are the Boers of Ireland. Conscientious to a degree, they yet remain opinionated above all British-speaking people, and they take pride in their unchanging disposition in politics and theology. In business they make up in progressive methods for their backwardness in matters of opinion. The greatest ship yard in the world, the greatest linen factories, the greatest rope works, the greatest municipal gas tank, the greatest aggregation of steam horsepower under one engineer, are some of the records of which Belfast boasts. The municipal street railway system and the municipal harbor board are models of administration.

But the conservative Belfastman goes to bed every night with the conviction that if home rule were granted as we have it in Canada, he would be murdered before morning. It is impossible for anyone not born and bred in Belfast to understand the sentiment in this respect. And yet six months' residence in Toronto will convince any Belfast man of the folly of the ordinary Belfast attitude, as many examples may be had to show.

The invitation for tenders for the im-

mediate delivery of arms and ammunition, if it be genuine, is not to be laughed aside. The hysteria of solid citizens is a most dangerous condition, but it is hysteria none the less. Standish O'Grady, a representative of one of the great Protestant families of the south, and familiar with the north of Ireland thru many years of legal and court practice, explains the condition by supposing that Ireland is a land of enchantment. Whatever the condition, it is a serious one. Belfast, in a reasonable temper with a solid Ulster behind it, and under home rule, would dominate Ireland. In finance, in education, in agriculture, in commerce and in manufactures, Ulster would lead. But with touching fidelity to a party which never did anything for Belfast in its existence, the city of the four clings to the tradition of conservatism. At the same time Belfast men will tell you that when a home ruler represented West Belfast some years ago, he obtained more favors for the city than any representative it ever had. Belfast men hated to make the admission, and purged themselves of any complicity in accepting such favors by voting more solidly than ever for the parliamentary nentities it usually delights to honor.

### THE VIADUCT AND ITS CRITICS.

The Globe and The Star have been telling Toronto people for twenty years that the Bloor-street viaduct is a luxury for which they must wait. If these organs would condescend to say how long the people must wait, so that we could pin them down to a definite issue, we might believe in the good faith of the representations made. It is not postponement, however, that The Star and The Globe want. It is suppression.

The Star is the street railway organ, and the street railway is the only interest that is to be benefited by leaving the Don viaduct unbuilt. A cross-town thoroughfare from West Bloor to East Toronto, on the Danforth-road, would give the city a direct street car route to East Toronto, and put the Kingston-road branch of the radial line out of business for this traffic. Neither now nor at any future time, does The Star and its supporters wish to have the Bloor-street viaduct built on this account.

The Globe professes to think that by paying for what the city needs will cause a boom, and declares this is the sort of talk that caused a boom in 1859. The Globe is put to severe straits to invent arguments against the Bloor-street viaduct. The Globe might just as well agree that had the Bloor-street viaduct been built in 1859 the evil effects of a boom would have been averted, as to contend that the viaduct would now precipitate a boom. Everybody admits that the viaduct must be built sometime, and that the east end will be benefited by it. The Globe and The Star declare that this is not the time to benefit the east end; the east end can wait another twenty years.

### LADY AND ORATOR.

Regret will be felt that owing to his engagements in England during the unexpected election crisis, Mr. Philip Snowden, who was to speak in Massey Hall to-morrow evening, will be unable to do so. His wife, however, is a most notable orator, and she has undertaken to fill his place. At the present juncture her address will have profound interest.

Rupert Hughes' story in the current Saturday Evening Post, "Number 315," is the greatest impeachment of the conventional Christmas that has yet been indited.

### QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

"Constant Reader" is informed the majority against the Bloor-street viaduct last January was 450. (2) In the last British parliament the standing was: Liberals 275, Unionists 273, Labor 40 and Nationalists 82.

### ENGLISH GOLD MOVEMENT.

During October England's imports of gold were \$16,690,000, and exports \$41,300,000. The excess of exports, \$24,610,000, compared with a similar excess in October last year of \$24,100,000, and with an excess of \$10,000,000 in October, 1908. The exceptionally large balance of shipments was due, of course, to Egypt, which took \$20,275,000 in sovereigns, as compared with \$10,675,000 a year ago, and only \$3,600,000 in 1908.

