

Rowat's Teas
Used in Homes Where Quality Rules.
From 70c to \$2.00 Pound.
T. A. Rowat & Co.
250 Dundas St. W. Phone 3051-3052



Young Students
It should be impressed upon your mind that the eye-needs of your children are as health-important as their dental needs. If they show a distaste for study or play visit us.

"They will thank you in later life for your attention to their eye needs now."

Says Mr. Foresight

Carlyle T. BILCOCK OPTICIAN

233 DUNDAS STREET, TELEPHONE 2351.

Lehigh Valley Anthracite

Solvay Coke \$12.00 ton
Pocahontas Egg \$12.00 ton
Irate Coal \$12.00 ton

GEO. R. KETTLE

PHONE 299.

Quality Vulcanizing Only.

ART WILKES

London Tire Repair Dept.
254 WELLINGTON STREET,
Opposite McCall's.

GILLIES

Coal-Coke-Wood

PHONE 112
COR. ADELAIDE AND BATHURST

PANT SALE

Closes January 3rd. Come and get your share of this \$8,000 stock at less than factory prices.

\$2.98 & \$5.95

WEGNER CLOTHING CO.

371 Talbot St., Opp. Market.

POCKET DIARIES

FOR 1925.

We have them at 25c, 35c and 50c

RED STAR NEWS CO.

10 MARKET LANE.

Our fitters are experts. \$1.50 to \$10.00. We have Trusses to fit

ANDERSON & NELLES

Dundas St.

Dr. J. W. Hutchison

OPTOMETRIST

EXPERT EYE EXAMINATION

Office in Johnston Bros. Jewelry Store,
Next Cairncross Drug Store.

HAWKEN-LANG

COAL COMPANY

PHONE 522

N. J. GRIFFITH

FUNERAL DIRECTOR AND
EMBALMER

104 Dundas Street, London,
Residence on premises. Phone 450.

GEO. E. LOGAN

FUNERAL HOME

371-373 DUNDAS STREET,
PHONE 1965.

J. FERGUSON'S SONS

R. B. FERGUSON, Manager.

Funeral Directors and Embalmers.
Handsome Motor Hearses.
Day or Night Service with Promp-
ness, Neatness and Quietness.
Phones: Office 543; residence, 2056W.

RAMSAY MACDONALD

ARRIVES AT JAMAICA

Former Premier Says Health
Greatly Benefited by
Sea Voyage.

Associated Press Despatch.

Kingston, Jamaica, Jan. 5.—Ramsay Macdonald, the former British premier, arrived here today on the steamer Camito. Mr. Macdonald, who is to visit several West Indian and Central American ports before returning to England early next month, said that his health had greatly improved and that the sea voyage from Avonmouth had been most enjoyable.

Welcomed by city officials and by Horace Myers, president of the Kingston chamber of commerce, Mr. Macdonald received an ovation from a large crowd as he left his steamer to call on the governor.

DECIDES CHICAGO THEFT IS ILLEGAL

Backs Order Restraining City From Exceeding Allowance of Lake Water.

LEFT TO CONGRESS

Associated Press Despatch.

Washington, Jan. 5.—The supreme court today affirmed the decision of the federal district court at Chicago restraining the sanitary district from withdrawing from Lake Michigan water in excess of the 250,000 cubic feet per minute allowed by the secretary of war.

In a sweeping decision the court recognized the full and complete authority of the federal government, and declared that those interested in maintaining the present volume of intake (600,000 cubic feet per minute) must look to congress or the secretary of war for permission. To prevent any arbitrary action the court announced that its decision would not be given effect for 30 days, and that it was made without prejudice to any permit which the secretary of war might issue according to law.

Immediately after the announcement of the decision, the Illinois congressional delegation, hastily summoned into conference, adopted two resolutions, one authorizing Representative Madden to invite such persons into conference as he might deem advisable and the other pledging the delegation to stand united behind any proposals which might be considered to the best advantage of the state.

Referring to the "gravity and importance" of the question presented, to the large expenditures which had been made and which might be necessary in the future, as well as to its bearing upon "the welfare of millions of men," the decision prepared by Justice Holmes and read by Chief Justice Taft in his absence, stated that such considerations, aside from adding to the solemnity of its duties, did not increase the difficulty of a decision. The law on the subject was clear and the material facts presented were few, it stated.

In the controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The controversy the court continued, the United States was asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. In addition to its right to remove obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce, the federal government was also bound to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power.

The January Sales

LINENS, WHITEWEAR

Have Your Furniture Re-Upholstered Now

One-third off the cost of work for a limited time.

MAKING CURTAINS and PORTIERES FREE

Any material at \$1.00 or over will be made up free of charge now. Fourth Floor.



AND MILLINERY

WALLPAPER CLEARANCE

BEGINS TODAY.

15,000 rolls at one-third to one-half off, 10c, 19c, 29, 39c, 49c and 59c roll.

Third Floor.

Table Damasks 1-3 Off to 1-2 Price—Manufacturer's Seconds and All Soiled Cloths and Naps

An event of particular interest to the housewife is this sale of table linens tomorrow, covering a remarkable collection of cloths in every conceivable size, hemstitched as well as plain edge. If you are acquainted with the extraordinary values represented in these January sales be sure to attend this sale tomorrow. Our old customers await this announcement with keen interest and

need no urging to be on hand early. With careful planning months ahead we have arranged for a record-making sale from the small kitchen cloth to charming hand-loom dinner cloths with hundreds of napkins in a variety of qualities.

