despatch of business' on the 7th of December. The nominations and pollings (except in Algoma) were respectively held on the 14th and 21st of March, 1871, and for Algoma the date of the return is given as the 5th of May, the return being received on the 15th of May, 1871. In 1875, as already observed, the writs were generally returnable on the 2nd of February, and for Algoma on the 14th of August. The House stood prorogued from time to time to the 24th of November, 1875. The practice which long obtained in Canada of naming as the day of meeting, the day on which the writs generally were returnable, was doubtless copied from that of Great Britain, where no exceptional conditions existed. It does not, however, follow by any means that the Parliament of Great Britain always meets on the day first appointed. May says on this point (p. 52): 'The interval 'between a dissolution and the assem-'bling of the new Parliament varies 'according to the period of the year, 'the state of public business, and the 'political conditions under which an 'appeal to the people may have become 'necessary. When the session has 'been concluded, and no question of 'ministerial confidence or responsi-'bility is at issue, the recess is gene-'rally continued by prorogation until 'the usual time for the meeting of 'Parliament.'

THE ALLEGED INVASION OF THE PREROGATIVE.

It is alleged that, by virtually prohibiting or precluding the assembling of a new parliament, pending the election for Algoma, the prerogative is violated. In answer to this it may be observed that, while the summoning, prorogation and dissolution of Parliament are undoubtedly attributes of the prerogative, they are nevertheless subject to the restraints and limitations of law. Every Act must have the assent of the Crown, and if the Crown thus be a consenting party to an abridgement of the prerogative, no wrong is done to the rights of the Crown by such legislation. The forty days secured by the Barons in Magna Charta for the summoning of the 'Common Council of the Kingdom,' virtually suspended the prerogative for that space of time. So did the forty days statutory provision of William III. So did the fifty days of the Scotch Union Act. So did the fifty days of the Union Act of Canada. So did the ninety days allowed by the Ontario Act of 1868-9 for Algoma in the winter season. So has nearly every statutory limitation or security which has been considered by the Crown as advised by Parliament, essential to the privileges of the electorate.

By the Act of 36th Edward III. it was enacted that 'Parliament shall be holden every year.' The Triennial Act, 6 & 7 William & Mary, c. 2, enacted that 'from henceforth Parliament shall be holden once in three years, at the least.' By the Septennial Act, 1 Geo. I, c. 38, the duration of Parliament was limited to seven years, so that the Sovereign might not be able by the aid of a servile or corrupt Parliament to abuse the prerogative. The Canadian Acts providing for the annual convening or duration of the Parliament or Legislatures, are but reflections of the British Statutes. The most potent influence over the acts of the Crown and an all-powerful check on the abuse of the prerogative is, however, the voting of supplies. The granting of these for one year only compels the summoning of Parliament annually quite as effectually as any law. The fact is that, interpreted by modern practice, usage and ideas, the prerogative is simply a power held in trust by the Crown for the people, a power, consequently, that may be enlarged or contracted by the joint action of the Crown and the people, and which has been subject to both in many ways. Hence it is not to be argued that if, by the joint ac-