

ought not to be impeached or questioned in any Court or place out of Parliament."

In *Lex Parliamenti*, p. 376, it is stated that in 1629 "all the judges agreed, upon questions propounded to them, 'that regularly a parliament-man cannot be compelled, out of Parliament, to answer things done in Parliament, in a Parliamentary course.'" And in the celebrated case of *Stockdale v. Hansard* (9 Ad. & Ellis 1), in which Parliamentary privileges were strongly assailed, the law was clearly explained by experienced judges. Lord Denman, C. J., said "The privileges of having their debates unquestioned was soon clearly perceived to be indispensable and universally acknowledged. By consequence, whatever is done within the walls of either assembly must not be questioned in any other place. For speeches made in Parliament by a member, to the prejudice of any other person, or hazardous to the public peace, that member enjoys complete immunity." Mr. Justice Littledale concurred in these views; and Mr. Justice Patteson added:—"Beyond all dispute, it is necessary that the proceedings of each House of Parliament should be entirely free and unshackled; whatever is done or said in either House should not be liable to examination elsewhere."

Now, looking at the terms of the Royal Commission, it cannot be denied but a Court has been established to enquire and report upon the truth of what was "said by a member in his place in Parliament;" and if this Commission can lawfully issue because one of the objects desired by the House of Commons cannot—according to the views of the Ministry, not the views of the Commons—be attained, why may not other pretexts be availed of by future Ministries to officiously intrude the prerogative, instead of allowing the will of Parliament to be declared; and that too in what is a matter of procedure or of