

the Rolls, and another member, the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. John Hungerford, M.P. for Scarborough), in 1694, from receiving 'gratuities' from parties interested in the promotion of a private bill before the House, and which violation of Parliamentary law was doubtless the cause of the passing of the resolution above referred to. The City of London was at that time promoting 'The City of London's Orphans' Bill,' and after the passing of the Bill the city gave to the Speaker (Sir John Trevor) 1,000 guineas as a 'gratuity,' as expressive of its gratitude for his services in aiding in the passage of the Bill. For this act of dishonour he was expelled the House, and he had from the chair to put the resolution which declared, 'That Sir John Trevor, Speaker of this House, receiving 1,000 guineas from the City of London after passing of the Orphans' Bill, is guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour' ^(a). Such a crime could not be concealed, for, with a curious and quaint simplicity, the city officers entered in the books the payment to the accomplice in this crime, Mr. Hungerford, as follows:—'March 23, paid Mr. Hungerford, Chairman of the Grand Committee, for his pains and services, twenty guineas.' The city books with this entry were produced to the House, and thereupon it was ordered 'that Mr. Hungerford, a member, being guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour by receiving twenty guineas for his pains and services as Chairman of the Committee to whom the Orphans' Bill was committed, be expelled this House' ^(b). These cases doubtless led to the adoption of the standing order of 1695.

Other cases occurred during the same Parliament—one, the case of Mr. Henry Guy, the Secretary of the Treasury and a member of the House. His crime was charged in the bald term

'a bribe of two hundred guineas.' He was not expelled, but was committed prisoner to the Tower of London ^(a), under the following resolution:—'Resolved, that Mr. Henry Guy, a member of this House, for taking a bribe of two hundred guineas, be committed prisoner to the Tower of London, and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly' ^(b).

But the case which more accurately illustrates the position and duty of the lawyer in Parliament is the case where one Bird, an attorney, offered a fee of a guinea to Mr. Musgrave, a barrister and a member of Parliament, to revise a petition relating to a private Bill then before the House. Mr. Musgrave, according to his duty, at once reported the matter to the House, and an order was made directing Bird to attend the House and answer for his offence. The Journal reports the case thus:—

'The House being informed by Mr. Musgrave that Mr. Robert Bird, of Staple Inn, came to him yesterday, in the Court of Request, and desired him to present a petition, and pulled out some guineas to give him for the same; ordered, that Mr. Robert Bird, attorney-at-law, be summoned to attend this House upon Monday morning.

'Mr. Bird, attending according to order, was called in, and, being at the Bar, was told by Mr. Speaker that there had been a complaint made against him to this House for offering money to Mr. Musgrave, a member of this House to present a petition to the House. Whereupon he said that some persons did apprehend that a Bill depending in this House for settling an estate late of Mr. Howland, did affect their interest in part of that estate, and therefore desired him to prepare a petition to be presented to this House for the protection of their interests, which accordingly he did;

(a) 5 Parliamentary History, 908.

(b) 11 Commons Journal, 283.

(a) Commons Journal, 236, 275.

(b) The vote for his expulsion stood 66 yeas and 103 noes (11 Com. Jour. 307.)