

DOMINION PARLIAMENT. SECOND SESSION—FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, Feb. 26. The Speaker took the chair at 3 p.m.

SUPREME COURT.

Mr. KEELER moved the second reading of the bill to repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court of Canada Act, 1875. He stated that he introduced a similar bill last year which was slaughtered with the innocent at the end of the session. He had brought the bill forward, however, with a sincere desire to promote economy, and to save to the country the large amount of money that was being squandered on the Court. His constituents were opposed to the Court, which was an expensive affair for which the public had not asked. He did not expect that the bill would be passed, but he had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time.

Mr. MACDONALD said that after the statement made by the Minister of Justice, he did not intend to occupy the time of the House by discussing the bill. He had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time.

Court would be criticised rather freely, but there was not a lawyer from that Province who, taking into consideration the requirements of the Court as a Dominion Court, and of the necessity of sometimes referring to it questions that could not be referred to the public tribunals. Perhaps would lay his hands on the Court, and to save to the country the large amount of money that was being squandered on the Court. His constituents were opposed to the Court, which was an expensive affair for which the public had not asked. He did not expect that the bill would be passed, but he had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time.

OTTAWA, Feb. 26. The Speaker took the chair at 3 p.m.

SUPREME COURT.

Mr. KEELER moved the second reading of the bill to repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Court of Canada Act, 1875. He stated that he introduced a similar bill last year which was slaughtered with the innocent at the end of the session. He had brought the bill forward, however, with a sincere desire to promote economy, and to save to the country the large amount of money that was being squandered on the Court. His constituents were opposed to the Court, which was an expensive affair for which the public had not asked. He did not expect that the bill would be passed, but he had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time.

Mr. MACDONALD said that after the statement made by the Minister of Justice, he did not intend to occupy the time of the House by discussing the bill. He had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time. He had no objection to its being read a second time.

Mr. HEDDER CAMERON, in seconding the motion for the second reading, said that when restrictions in marriage were proposed, his own province was in those who were in favour of it. Two arguments were used against marriage with a deceased wife, and he was in favour of it. Two arguments were used against marriage with a deceased wife, and he was in favour of it.

OTTAWA, Feb. 27. The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

DEFENDANTS AS WITNESSES.

Mr. MCARDY introduced a bill to amend the law relating to defendants as witnesses. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the defendant the same rights as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the defendant the same rights as the witness.

STOCK GAMBLING.

Mr. GIBBOUD introduced a bill to regulate stockbrokers, and to suppress the practice of stock gambling. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness.

Mr. HEDDER CAMERON, in seconding the motion for the second reading, said that when restrictions in marriage were proposed, his own province was in those who were in favour of it. Two arguments were used against marriage with a deceased wife, and he was in favour of it.

OTTAWA, Feb. 27. The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

DEFENDANTS AS WITNESSES.

Mr. MCARDY introduced a bill to amend the law relating to defendants as witnesses. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the defendant the same rights as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the defendant the same rights as the witness.

STOCK GAMBLING.

Mr. GIBBOUD introduced a bill to regulate stockbrokers, and to suppress the practice of stock gambling. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness.

Mr. HEDDER CAMERON, in seconding the motion for the second reading, said that when restrictions in marriage were proposed, his own province was in those who were in favour of it. Two arguments were used against marriage with a deceased wife, and he was in favour of it.

OTTAWA, Feb. 27. The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

DEFENDANTS AS WITNESSES.

Mr. MCARDY introduced a bill to amend the law relating to defendants as witnesses. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the defendant the same rights as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the defendant the same rights as the witness.

STOCK GAMBLING.

Mr. GIBBOUD introduced a bill to regulate stockbrokers, and to suppress the practice of stock gambling. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness.

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE. FIRST SESSION—FOURTH LEGISLATURE.

THURSDAY, FEB. 26. The Speaker took the chair at 11 a.m.

THIRD READING.

On the order of the third reading of Mr. Wipe's bill to amend the game law. The bill was read a third time, and passed. The bill was read a third time, and passed. The bill was read a third time, and passed.

THE ESTIMATES.

The debate on the motion to go into committee on the estimates. The debate on the motion to go into committee on the estimates. The debate on the motion to go into committee on the estimates.

money which they had expended themselves. When presented opposite were seeking power, they promised to avoid needless expenditure, and said they would not be more than \$100,000. They promised to avoid needless expenditure, and said they would not be more than \$100,000.

FRIDAY, FEB. 27. The Speaker took the chair at 3 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. BROEHR said that he had introduced a bill to amend the law relating to the estimates. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness. He explained the bill, and stated that it was intended to give to the public the same protection as the witness.

THE ESTIMATES.

The debate on the motion to go into committee on the estimates. The debate on the motion to go into committee on the estimates. The debate on the motion to go into committee on the estimates.

WILLIAM DONNELLY'S EVIDENCE. Continuation of the Preliminary Inquiry at London.

LONDON, Feb. 25.—The Donnelly case was resumed before Squire Peters at the Court. The Court was crowded.

Five of the Accused Discharged.

Mr. DONNELLY's evidence was continued. He stated that he had been in the room at the time of the murder. He stated that he had been in the room at the time of the murder. He stated that he had been in the room at the time of the murder.