40 Hours—Toronto to Jacksonville, Fla., With Only One Change.  
Commencing Dec. 12, you can leave Toronto 4:40 p.m. (International Limited) for Montreal, and leave there 10:45 p.m. in drawing-room Pullman sleeper through to Jacksonville without change, via Cincinnati, Chattanooga and Atlanta, arriving at Jacksonville 8:30 a.m. second day. Round trip rate till June \$55.00. Consult C. E. Horning, C.P. and T.A., Grand Trunk Railway, northwest corner King and Yonge-streets. Phone Main 4209.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

OLD GOLD CIGARETTES

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

Old friends are best, tried, tested, true.

## AT OSGOOD HALL

### ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Osgood Hall, Dec. 5.  
Motions set down for single court for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Re Edwards v. Edwards.  
2. David v. Ryan.  
3. Standard v. Nicholson.  
4. Re Raven Lake National Trust v. Trust and Guarantee Co.  
5. Davis v. Winn.  
6. Hamilton v. Hamilton Steel.  
7. Standard v. Toronto Ry. Co.

Peremptory list for divisional court for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Patterson v. Dart.  
2. Fitzgerald v. Smith.  
3. Canadian Gas Power Co. v. Orr Brothers.  
4. Hamilton v. Hamilton Steel.  
5. Standard v. Toronto Ry. Co.

Peremptory list for court of appeal for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Zuffel v. C.P. Ry. Co.  
2. Brown v. Timmins.  
3. Canadian Gas Power Co. v. Orr Brothers.  
4. Dominion Linen Co. v. Langley.

### Master's Chambers.

Before Carlwright, K.C., Master.  
Imperial Trust v. Kingstley-H. Symonds, K.C., for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for a final order of foreclosure. Order made.  
Gallagher v. Mathew-The plaintiff in person. Motion by plaintiff for an order for the issue of a concurrent writ and for service of same and of statement of claim on defendants in the Province of Quebec. Order made.

Northern Crown Bank v. Jenkins-Craig (Arnold & Co.), for plaintiff. No one contra. Motion by plaintiff for an order extending time for delivery of statement of claim until 10th inst. Order made without cost.

Bucovsky v. Cook-J. Mitchell, for defendant. No one contra. Motion by defendant to leave to take their exhibits off the files. Order made.  
Wilson Lumber Co. v. Simpson-J. N. Black, for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for leave to issue subpoena duces tecum to the Registrar of Deeds for West Toronto. Order made.  
Re Jacob Roszell and Trustee Relief Act—R. H. Parmenter, for administrator. Motion by administrator de bonis non with will annexed for an order for leave to pay into court a large legacy. Order made. Payment in of \$27,460, less costs, fixed at \$5.

### Single Court.

Before the Chancellor.  
Broom v. Godwin-J. Broom, plaintiff in person. J. T. Loftus, for defendant. A motion by plaintiff for an order for contempt of court in not obeying the injunction of the court.  
Judgment having been given, I think it is very clear that the terms contained in the letter signed by Broom and dated Oct. 21, 1910, as being allowed to remove his goods that night or next day, did not comply with that which he is bound by the terms of that letter to do.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

## AT OSGOOD HALL

### ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Osgood Hall, Dec. 5.  
Motions set down for single court for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Re Edwards v. Edwards.  
2. David v. Ryan.  
3. Standard v. Nicholson.  
4. Re Raven Lake National Trust v. Trust and Guarantee Co.  
5. Davis v. Winn.  
6. Hamilton v. Hamilton Steel.  
7. Standard v. Toronto Ry. Co.

Peremptory list for divisional court for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Patterson v. Dart.  
2. Fitzgerald v. Smith.  
3. Canadian Gas Power Co. v. Orr Brothers.  
4. Hamilton v. Hamilton Steel.  
5. Standard v. Toronto Ry. Co.

Peremptory list for court of appeal for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Zuffel v. C.P. Ry. Co.  
2. Brown v. Timmins.  
3. Canadian Gas Power Co. v. Orr Brothers.  
4. Dominion Linen Co. v. Langley.

