

Committee of the whole House, but finding this method again to prove a failure, they ceased that practice and again dropped back to the original procedure which is closely analogous to that which the hon. Leader of the House asks this House to adopt. (Applause.) What is the procedure in the case of impeachment? It is a safe parliamentary practice; it is the practice not only followed in charges made against members in the British House of Commons, but it is the practice followed under our law, and rightly followed even to the meanest criminals from the slums who are charged; that is, that the charge should be direct and specific. (Applause.) Any charge ought to be specific, giving the place where and the time when. I cannot help thinking it would have been well for hon. gentlemen opposite if they had weighed well the manner of procedure, and had adopted the proper parliamentary practice and followed the rule that when a charge is made against any member it should be definite, specific, in black and white, and over the signature of the accuser. (Applause.) They have not chosen to do so. One charge has been made, and it is being dealt with. In Great Britain if a charge were being made against a member of the House of Commons, the member would make the charge in black and white, definite and specific, and would not be afraid to put his name to it. Any man, in or out of this House, who is not man enough to put his name to the charge ought to be gentleman enough to withdraw it and not make it at all. (Applause.) When a charge is made in the British House of Commons, the commoners would resolve, if they think it a proper case, that the commoner who is to be impeached, the accused man, shall be sent forthwith out of that House entirely. So here, we say, send the accused outside this House. In Britain the accuser and accused, prosecutors and defenders, are sent outside the House of Commons to appear before the Law Lords. So here, we say, send accuser and accused, prosecuting and defending Counsel, out before what here corresponds to the Law Lords—the highest Judges in our Province—Chiefs of the Supreme Court for this Province. (Loud applause.)

What is the proposition in this case? We have no House of Lords. The Law Lords are the highest judges in Britain, the highest judges in the territory over which the British House of Commons has jurisdiction. So we propose to send the case to the highest judges in our Province, the district over which this House holds sway, commonly known as the Supreme Court Judges. The proposition now is a close analogy to the procedure in Britain. I follow it further. While the Law Lords are not in name the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, yet they form in another capacity part and parcel of them. So we propose to send the present case up to judges who are not sitting as High Court Judges, as, for example, Assize Court Judges, but who, in another capacity, are those judges, and in this case are a special tribunal as in the case of the Law Lords. I cannot understand how human mind could frame on the floor of this House a resolution which would provide a procedure more closely analogous to the procedure adopted in Britain in impeachment