

*stantive fact* of forgetfulness of their oath of office and of their duty, in this respect, towards the Head of the Government?

There are rules of proceeding which ought to be held sacred by deliberative bodies as well as by every other species of tribunal. Honorable Members sit as Judges on this occasion. I appeal to them, as such, whether they can pronounce a judgment without evidence, or upon documents made up wholly of assertion on the one hand and denial on the other, utterly insusceptible of coming properly before this House, and stamped with every mark of the most hopeless irregularity.

The Legislative Assembly can no more than a Court, or even an individual who pretends to form an opinion, not merely on a question of accusation or defence but upon any action whatever, be justified in pronouncing a decision, except upon facts proved or acknowledged by those for or against whom they are alleged.

In what a position have the late Ministry placed themselves! In the case before us, any more than in any other, no judgment can be pronounced except upon substantive facts: who can pretend that it is not necessary that such facts should be evidenced to us, if not by irrefragable proofs, then by the mutual assent of the Head of the Government, on the one hand, and of those who demand of us an approval of their conduct, on the other?

Instead of a simple statement of facts, and the production of documents which should render them indisputable, such as an English Ministry would have adopted under analogous circumstances, the document produced by our late Ministers is but a piece of pleading from one end to the other.