SEE WINDOW TODAY—SALE TOMORROW, 9 A.M.

SMALL CLOTHS FOR LUNCHEON OR BREAKFAST—All Guaranteed Pure Linen

12 only, size 36x36 inch. Sale price, \$1.17
16 only, size 36x36 inch. Sale price, \$1.33
12 only, size 36x36 inch. Sale price, \$2.29
12 only, size 45x45 inch. Sale price, \$1.83
6 only, size 45x45 inch. Sale price, \$2.29
6 only, size 45x45 inch. Sale price, \$2.33
6 only, size 45x45 inch. Sale price, \$2.83
6 only, size 45x45 inch. Sale price, \$2.49
3 only, size 54x50 inch. Sale price, \$3.67
2 only, size 54x86 inch. Sale price, \$4.98
2 only, size 58x120 inch. Sale price, \$4.98
5 only, size 58x52 inch. Sale price, \$2.67

ALL-LINEN CLOTHS, EXTRA SIZES

2 only 72x126 inch. Sale price, \$6.98
2 only 81x126 inch. Sale price, \$8.33
3 only 90x108 inch. Sale price, \$8.33
4 only 90x108 inch. Sale price, \$9.98
2 only 86x144 inch. Sale price, \$10.50

ALL PURE LINEN CLOTHS, 2x2 YDS.

8 only, 68x86 inch. Sale price, \$3.29
3 only, 70x86 inch. Sale price, \$4.67
6 only, 70x86 inch. Sale price, \$3.98
6 only, 72x90 inch. Sale price, \$4.98
3 only, 72x90 inch. Sale price, \$4.67
4 only, full 2x2 1/2 yards. Sale price, \$5.33
34 assorted designs, 2x2 1/2 yards. Sale price, \$5.83
24 assorted designs, 2x2 1/2 yards. Sale price, \$7.50
10 only, hand loom, 2x2 1/2 yards. Sale price, \$9.00

Several odd slightly soiled Cloths from our regular stock. Special at about one-third off \$3.98, \$4.98, \$5.98 each

HEMSTITCHED ALL-LINEN CLOTHS

6 only assorted designs, 54x54 inch. Sale price, \$3.19
10 only, assorted designs, 54x54 inch. Sale price, \$3.67
6 only, assorted designs, 66x66 inch. Sale price, \$3.83
8 only, assorted designs, 66x66 inch. Sale price, \$3.67
6 only, assorted designs, 70x70 inch. Sale price, \$4.67
8 only, assorted designs, 64x82 inch. Sale price, \$4.50
6 only, assorted designs, 70x88 inch. Sale price, \$5.83
3 only, assorted designs, 66x104 inch. Sale price, \$6.98
2 only, assorted designs, 70x124 inch. Sale price, \$8.50
2 only, assorted designs, 81x108 inch. Sale price, \$14.33
7 only Scalloped Damask, 36x36 inch. Sale price, \$1.67

ALL PURE LINEN CLOTHS, 2x3 YARDS

3 only, sale price, \$4.98
3 only, sale price, \$4.33
10 only, sale price, \$6.33
14 only, sale price, \$7.50
13 only, sale price, \$9.00
3 only hand loom, sale price, \$11.67
1 only hand loom, sale price, \$13.33

CLOTHS, 1 1/4x1 1/4 YARDS

10 only assorted designs. Sale price, \$3.19
20 only assorted designs. Sale price, \$3.33
14 only, double damask. Sale price, \$4.50

NAPKINS FOR EVERY PURPOSE, ONE-QUARTER TO HALF PRICE

From this tremendous collection you can find the qualities you desire at attractive prices. Every Napkin in the sale guaranteed pure linen, and they run all the way from 22-inch at 39c each to the finest hand loom.

HEMSTITCHED DAMASK TRAY COVERS

24 only size 14x20 inch. Sale price, \$4.3c
12 only size 16x24 inch. Sale price, \$6.6c
48 only size 18x27 inch. Sale price, \$6.6c
24 only size 18x27 inch. Sale price, \$8.3c

ALL PURE LINEN CLOTHS (SOILED)

8 only 13 1/4x13 1/4 yards. Sale price, \$4.98
5 only 2x2 yards. Sale price, \$3.98
2 only 2x2 yards. Sale price, \$5.98
5 only 2x2 yards. Sale price, \$6.98
Also 2x2 1/2 yards, a few only, at \$3.98, \$4.75 and \$5.98

DOUBLE DAMASK SETS, CLOTH AND DOZEN NAPKINS, ONE-THIRD OFF

1 set 2x2 yard Cloth and one dozen Naps. Sale price, \$11.67
4 sets 2x2 yard Cloth and one dozen Naps. Sale price, \$11.33
1 set 2x2 yard Cloth and one dozen Naps. Sale price, \$11.75
1 set 2x2 1/4 yard Cloth and one dozen Naps. Sale price, \$12.00
2 sets 2x2 1/2 yard Cloth and one dozen Naps. Sale price, \$12.67
Odd lots and seconds, all pure linen Napkins, at 39c, 49c, 59c and