

## EVENTS OF CITY LIFE.

## THE PASSING NEWS OF A DAY BRIEFLY TOLD.

Concerning People, Places And Things of More than Ordinary Interest, Recorded in a Short Readable Form—Notes of The News.

Wednesday.  
The steamer Empress of China arrived at Yokohama on the 11th.

Schooner Avalon is discharging furnace and nut coal at Pater's Wharf Company's, No. 87 Water street.

The Alumnae Society of the High School will meet at the residence of Mr. Walker, Princess street, Thursday evening.

The profit of the Rebekah concert of the Ontario Society last May was \$123, no. \$123 as the types made it appear.

Captain Charles Taylor, of the Star line, arrived in the city last night, and will commence getting the steamer David Weston in shape for the river business.

Electric car No. 44, while proceeding along Main street on Monday, struck and severely damaged a sleigh owned and driven by M. D. Colwell. Mr. Colwell was comparatively unhurt.

Dr. W. H. Drummond, Montreal, will give, in this city on March 25th, a series of readings from his poems. The entertainment will be under the auspices of the High School Alumnae Society.

Mr. John Seely's horse with sled backed over the wharf into Turnbull's slip, yesterday morning. The animal was unharnessed and towed into Market slip by men in a small boat. The shafts of the sled were broken.

The head line steamer Teelin Head, which sailed from Belfast on the 1st, has about 20 tons of general cargo for St. John and western points. This is the first inward cargo brought by this service and it is expected that the boats following will also bring freight.

Michael Collins, who some months ago assaulted Sergeant Hywell, and was accordingly sent to Dorchester penitentiary, returned to this city yesterday, under charge of attendant. It is thought he is insane and that the Provincial Lunatic Asylum will receive the unfortunate as an inmate.

The examination in the Liverpool Court of Bankruptcy of Pierce, Watts & Company, was continued on the 27th ult. It consisted chiefly of the firm's transactions with the Bank of Liverpool and the transfer of certain lumber as a lien to cover advances made by the bank. The case was adjourned.

Messrs. A. Kelly and G. H. Collins, of Greenwood, B. C., directors of the Brandon and Golden Crown Mining Company, were present yesterday evening at a meeting of the St. John shareholders. The meeting decided to purchase a controlling interest, thus giving the management to the St. John owners.

The many friends of Miss Aggie Mullin will regret to hear of her death, which occurred yesterday afternoon. She was a devoted mother, and her death was a great loss to her family. Her remains will be interred in the St. John cemetery.

The I. C. R. is receiving about 40 new locomotives from the Baldwin and Manchester works and they will mostly be used for the passenger service. The first one of the 20 engines from Manchester arrived at Moncton a couple of days ago and is now being fitted out in the Moncton shops. The new engines will all, it is expected, be delivered to the I. C. R. by the last of the month.

A splendid trophy of sport comes from Lepreau. It can be seen in the taxidermy room of J. H. Carnall, and is an American bald-headed eagle, taken, from tip to tip of its wings, measures six feet nine inches and weighs about 20 pounds and was shot recently by Mr. Hansen, a resident of Lepreau. The bird was responsible for the destruction of a good many sheep, and in its huge talons are quantities of wool, once the adornment of its unfortunate victims.

Many old friends will hear with regret of the death of Mrs. Susan Lynde Stevens, wife of the Rev. L. G. Stevens, formerly pastor of St. Luke's church, in this city. Mrs. Stevens was the eldest daughter of the late Dr. Waddell, formerly superintendent of the Provincial Lunatic Asylum. Mrs. Stevens has been a sufferer for some time from an incurable disease, cancer of the liver and pylorus, and died at St. Margaret's Bay, Dover, England, on the 23rd ult.

Thursday.  
Rev. Dr. Macrae will preach Sunday at St. John's church, Moncton, when he will formally declare the pulpit vacant.

James Monahan, son of Mr. Daniel Monahan, of Union street, has returned, having served twelve months in the gaol at Halifax.

The Maritime Food Food Company, of Woodville, has gone out of business and the plant will likely be leased by the D. W. Hoag Company. The plant is valued at \$14,000.

The board of trade will meet in special session Friday afternoon, to discuss the resolution that the preferential tariff should be allowed only on goods brought into Canada through a Canadian port.

