

"sue ! none of us knowing the Law by which
 "persons are committed by the Commons.
 "three persons were committed for the same
 "breach of privilege, and applied severally
 "different Courts, one Court perhaps would
 "bail, another Court discharge, and a third
 "commit."

On the same occasion, Justice Gould, in delivering his opinion observed, that "this Court
 "hath no cognizance of contempts or breach
 "privilege of the House of Commons; they are
 "the only Judges of their own privileges." As
 Justice Blackstone remarked, "that all Courts
 "by which I mean to include the two Houses
 "Parliament, and the Courts of Westminster
 "Hall, can have no controul in matters of con-
 "tempt. The sole adjudication of contempt
 "and the punishment thereof, in any manner
 "belongs exclusively and without interfering
 "each respective Court. Infinite confusion
 "and disorder would follow, if Courts could
 "by Writs of Habeas Corpus, examine and de-
 "termine the contempts of others. This power
 "to commit, results from the first principle
 "of Justice; for if they have power to decide
 "they ought to have power to punish. It is
 "confidence that may with perfect safety and
 "security, be reposed in the Judges and the
 "Houses of Parliament."

Much more might be quoted from this and
 other cases respecting the privileges of Parli-
 ment, which are very large and indefinite, but
 your Committee presume that their necessity,
 importance and existence, as regards the British
 Parliament, are sufficiently made out.

Your Committee sensible of the vast difference
 in degree and dignity between the Legi-