And he did observe that they were but upon the brink of the Danse, for that afterwards there were two things to come in question first whether an offence, secondly whether the defendants were guilty.

And he observed that the question at this time was not between the Parliament and the Kings, but between private and ptiular persons and the Kings, and whether the Kings bee a fit Judge to determine the same in the doubt. And he said that not ptiular man was exempted from answering his actions examined, but onlie the Kings. And he considered that the Kings, who is the Regist, and the head of the Parliament, is a person most fit to examine these offences. And he said, that though the acts of Parliament themselves are not examinable, yet the acts of the ptiular members of the Parliament are.

And he said that no man had a greater privilege then a Minister in the pulpit yet if he treadne the Kings and his

government, it is punishable for the same, for then he forsoke the humility of his function.

And for his 1st, he said, he never heard the person of any man traduced in Parliament.

And as to the objection of superiorities of Counties, he said, it would goe in point of Judgement. But yet the Case that a Judge of the Kings Bench doth in his argum there stand all the state and government, therefore shrelie he is punishable for the same by Commission of Oyer and terminer, for then he hath relinquished the person of a Judge and assumed the person of a defendor.

And so he said that the act of the Parliament was not now questioned, but the act of ptiular men, over whom he considered the Court had intribition. And he cited a president in 2: R: 2: where the upper house, and the Earle Talbot, and the Prior of Kenilworth to the Kings Bench to be punished according to the verdict of their offence (they having fallen out in the upper house of Parliament, and the one was bound to the peace, and the other in

University of Kansas
Kenneth Spencer Research Library
MS D153