A number of the Moncton curlers passed through the city early this morning en route home, after playing a match with the Fredericton curlers at the club.

## BOURASSA EFFECTIVELY CRUSHED BY UNITED VOTE IN COMINGS.

## Found But Two Supporters for His South African War Resolution—The Premier's Eloquent Speech Put Arguments at Naught.

Ottawa, March 12 (Special).—The debate on Mr. Bourassa's motion on the war in South Africa today.

Although few, if any, sympathized with the utterances of Mr. Bourassa, they nevertheless enjoyed his eloquent powers and oratory.

Mr. Bourassa spoke for about two hours and a half and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who followed, completely disposed of every contention that Mr. Bourassa had set up. In fact he showed the member for Bellefleur to be in a ridiculous position.

Mr. Bourassa, in his opening remarks, made reference to the various views expressed by the press with respect to himself. He said that, in Ontario, he was denounced as a demagogue desirous of raising racial questions in Canada. In Quebec, a section of the press described him as a dangerous British imperialist.

Denouncing both with a few words, he proceeded to again assert his determination to stand against Canada's going into war by order-in-council.

While taking that stand, he argued that Canada, having contributed money and men to the South African war, the dominion had a right to express an opinion upon the settlement of the war. He also protested against the re-creating of the Baden-Powell police force here, saying sufficient recruits could not be secured in England, and New Zealand had refused to allow recruiting there.

He thought it was time to put a stop to the speculation of Sir Alfred Milner and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain upon the naivete of Canadians.

Mr. Bourassa then launched out into a general denunciation of imperialism which, the greater it grew, the less respect it showed for liberty and toleration. He said the colonial empire was the result of the imperialist's desire to see the world divided into spheres of influence.

He stated that no members of the Canadian government had offered any advice or suggestions in regard to the settlement of the war.

Parallel with this, he placed Mr. Chamberlain's statement in the imperial parliament to the effect that he had already made himself acquainted with the views of the colonial governments and they were in accord with the proposal for annexation of the Free Republics.

Mr. Bourassa also recalled the Chamberlain's statement in regard to the acceptance of the first Canadian contingent. The Canadian government declared that the sending of a contingent was not a precedent. Still Mr. Chamberlain accepted the contingent as an evidence of Canada's desire to accept a share of the colonial empire.

He qualified all these statements as they might be, he might be called to order by Mr. Speaker. He protested against the sending of a contingent as a precedent. Still Mr. Chamberlain accepted the contingent as an evidence of Canada's desire to accept a share of the colonial empire.

Referring to himself, Mr. Bourassa said he did not need to apologize for anything he had said on the subject of the war, as his remarks had been twice justified by the people of Quebec. Proceeding, Mr. Bourassa argued that the war was not for the benefit of the British empire, but for the benefit of the British subjects.

He referred, as evidence of this in England, to the big Liberal party vote in the general elections and also the result of the elections for the London county council. He referred to the claim that the result of the general elections in Canada had been a victory for imperialism. He denied that the question of imperialism had been put before the voters.

On Monday evening next Miss M. A. Nannery will deliver her lecture on "The Question of the South African War" at the A. T. P. Across the Rockies.

The Provincial Chemical Fertilizer Company has paid Mr. Henry Lee, of Simonds, \$1,000 for the property on which the company's works are located.

The Chatham Board of Trade are protesting against the bill which Hon. H. A. McKenna presented to the legislature, to the effect that he should exercise his franchise at elections, regardless of non payment of taxes.

Mr. W. S. Fisher, of the Tourist Association, is in receipt of a letter from Mr. P. Giffins, general manager of the D. A. R., in which he announces his willingness to contribute \$100 towards the funds of the association.

Mr. George Robertson, M. P. P., has written the common clerk, but requests that his letter be not made public. He states that his dry dock negotiations are still pending and asks that the council give him further time.

Alexander Henderson, Violet Henderson, Emma Henderson, Woodstock; Samuel S. Miller and Maud M. Miller, Hartland, and M. Alice Baird, Grafton, are applying for incorporation as the "A. Henderson Furniture Company, Ltd.," to carry on the manufacturing business of A. Henderson, in Woodstock.

