be first without any vote of the House? Surely, from the report of a committee for a committee of enquiry, that charge ought to be adopted. This, in my opinion, is the full course that can be pursued for the public information. Here, it is, that thereby expected innuendoes of honest persons that this judge has done wrong. So far his character is vindicated; but is the public satisfied with it? it is impossible. The committee are to enquire whether there are grounds for an impeachment or not. If they report that there are no grounds, the sensation will be dropped; and if the members in most there are grounds, the House will, at our peril, be the sacrifice of taking this step to ascertain their ex ifence.

Another ground of difficulty is taken. It is said there are no precedents for this proceeding. I believe that all precedents must have had an origin; and that somebody had original a priority to establish them as a precedent. Our government is young, and only now rises out of infancy; it has been accused under it. Most of our precedents are of things peculiarly circumstances are borrowed from England, and if precedents are necessary to the affair, we must resort to that country for them. My opinion is that they are not necessary; and that common sense and the reason of the thing are more to be regarded by us than our decision in this case. There is however, in the British annals one decision, which is to the point. The Earl of Strafford's case. The Earl of Strafford was a peer of Ireland, and was impeached by the Commons of England, and if precedents are necessary to the affair, we must resort to that country for them. My opinion is that they are not necessary; and that common sense and the reason of the thing are more to be regarded by us than our decision in this case. There is however, in the British annals one decision, which is to the point. The Earl of Strafford's case. The Earl of Strafford was a peer of Ireland, and was impeached by the Commons of England; and the decision was, that he should be tried by the House of Lords, and not by the House of Commons. Now, I ask, if the House of Lords was made upon the Earl of Strafford in the House of Commons, I ask, I say, I ask, who after contemplating on a long list of popular grievances, we shall inquire, added to, from what foundation, he was charged? It is, and though doubtful, many evil consequences will be found to have contributed, the evil consequence is three times, I challenge the informer, pre eminence and who by his country, conversing with enquiries, is entitled to the first place among their betrayers of their country. He is the son of Strafford, lieutenant of Ireland, and president of the country of York, who in both places and in all other provinces where he has been entrusted with authority, has raised amplemonuments of tyranny, and will appear from a long list of his actions to be an chief promoter of very arbitrary counsel. Many others entered into the Earl of Strafford's case, and the Earl of Strafford should be impeached. Lord Falkland, alone though the known enemy of Strafford, expressed his doubt not to admit, exception. But Pym replied that doubt would shall if there is, without doubt, and debate the impeachment was voted and Pym was chosen to carry it up to the Lords.

In this case, it does not appear that any evidence was called for; a memoir he was charged with Commons pro and declared his opinion of that House, and at the same follows an indictment was exhibited, and the charge of impeachment is very different from that now proposed.

I will now refer to a more modern precedent, which at the time does not appear to have been sufficiently well known, in the reign of George I. and will be found based in Rolle's Modern Entries, fol. 8, page 384.

"A new parliament was called, in which the interest of the whigs predominated, and the commons chose their speaker, was appointed to examine all the papers, and enquire into all the negotiations of the late ministry, and report to the cellation of arms, by which it was concerted.

"The Committee of Secrecy proceeded this enquiry with the greatest rigorous, and, in consequence of their report, the commons resolved to impeach lord Bolingbroke, the earl of Oxford, and the duke of Ormond, of high treason."

Our circumstance is worthy of attention. A secret committee was chosen, and the judge was undoubtedly prevailed—Whether he is wrongfully accused I will not for. But the affirmation is unwishfull; for the representatives of two respectable states lately come forward and opposed our being placed in concurs which embarrass their affairs. This single fact ought to make an impression on the House.

It is all good that there is no proof before the House. But one thing is notorious, universally known. I believe that this man (Pries) was tried before this judge for his life, and was tried without being heard. This fact cannot be disputed. When we consider the importance of the life of a citizen, and know that such an event has taken place, it is not the duty of the only but representatives to consider the call. With other sentiment I believe that the humanities of office ought to be expiated. I believe also that judges are like other men, and that like them they are fully to the common frailties of human nature; and I do believe that when the frailties of human nature produce such effects, the House cannot be justified in themselves or their country if not unseeking an enquiry. On duty to our country and our children, and when such a high character is implicated, all calls for it. If unnecessary, a proper regard to his character, and the public good, requires Maryland unknown as that he will rejoice at the opportunity of coming forward, and the opportunity of coming forward, and the opportunity of coming forward, and