

between the two houses. It was very much to be regretted that that motion should be brought down at the time it was, because it must be admitted that if a Conference was desirable, another time would be more fitting. After the Lower House had taken action in the matter, then it would have to go before the House of Bishops and be passed by them before it could become law. Then, if they wished a Conference it would be the proper time to have it. The Lower House was competent to form its own opinions without having any pressure brought to bear upon it from other quarters. In reference to the legal view of the question, he must say that the true construction to be put on the Constitution was that they should give precedence to the subject that was engaging the attention of the House at the time the message was received from the House of Bishops; he quoted certain articles of the Constitution to support this view. It was charitable to suppose that their Lordships knew what the Lower House was discussing, and according to the 12th article of the Constitution, they were doing just what their Lordships desired. He did not wish to prolong the discussion, and he thought it would be seen that the delays had principally been caused by amendments and objections raised by the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. Hemming considered that all this discussion was irregular. (Hear, hear.) The Prolocutor had decided that proceedings should be stopped when the message was brought down, and, in that case, the discussion was entirely out of order. He would therefore ask the Prolocutor if he was not correct on this point?

The Prolocutor said that, in the 18th section it was laid down that the Lower House had power to accede or not to the request of the Bishops to grant a Conference. At the same time he hoped the discussion would speedily be brought to a close.

Rev. Dr. Nicolls wished to call the attention of the Synod to one or two points. The Upper House had a right to summon or to invite the Lower House to a Conference. They had not summoned them, but invited, and, therefore, he inferred that their Lordships wished to confer with them in an informal manner. He thought that they should be very much obliged to the House of Bishops for their advice on this subject. (Oh!) They might come to an independent conclusion; but what use would their conclusion be, if it was not sanctioned by the Bishops. The time for a Conference in his opinion was before they came to a dead lock with the Upper House.

Rev. S. Givins said that he was amazed at the number of expedients that had been raised by gentlemen opposite, to check discussion in this matter. (No.) Their conduct reminded him of a little story. (Cries of "Order, order!") He proceeded to relate the story, but was interrupted by the Prolocutor, and took his seat.