An unusual and painful accident happened to one of White's Express horses yesterday afternoon on Dock street. The animal, while hauling a load down the hill, slipped upon the ice track and while struggling to regain its feet one of the trace hooks caught in its right hind fetlock. The hook went deeply in and was with difficulty extricated.

A few days ago a young girl who is an employee in an up-town establishment, found on Mill street, a pocket-book containing about \$27 and a ticket bearing the name of a Goldbrook lady. The finder called at the I. C. R. station and requested Station Master Ross to aid her in communicating with the owner of the money. Mr. Ross willingly acceded and no doubt the young girl has been rewarded for her honesty.

government had not offered horses instead of men. Mr. Bourassa took issue with the claims of Hon. Mr. Sifton, made in his speech at the banquet given him in Toronto, and Hon. Mr. Bernier that the elections were an endorsement of the government's war policy. Proceeding, he reviewed various elections in Quebec.

Mr. Casgrain, Conservative, of Montserrat, as saying in the house that he was always ready to stand by the empire. (Conservative cheers.)

Mr. Casgrain attended a meeting at Montreal after the general election when he said that he was ready to stand by the empire. He would not sacrifice him to the quarrels of England, just though they might be. In conclusion, he spoke of his increasing love for British institutions, since he began to study the war question.

The Premier.  
Sir Wilfrid Laurier said: "I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that it is with a great deal of regret and with some surprise that I have seen the honorable member for Bellefleur, who has been so long a member of the opposition, move the motion which he has given notice some days ago and which he has now placed in your hands."

Remembering that Mr. Bourassa had in the past announced himself as entirely opposed to what he called imperialism and had refused assent to the policy of sending troops to South Africa, Sir Wilfrid was little prepared for the present attitude of the member for Bellefleur.

"I would have supposed that he would have been stalwart to the end and that having refused to assent to the sending of troops to South Africa, he would not have taken an altogether different attitude. He would not fight for the cause of England but he is willing to sit at the council board in discussing the cause of England today. How far this conduct is in keeping with his former views, I shall offer no opinion but which I shall leave for his own pondering."

The right of the Canadian parliament to make representations to the imperial authorities on all questions that may affect the British empire, in whole or in part, the premier said, was one which was no longer in question. It had been asserted on a number of occasions. The fact that Canada sent troops to South Africa, the premier said, was one which was no longer in question. It had been asserted on a number of occasions. The fact that Canada sent troops to South Africa, the premier said, was one which was no longer in question.

As to the first conclusion of the proposition that it is not necessary for sending Canadian troops to South Africa, the premier said, it was one which was no longer in question. It had been asserted on a number of occasions. The fact that Canada sent troops to South Africa, the premier said, was one which was no longer in question.

Mr. Wilfrid here quoted some affidavits on this subject, which he considered afforded a justification to the British government for all they had done.

Proceeding, Sir Wilfrid said: "Those who were the first to demand that the Boers were to be treated as British subjects, when they were in the hands of the Boers, were the same who were the first to demand that the Boers were to be treated as British subjects, when they were in the hands of the Boers."

"Let me give another argument. If I understand him right he would like the British government to go back to the policy of Mr. Gladstone in 1881. Mr. Gladstone was magnanimous towards the Boers in 1881. When he had them in his power he treated them with the greatest generosity, expecting that when they had British subjects in their power they would extend the like generosity. That was a mistake; he measured the men with whom he had to deal with the measure of his own great soul. If magnanimity be a fault and if that was a fault in Mr. Gladstone, everybody must admit that magnanimity has never been a fault of Mr. Kruger. If Mr. Kruger had had the slightest amount of magnanimity of Mr. Gladstone there would have been no war; if Mr. Kruger had shown towards the British subjects the principles of justice that Mr. Gladstone showed towards the Boers, there would have been no war."

Mr. Wilfrid then reviewed the events which led to the conclusion of peace after Majuba, showing that, after Gladstone had filled the country with British troops and had the Boers in his power he gave them another chance as they agreed to give all the rights of citizenship to British subjects, one year's residence being enough to entitle them to these rights. It is no part of my duty to defend the British government. But I may say that Mr. Gladstone should be forgotten and that Mr. Kruger and Mr. Steyn should be restored to their position which they so much abused.

