

cases than is done by the resolution before the House. I ask hon. gentlemen to follow it up and point out where the analogy fails if failure there is. I challenge them to the task, sir. (Applause.)

## THE PARNELL CASE

Now, let me take a very important case referred to previously in this debate, a different line of case, not an impeachment case; that is the Parnell case, a case in which a British commoner was charged by that great Conservative thunderer, The London Times, with a grave crime, a case which had been considered for a number of years by the British House of Commons, a case that led to, as this did, a great deal of heated discussion. Speakers referred to it, members of the House used a great deal of animated discussion, very much passion, very much the same kind as the greater number of the hon. gentlemen opposite have exhibited in this discussion; even the Leader of the Opposition, who ought to give a fair and moderate lead, entirely lost his head and frantically raved about larceny and murder. (Applause.) When the Parnell case came before the British House of Commons, an alleged crime committed outside the House, the same as the present, but brought up on the floor of the House, as is the present charge—when the grave charges were made, affecting not only the dignity of the House of Commons, but affecting as this charge affects every hon. gentleman sitting as a member of this House, Mr. Parnell rose on the floor of the House and submitted this question:—

"I now beg to ask the right hon. gentleman, the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he will grant a select committee consisting, if he likes, entirely of English and Scotch members," to inquire into them and report the facts to the House?

If the British House of Commons had appointed a select Committee, that would be a precedent in favor of the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite, but if the British House of Commons gave reasons for not sending a case of that kind to a Committee of the House, but of sending it on to the judges, then I ask is that not a strong argument in favor of our contention? I ask hon. gentlemen to tell us if a Committee of this House, consisting of 41 members, nearly half the House, will not naturally be divided into Conservatives and Liberals, if the Conservatives will not naturally desire to bring about a report which will lead them to the land they have been looking forward to for thirty-three years? (Applause.) Would not they naturally desire to bring in a report that would assist them to walk across to the treasury benches? So, also, would not our natural desire—hold the scales as evenly as you will—the natural desire of the majority of that Committee would be to have a report brought in which would maintain the integrity of the Ministers and maintain the Liberals in power? I leave that to any independent thinking man if that would not be the natural result. That is the exact thing that the British Commoners said. The First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. W. H. Smith, answered Parnell:—