

Mr. EDGAR. But there was a doubt in the hon. gentleman's mind. He seemed to think that we may have been wrong, so he must have thought that we may have been right. He seemed to argue that even if we were right in meeting on 29th April we might have power to sit until 3rd June, or five years and 35 days. Therefore, we run our head straight against the plain simple language of our own constitution which says we may continue for five years and no longer. I cannot get over that answer to his argument. The hon. gentleman seemed to misapprehend the position that Sir Oliver Mowat took, or the grounds of his arguments of the Algoma case in the province of Ontario. Sir Oliver Mowat argued from the proclamation; he never argued that because a writ was returned on a certain day, later than the other writs, that, therefore, the day on which the writ was returned should have any effect whatever in determining the duration of Parliament. It was not necessary for him to argue that. I hold in my hand the proclamation which they were discussing. It is dated the 23rd December, 1874, and reads, in part, as follows:—

That we have this day given orders for issuing our writs in due form for calling a new legislative assembly for our said province, which writs are to bear date of 27th December instant, and to be returnable on the 2nd day of February.

If it stopped there, as ours does, there would have been some force in what the hon. gentleman said. But it goes on:

Except our writ for the district of Algoma, which is to be returnable on the 14th day of August next.

And Sir Oliver Mowat held that the existence of Parliament would begin and run for four years after the return of the Algoma writ. That is the whole point of the case. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman to point out a provision like that in our proclamation. For three Parliaments after confederation, there were exceptional dates fixed for the return of the writs, just as there were in the Ontario case, and Parliament never was called together till after the last date that was fixed for their being returnable. But since that, in the elections of 1878, 1882, and 1891, one date has been fixed for the return of the writs, covering the whole country, without exception. There is nothing I have heard in this debate that has changed, in any way, my opinions I had formed before I spoke. I am sure I have nothing to complain of as to the spirit in which the arguments have been presented. We would like to have heard the Minister of Justice's own idea on this important question, but we had only hypothetical quotations from hypothetical persons, and so we have lost the valuable opinions we hope to get before long from the gentleman mainly responsible in this matter.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. EDGAR.

CANADIAN JOCKEY CLUB.

House proceeded to consider amendments made in Committee of the Whole to Bill (No. 48) respecting the Canadian Jockey Club.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

Mr. MARTIN. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any length, but I wish to register my protest in the House, as I did in the committee, against the provisions of the Bill which give twelve men permanent control of the Canadian Jockey Club, a club which is supposed to be a representative institution for the purpose of governing racing in Canada. I submit that this is bound to be very much to the detriment of this club, and very much to the detriment of any attempt to make it the guiding body of racing in Canada. There is no reason whatever why there should be any stock. And there is no reason why the possession of a certain amount of stock upon which there is only \$550 paid, should entitle certain gentlemen to a representation of twelve upon the committee; in other words, to make these particular gentlemen equal, for purposes of representation, in this important association, to twelve affiliated clubs.

Amendments concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Manitoba and North-west Millers' Association.—(Mr. Masson.)

MILITARY GROUND AT ESSEX.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) asked:

Whether the military ground at Sussex, N.B., has been leased to any person? If so, to whom, and when, and for what length of time, and at what rent, and on what other terms?

Mr. DICKEY. By a lease dated 12th July, 1895, the Department of Militia and Defence has rented to Lieutenant Colonel Edwin B. Beer, the military ground at Sussex, N.B., for seven years, from 1st November, 1894, at the rate of \$25 per annum, on condition that: The said lessee is to give his supervision to the property generally, to maintain the fences erected by the department, as permanent fences, to superintend such works and repairs as may, from time to time, be authorized to be done upon the premises, to clear such land as may be ready for stumping (not to exceed ten acres in any one year) and to crop and seed the same to grass, to perform eighteen days' work of team and two men in repairs to the river banks, or other necessary work in each and every year, and to have the land clear and ready for military camps when required. It