### Master's Chambers.

Before Carlwright, K.C., Master.  
Imperial Trust v. Kingstley-H. Symonds, K.C., for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for a final order of foreclosure. Order made.  
Gallagher v. Mathew-The plaintiff in person. Motion by plaintiff for an order for the issue of a concurrent writ and for service of same and of statement of claim on defendants in the Province of Quebec. Order made.

Northern Crown Bank v. Jenkins-Craig (Arnold & Co.), for plaintiff. No one contra. Motion by plaintiff for an order extending time for delivery of statement of claim until 10th inst. Order made without cost.

Bucovsky v. Cook-J. Mitchell, for defendant. No one contra. Motion by defendant to leave to take their exhibits off the files. Order made.  
Wilson Lumber Co. v. Simpson-J. N. Black, for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for leave to issue subpoena duces tecum to the Registrar of Deeds for West Toronto. Order made.  
Re Jacob Roszell and Trustee Relief Act—R. H. Parmenter, for administrator. Motion by administrator de bonis non with will annexed for an order for leave to pay into court a large legacy. Order made. Payment in of \$27,460, less costs, fixed at \$5.

### Single Court.

Before the Chancellor.  
Broom v. Godwin-J. Broom, plaintiff in person. J. T. Loftus, for defendant. A motion by plaintiff for an order for contempt of court in not obeying the injunction of the court.  
Judgment having been given, I think it is very clear that the terms contained in the letter signed by Broom and dated Oct. 21, 1910, as being allowed to remove his goods that night or next day, did not comply with that which he is bound by the terms of that letter to do.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

## AT OSGOOD HALL

### ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Osgood Hall, Dec. 5.  
Motions set down for single court for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Re Edwards v. Edwards.  
2. David v. Ryan.  
3. Standard v. Nicholson.  
4. Re Raven Lake National Trust v. Trust and Guarantee Co.  
5. Davis v. Winn.  
6. Hamilton v. Hamilton Steel.  
7. Standard v. Toronto Ry. Co.

Peremptory list for divisional court for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Patterson v. Dart.  
2. Fitzgerald v. Smith.  
3. Canadian Gas Power Co. v. Orr Brothers.  
4. Hamilton v. Hamilton Steel.  
5. Standard v. Toronto Ry. Co.

Peremptory list for court of appeal for Monday, 5th inst., at 11 a.m.:  
1. Zuffel v. C.P. Ry. Co.  
2. Brown v. Timmins.  
3. Canadian Gas Power Co. v. Orr Brothers.  
4. Dominion Linen Co. v. Langley.

### Master's Chambers.

Before Carlwright, K.C., Master.  
Imperial Trust v. Kingstley-H. Symonds, K.C., for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for a final order of foreclosure. Order made.  
Gallagher v. Mathew-The plaintiff in person. Motion by plaintiff for an order for the issue of a concurrent writ and for service of same and of statement of claim on defendants in the Province of Quebec. Order made.

Northern Crown Bank v. Jenkins-Craig (Arnold & Co.), for plaintiff. No one contra. Motion by plaintiff for an order extending time for delivery of statement of claim until 10th inst. Order made without cost.

Bucovsky v. Cook-J. Mitchell, for defendant. No one contra. Motion by defendant to leave to take their exhibits off the files. Order made.  
Wilson Lumber Co. v. Simpson-J. N. Black, for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for leave to issue subpoena duces tecum to the Registrar of Deeds for West Toronto. Order made.  
Re Jacob Roszell and Trustee Relief Act—R. H. Parmenter, for administrator. Motion by administrator de bonis non with will annexed for an order for leave to pay into court a large legacy. Order made. Payment in of \$27,460, less costs, fixed at \$5.

### Single Court.

Before the Chancellor.  
Broom v. Godwin-J. Broom, plaintiff in person. J. T. Loftus, for defendant. A motion by plaintiff for an order for contempt of court in not obeying the injunction of the court.  
Judgment having been given, I think it is very clear that the terms contained in the letter signed by Broom and dated Oct. 21, 1910, as being allowed to remove his goods that night or next day, did not comply with that which he is bound by the terms of that letter to do.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before.

By an injunction granted on June 30, 1910, the defendant was enjoined from making complaint of what happened before. By an injunction granted on June 30, 19