

all Parliaments for and touching any bills, speaking, reasoning or declaring of any matter or matters in and concerning the Parliament to be commenced and treated of." They resolved also that the judgment given in the 5th year of Charles I against Sir John Eliot, Denzil Holles, and Benjamin Valentine was an illegal judgment against the freedom and privilege of Parliament. To these resolutions the lords solemnly gave their concurrence, and Holles then became a peer; having brought the record of the King's Bench by writ of error before them, they solemnly reversed it. This decision has established beyond all controversy the great privilege of unlimited freedom of speech in Parliament; unlimited, that is to say, "by any authority except that by which the House itself ought always to restrain indecent and disorderly language in its members." 2 Hallam Const. Hist. 6. But does the reversal of this judgment decide that offences committed in Parliament by members, as indeed was argued in the case of Holles and Valentine, are not punishable in any other place, and that, accordingly, the participators in the recent affray are not answerable in a court of justice for their conduct? Mr. Hallam gives the following reply to this query. "It does not however appear," he says, "to be a necessary consequence from the reversal of this judgment (in the case of Eliot, Holles and Valentine) that no actions committed in the House by any of its members are punishable in a court of law. The argument on behalf of Holles and Valentine goes indeed to this length; but it was admitted in the debate on the subject, in 1667, that their plea to the jurisdiction of the King's Bench could not have been supported as to the imputed riot in detaining the speaker in the chair, though the judgment was erroneous in extending to words spoken in Parliament. And it is obvious that the House could inflict no adequate punishment in the possible case of treason or felony committed within its walls, nor if its power of imprisonment be limited to the session, in that of many smaller offences.'" 2 Const. Hist. 6, 7.—*Albany Law Journal*.

THE BEHRING SEA AWARD.

The daily papers have announced the contents of the award of the Behring Sea arbitrators, and we have witnessed the unwonted sight of both parties applauding the decision. The English papers express their satisfaction, having read the first part of the award; the United States press is truly thankful, having read