

Lordships will not have a doubt, that his removal was the effect of private resentment, and not of any good and sufficient cause, when you shall have considered,

IIIIdly and lastly, The pretended cause of the violence offered to him.

The Governor has not thought proper to specify (as is usual on occasions of this nature) his charge against the Chief-Justice, but has left your Lordships to collect it from the minutes of the Council to which he refers you. What is to be understood by this? but that the Governor has assumed the power of removing the Chief-Justice, because the measures he promoted, and the advice he gave in Council, were not agreeable to the Governor; that is to say, the King has instructed the Governor to allow freedom of debate, and vote in Council; and he now tells your Lordships, that instead of allowing any such matter, he has taken upon him to remove the Chief-Justice from his judicial office, for having dared to use that freedom in Council. The measures he proposed and promoted are, in their nature, such as leave no room to imagine they were seditiously intended; supposing him therefore mistaken in his conduct in Council, that would not be a sufficient cause even for his being suspended from being of the Council; but how absurd is it, that because it is supposed he did not

C 2

behave