"My honorable friend spoke eloquently of the miseries of war and I agree with him. I take no exception to what he said in that respect. Macrae in his speech today the position of the once proud South African republic, miserable by reason of its ruined farms, its closed mines, its cities arrested in their growth, and its aged president a fugitive in Europe, fugitive from the misery which he brought upon his own country. Miserable indeed is the condition of the once happy State of Orange, which had no quarrel with Britain, but which was precipitated into the horrors of war and of invasion by the man to whom we had entrusted its destinies, himself today a self-constituted outlaw in his own country. These men appealed to the God of Battles and the God of Battles has pronounced against them. They invaded British territory. Their territory was invaded in turn and was annexed to the British dominion in consequence of the terrible logic of war."

Whether he will agree with me or not I am sure every one else will agree that, in the terrible uncertainties of war, in the series of successes and reverses which generally make up the history of war, the leader of the defeated people has no right to complain if he receives from his victorious opponent the same treatment which he had previously applied to his opponent in the hour of victory. Now, he knows very well that, when Lord Roberts invaded the State of Orange, he raised the British flag in Bloemfontein, when, subsequently, he invaded the Transvaal and raised the British flag in Pretoria, and when he invaded the State of Orange and the Transvaal, he knows very well that Lord Roberts then and there applied to the vanquished the very same policy which he is now applying to the Boers in the first stages of that war. He is aware of the ultimatum by which President Kruger went to war with such a light heart on the 9th of October, 1899; he is aware that on the following day the State of Orange, which had no quarrel with Great Britain, was invaded by the Transvaal republic and that President Steyn called on the Free State burghers to stand shoulder to shoulder against what he called the district of Kimberley, when that very same day the Boers invaded the British colony of Natal, that within the following week they invaded the Cape Colony, and that they occupied the district of Kimberley and that by a series of proclamations from the commandant to the invading army they annexed the district of Kimberley to the State of Orange. These things took place at the beginning of the war. My honorable friend pines and laments the condition of the Dutch citizens. I have here in my hand the evidence of British subjects in the district of Kimberley, who were forced to serve in the Dutch army and, when they appealed to President Kruger, were told that the district of Kimberley would henceforth be part of the State of Orange."

Mr. Wilfrid here quoted some affidavits on this subject, which he considered afforded a justification to the British government for all they had done.

Proceeding, Sir Wilfrid said: "Those who were the first to demand that the Boers were to be treated as British subjects, when they were in the hands of the Boers, were the same who were the first to demand that the Boers were to be treated as British subjects, when they were in the hands of the Boers."

"Let me give another argument. If I understand him right he would like the British government to go back to the policy of Mr. Gladstone in 1881. Mr. Gladstone was magnanimous towards the Boers in 1881. When he had them in his power he treated them with the greatest generosity, expecting that when they had British subjects in their power they would extend the like generosity. That was a mistake; he measured the men with whom he had to deal with the measure of his own great soul. If magnanimity be a fault and if that was a fault in Mr. Gladstone, everybody must admit that magnanimity has never been a fault of Mr. Kruger. If Mr. Kruger had had the slightest amount of magnanimity of Mr. Gladstone there would have been no war; if Mr. Kruger had shown towards the British subjects the principles of justice that Mr. Gladstone showed towards the Boers, there would have been no war."

Mr. Wilfrid then reviewed the events which led to the conclusion of peace after Majuba, showing that, after Gladstone had filled the country with British troops and had the Boers in his power he gave them another chance as they agreed to give all the rights of citizenship to British subjects, one year's residence being enough to entitle them to these rights. It is no part of my duty to defend the British government. But I may say that Mr. Gladstone should be forgotten and that Mr. Kruger and Mr. Steyn should be restored to their position which they so much abused.

"My honorable friend spoke eloquently of the miseries of war and I agree with him. I take no exception to what he said in that respect. Macrae in his speech today the position of the once proud South African republic, miserable by reason of its ruined farms, its closed mines, its cities arrested in their growth, and its aged president a fugitive in Europe, fugitive from the misery which he brought upon his own country. Miserable indeed is the condition of the once happy State of Orange, which had no quarrel with Britain, but which was precipitated into the horrors of war and of invasion by the man to whom we had entrusted its destinies, himself today a self-constituted outlaw in his own country. These men appealed to the God of Battles and the God of Battles has pronounced against them. They invaded British territory. Their territory was invaded in turn and was annexed to the British dominion in consequence of the terrible logic of war."

