from committing the like wicked practices for the time to come.' (*a*).

We pass by the days of Robert Walpole and the days when public contractors revelled in the possession of paid members of Parliament in their service, during the times of the great continental wars at the beginning of this century; for to the honour of the profession be it said, that the name of no lawyer of prominence stands associated with those days of public corruption. We now come to the days when public honour and public morality had triumphed over corruption in Parliament.

In 1830 the following case occurred: Mr. Daniel Whittle Harvey, member for Colchester, a solicitor, had entered into a partnership with Mr. Sydney, another solicitor, as solicitors and Parliamentary agents, and the firm sent a notice to a country solicitor, who was promoting a Bill before the House, that Mr. Harvey's practice and experience in promoting Bills in Parliament gave him facilities for conducting Parliamentary business which would be found very advantageous to his clients. The letter was franked by Mr. Harvey as M.P., and had on it what appeared to be the ordinary seal of the firm. The country solicitor brought the matter before the House, and petitioned Parliament to take into its serious consideration 'whether the practice, above disclosed, of members possessing an interest in Bills which were in progress through the House was not one which ought to be disallowed.' (*b*).

In the debate which followed Mr. (afterwards Lord) Brougham said: 'He marvelled to hear it a matter of doubt whether an individual, being a judge of some of the Courts at Westminster, a justice of Quarter Sessions, or even a member of any inferior judicature, exercising deliberate functions, could practise in those Courts or judicatures as counsel, agent, or solicitor. It was a proposition utterly repugnant in itself. The same rule must apply to the House of Commons' (*a*). And Mr. (afterwards Sir Robert) Peel gave these reasons against the practice:—1st. Because it was consistent with the uniform practice of the House that lawyers should not take any part as members of Parliament in any proceedings wherein they were professionally engaged; and the same rule should apply to solicitors; 2nd. That any member taking pecuniary reward for his services did that which was incompatible with the discharge of any Parliamentary duty; 3rd. The practice referred to gave members of Parliament an undue preference over the other members of their own profession, and therefore it should not be sanctioned by the House (*b*). To put a stop to this practice, the House, by a large majority, adopted the following standing order:—

'That it is contrary to the law and usage of Parliament that any member of this House should be permitted to engage, either by himself or any partner, in the management of Private Bills before this or the other House of Parliament, for pecuniary reward (*c*).'

We have now shown from the written and the unwritten practice of Parliament; from the exposition of Parliamentary law by Lord Brougham and Sir Robert Peel, from the nature of the judicial and legislative functions incident to the position of a member of Parliament, that the independence and honour of the House is as well protected against the monetary influence of the subject as it is now protected by statute from the monetary and official influence of the Crown.

From the examples above quoted, it will be seen that the law of Parliament has been exemplified in such a

(*a*) Repealed by 30 and 31 Vic., c. 59, L. R. 2, Stats. 675.

(*b*) 22 Hansard, 2nd S., 727.

(*a*) 22 Hansard, 2nd S., 1025.

(*b*) Ibid, 1038.

(*c*) 85 Commons Journal, 7.