

in, an order was made 'that the lawyers prepare themselves, and the report be disputed on Friday peremptorily' (a). Some time afterwards, however, an order was made imposing a fine upon those who came in after prayers. In the debate, it was urged that 'lawyers cannot attend in term time,' to which the Solicitor General replied, 'that lawyers spend their time ill in Westminster Hall, if they, for their late coming, cannot afford to pay sixpence' (b).

But the House would allow lawyers of only one religious persuasion to practice, for later on we find an order 'that all lawyers of the House be added to the Committee respecting recusants, and by them consideration be taken of the best means to discover Popishly-inclined persons living in the Inns of Court and Chancery, or that are lawyers and practise the law, and to prevent all hurt which can grow by them' (c).

There was a time when there were no Queen's Counsel, with the right of pre-audience in the Courts. And as the House had so earnestly desired the attendance of lawyers at its sittings, it acted consistently in sending its Sergeant-at-Arms to the Courts with the following message:—'Ordered, that the Sergeant go to all the Courts to move them, from this House, to hear those of this House before any other, that so they may attend their service in this House, and yet not lose their practice' (d).

Young lawyers got into Parliament in those days, and one of them, designated as 'one of the busy young lawyers in the Proclamation [of James I.] that ought not to have been elected,' was, on the 16th of February, 1620, expelled from the House, after being called to the Bar upon his knees and informed by the Speaker, that 'his offence great, exorbitant, never the

like, but that the House was very merciful, and might have imprisoned and further punished him.' His offence appears to have been that in a debate on a Bill respecting the Sabbath, which he desired should be called Sunday, he indulged in certain alleged atheistical sentiments, and called the laws against Papists 'gynnes and barracadoes,' and those against Puritans 'mousetraps,' and charged that the Bill 'was a mousetrap to catch a Puritan,' and he 'paralleled David's dancing to dancing at a May pole, which was a general scandal' (a).

The House occasionally usurped the powers of our modern Benchers, and the prerogatives of the Courts in dealing with junior barristers and attorneys: for about the time of the expulsion of the young lawyer just referred to, the House appointed three separate committees to deal with the following offences:—'Against young lawyers making unfitting speeches against men in their pleadings;' 'to prevent the excessive fees of lawyers;' 'to provide against any lawyer taking fees in any one term, on both sides;' and 'against judges suffering their sons or favourites to practise before them, to prevent this, and against favourites in all Courts' (b). And later on (10th of March, 1605), a Bill was brought in and passed, 'to reform the multitudes and misdemeanours of attorneys and solicitors-at law, and to avoid certain unnecessary suits and charges in law' (c)—a measure which had subsequently to be supplemented by a Bill 'for abridging the number of unskilful attorneys, and for reducing them to an orderly practice.'

But attorneys were not looked upon with much favour by the House. They appear to have been occasionally thorns in the path of impecunious members; and for their daring in issuing and serving the ordinary legal

(a) *Ibid.* 441.(b) *Ibid.* 668.(c) *Ibid.* 863.(d) *Ibid.* 479.(a) *Ibid.* 521-5.(b) *Ibid.* 595.(c) *Ibid.* 837. 3rd James I., c. 7.