Whether he will agree with me or not I am sure every one else will agree that, in the terrible uncertainties of war, in the series of successes and reverses which generally make up the history of war, the leader of the defeated people has no right to complain if he receives from his victorious opponent the same treatment which he had previously applied to his opponent in the hour of victory. Now, he knows very well that, when Lord Roberts invaded the State of Orange, he raised the British flag in Bloemfontein, when, subsequently, he invaded the Transvaal and raised the British flag in Pretoria, and when he invaded the State of Orange and the Transvaal, he knows very well that Lord Roberts then and there applied to the vanquished the very same policy which he is now applying to the Boers in the first stages of that war. He is aware of the ultimatum by which President Kruger went to war with such a light heart on the 9th of October, 1899; he is aware that on the following day the State of Orange, which had no quarrel with Great Britain, was invaded by the Transvaal republic and that President Steyn called on the Free State burghers to stand shoulder to shoulder against what he called the district of Kimberley, when that very same day the Boers invaded the British colony of Natal, that within the following week they invaded the Cape Colony, and that they occupied the district of Kimberley and that by a series of proclamations from the commandant to the invading army they annexed the district of Kimberley to the State of Orange. These things took place at the beginning of the war. My honorable friend pines and laments the condition of the Dutch citizens. I have here in my hand the evidence of British subjects in the district of Kimberley, who were forced to serve in the Dutch army and, when they appealed to President Kruger, were told that the district of Kimberley would henceforth be part of the State of Orange."

Mr. Wilfrid here quoted some affidavits on this subject, which he considered afforded a justification to the British government for all they had done.

Proceeding, Sir Wilfrid said: "Those who were the first to demand that the Boers were to be treated as British subjects, when they were in the hands of the Boers, were the same who were the first to demand that the Boers were to be treated as British subjects, when they were in the hands of the Boers."

"Let me give another argument. If I understand him right he would like the British government to go back to the policy of Mr. Gladstone in 1881. Mr. Gladstone was magnanimous towards the Boers in 1881. When he had them in his power he treated them with the greatest generosity, expecting that when they had British subjects in their power they would extend the like generosity. That was a mistake; he measured the men with whom he had to deal with the measure of his own great soul. If magnanimity be a fault and if that was a fault in Mr. Gladstone, everybody must admit that magnanimity has never been a fault of Mr. Kruger. If Mr. Kruger had had the slightest amount of magnanimity of Mr. Gladstone there would have been no war; if Mr. Kruger had shown towards the British subjects the principles of justice that Mr. Gladstone showed towards the Boers, there would have been no war."

Mr. Wilfrid then reviewed the events which led to the conclusion of peace after Majuba, showing that, after Gladstone had filled the country with British troops and had the Boers in his power he gave them another chance as they agreed to give all the rights of citizenship to British subjects, one year's residence being enough to entitle them to these rights. It is no part of my duty to defend the British government. But I may say that Mr. Gladstone should be forgotten and that Mr. Kruger and Mr. Steyn should be restored to their position which they so much abused.

"My honorable friend spoke eloquently of the miseries of war and I agree with him. I take no exception to what he said in that respect. Macrae in his speech today the position of the once proud South African republic, miserable by reason of its ruined farms, its closed mines, its cities arrested in their growth, and its aged president a fugitive in Europe, fugitive from the misery which he brought upon his own country. Miserable indeed is the condition of the once happy State of Orange, which had no quarrel with Britain, but which was precipitated into the horrors of war and of invasion by the man to whom we had entrusted its destinies, himself today a self-constituted outlaw in his own country. These men appealed to the God of Battles and the God of Battles has pronounced against them. They invaded British territory. Their territory was invaded in turn and was annexed to the British dominion in consequence of the terrible logic of war."

Whether he will agree with me or not I am sure every one else will agree that, in the terrible uncertainties of war, in the series of successes and reverses which generally make up the history of war, the leader of the defeated people has no right to complain if he receives from his victorious opponent the same treatment which he had previously applied to his opponent in the hour of victory. Now, he knows very well that, when Lord Roberts invaded the State of Orange, he raised the British flag in Bloemfontein, when, subsequently, he invaded the Transvaal and raised the British flag in Pretoria, and when he invaded the State of Orange and the Transvaal, he knows very well that Lord Roberts then and there applied to the vanquished the very same policy which he is now applying to the Boers in the first stages of that war. He is aware of the ultimatum by which President Kruger went to war with such a light heart on the 9th of October, 1899; he is aware that on the following day the State of Orange, which had no quarrel with Great Britain, was invaded by the Transvaal republic and that President Steyn called on the Free State burghers to stand shoulder to shoulder against what he called the district of Kimberley, when that very same day the Boers invaded the British colony of Natal, that within the following week they invaded the Cape Colony, and that they occupied the district of Kimberley and that by a series of proclamations from the commandant to the invading army they annexed the district of Kimberley to the State of Orange. These things took place at the beginning of the war. My honorable friend pines and laments the condition of the Dutch citizens. I have here in my hand the evidence of British subjects in the district of Kimberley, who were forced to serve in the Dutch army and, when they appealed to President Kruger, were told that the district of Kimberley would henceforth be part of the State of Orange."

## JUST A WORD.

If you have a thought that leans toward a Spring Suit the garments are here to clinch it. Our display of

## MEN'S SUITS

at \$5, 7.50, 9.00 and 10, has no equal in this city. The styles and patterns are the very latest and the quality and workmanship unequalled.

Wear one of these suits this season. They are sure to please. If dissatisfied, money cheerfully refunded.

## Henderson, Hunt &amp; McLaughlin,

Successors to FRASER, FRASER & CO., 40 and 42 King Street, St. John, N. B.

all frankness the attitude my honorable friend has taken is so unfair and unjust to the British government that I deem it my duty to place the facts which he left to oblivion. Who is responsible for the war? Is it the government of Great Britain? Sir, the man who is responsible for the war is Mr. Kruger himself."

Ottawa, March 13 (Special).—Two government bills were introduced in the house today, one to amend the franchise act and another to amend the dominion elections act. In reference to the dominion elections act, the solicitor general explained that it amended the section respecting the posting of proclamations in the Northwest Territories and also provided that an accepted cheque would be valid as a deposit. Another change was made in the form of ballot, as he pointed out that many people in Ontario had marked their ballots in the space for the electoral division instead of opposite the candidate's name. The space would be done away with. It also made provision that, under manhood suffrage, those who moved from one place to another would not lose their votes. Manhood suffrage lists less than a year old could be used.

Divorce Court for Each Province.  
Mr. Britton, Kingston, moved: "That jurisdiction should be given to some court in each of the provinces of the dominion, or a court should be established in each of the said provinces for the trial of cases for divorce, and that such courts should have exclusive jurisdiction to decree a dissolution of marriage."

Mr. Britton argued that there was no reason why the question of a marriage contract should be reserved for adjudication upon by parliament. He pointed out that while British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island had divorce courts, the latter provinces by virtue of their confederation, the rest of the dominion had to go to parliament for divorce. This procedure was very cumbersome and expensive—minimum cost being about \$500 and in Transvaal republic and that President Steyn called on the Free State burghers to stand shoulder to shoulder against what he called the district of Kimberley, when that very same day the Boers invaded the British colony of Natal, that within the following week they invaded the Cape Colony, and that they occupied the district of Kimberley and that by a series of proclamations from the commandant to the invading army they annexed the district of Kimberley to the State of Orange. These things took place at the beginning of the war. My honorable friend pines and laments the condition of the Dutch citizens. I have here in my hand the evidence of British subjects in the district of Kimberley, who were forced to serve in the Dutch army and, when they appealed to President Kruger, were told that the district of Kimberley would henceforth be part of the State of Orange."

He considered the best means was a divorce court. If the suggestion of Mr. Britton was accepted, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost of proceedings might be cheapened by parliament authorizing judges to take evidence of witnesses living long distances from Ottawa and sending evidence to parliament. Mr. Britton did not ask for any changes in the grounds on which divorce is granted. He pointed out that in the present method, the cost