talents, they had a right to expect, and which they so much relied upon, particularly in the important business of the finances of this kingdom; and that gentleman and his family would have been precluded, irreparably precluded, by an unjust judgment, from those great emoluments and high honors which were conferred upon him by two successive kings, as the rewards of his administration.

"That loss, however, would have been the misfortune of individuals; but a much heavier, a much more extensive misfortune would have befallen the Parliament and the constitution if so dangerous a precedent had taken place. An easy and an effectual plan would have been marked out to exclude from this House for ever, by an unjust vote once passed, any member of it who should be obnoxious to the rage of party or to the wantonness of power. Let not your prejudices, let not your just resentments against the conduct and character of the man who is now an object of your deliberation prevail upon you to ground any part of your proceedings upon such destructive and fatal principles. Consider that precedents of this nature are generally begun in the first instance against the odious and the guilty, but, when once established, are easily applied to and made use of against the meritorious and the innocent; that the most eminent and best deserving members of the state, under the color of such an example, by one arbitrary and discretionary vote of one House of Parliament (the worst species of ostracism), may be excluded from the public councils, cut off and proscribed from the rights of every subject of the realm, not for a term of years alone, but for ever."

The resolution of expulsion having been adopted on the 3d day of February, 1769, on the 16th day of the same month Mr. Wilkes was unanimously re-elected to the 13th Parliament. On the next day (February, 17th) Lord Strange submitted to the House of Commons the following motion:

"That John Wilkes, Esq., having been in this session of Parliament expelled this House, was and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament."

The motion was carried on the same day. In its support, it was said that when a member was once expelled it was the undoubted law of Parliament not to admit that person to sit again in the same Parliament; and the case of Robert Walpole was cited in support of this position. The journals of the House were consulted, and showed the following entry in Walpole's case:

"That Sir Robert Walpole, being expelled for bribery and corruption, is not capable of sitting in this Parliament." (16 Hans., 579.)

On the 16th of the next month (March, 1769) Mr. Wilkes was elected to the 13th Parliament for the third time. His election was unanimous. On the next day, March 17, 1769, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the election and return of John Wilkes, Esq., who hath been by this house adjudged incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament, are null and void." (16 Hans., 581.)

On the 13th day of April, 1769, Mr. Wilkes was elected to the 13th Parliament for the fourth time. He received 1,143 votes, and his competitor, H. L. Luttrell, 296 votes. On the next day, April 14, 1769, Mr. Wilkes's election was declared void by a vote of the House, and on the 15th a motion to seat his competitor was carried by a vote of 197 to 143. The advocates of this motion in the House took the ground that the previous action of the House had rendered Mr. Wilkes ineligible to a seat in that Parliament, and had at the same time sufficiently notified the electors of Middlesex of such ineligibility, so that all votes cast for him were nullities, and the votes cast for Mr. Luttrell were to be regarded as the only legal votes cast at the election.

Among the opponents of this motion were Mr. Beckford, Sergeant Glynn, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Grenville. Mr. Beckford insisted that all the precedents which had been cited in support of the measure were cases of persons disqualified by act of Parliament, and consequently were inapplicable to the case of Mr. Wilkes, whose alleged disqualification was created by vote of the House of Commons alone. Sergeant Glynn spoke very ably, taking the ground that, the disqualification of Mr. Wilkes, not being the law of the land, the electors of Middlesex were under no obligation to take notice of it. Mr. Grenville made, in opposition to the motion, one of the ablest speeches that had been made in the House of Commons for many years. He concluded that a vote of the House might and did bind the House for the session in which it was taken, but that out of the House, except in matters of privilege, it had no effect on the people.

Mr. Burke drew a moving picture of the condition of the country and the terrible consequences to be dreaded from the measure, showing that it was not, as had been represented, a dispute between the House and the electors of Middlesex, but between the House and all the voters in England, who would easily perceive their franchises invaded by this vote.

On the 30th day of September, 1774, the 13th Parliament was dissolved by royal proclamation. The 14th Parliament met two months later, on the 29th day of November, 1774. Mr. Wilkes was elected a member of the 14th Parliament, and took his seat without question or objection. He was at the time also Lord Mayor of London. He had been elevated to that honor by the persecutions of the House of Commons. He remained in Parliament for many years, and, in 1782, after the elapse of eight years from the time when he took his seat, he succeeded in carrying a motion to expunge the resolution of February 17, 1769, declaring him ineligible to the 13th Parliament on account of a previous expulsion by the same Parliament. Mr. Wilkes, had, without success, made repeated annual motions to expunge this resolution. On the 3d day of May, 1782, he renewed the motion, and closed his speech in support of it in these words:

"I will not detain the House longer than by moving that the entry in the journal of the House of the 17th of February, 1769, of the resolution 'That John Wilkes, Esq., having been in this session of Parliament expelled this House, was and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament,' may be read."

The same having been read, Mr. Wilkes next moved

"That the said resolution be expunged from the journals of this House, as being subversive of the rights of the whole body of electors of this kingdom."

(TO BE CONTINUED)

THE UTAH CHIEF JUSTICE.—The term of James B. McKean as Chief Justice of Utah expires next month, and if anybody but Grant was President we should have some hope that a man would be appointed as his successor who would have some qualification for the office. Owing to the anomalous condition of affairs in that Territory the public interest imperatively requires that a man of ability, fairness, and unquestioned integrity should fill the position which McKean has made ridiculous during the past four years. Utah is a thriving and wealthy Territory; its mining interests are assuming great importance, and there is a constant influx of immigrants who have neither connection or sympathy with the Mormon population who originally developed the resources of that region. Yet owing to the absurd and preposterous action of Judge McKean the administration of justice is at a stand still, and criminals of the worst character are permitted to go unpunished because the laws as they are do not suit his peculiar notions. As Parson Newman is out of the country, the President may surprise people by replacing McKean with a suitable man, but we greatly doubt it.—*N. Y. Sun.*

UNCONSTITUTIONAL RELIGIOUS TEST.—The House of Representatives will probably be forced into a decision of the question of the rights of polygamists in Utah, now that Elder Cannon has been admitted to his seat as delegate from Utah. An effort was made to prevent the admission of Cannon, because he is a Mormon, and is alleged to be a practical polygamist; but the House very wisely decided to admit him as "the duly elected member," and to decide upon his personal qualifications afterwards. A resolution has been passed directing an inquiry into the alleged polygamous practices of Elder Cannon. If he were a delegate from any other part of the country, the question of his qualification would probably rest solely on the question of fact, but as it is, there will no doubt be an effort made in his behalf to prove that Mormonism, with the polygamy which it justifies, is a religious faith, and that the refusal to admit a Mormon to office would be the application of a religious test forbidden by the Constitution.—*Philadelphia Ledger.*

TIDINESS.—Next in importance to the habit of self-help we would place that of personal tidiness. We do not care to guess how many American men and women sit down to breakfast every morning with their toilets half made, the men without collar and cravat, the women with unkempt hair, and the children resembling the parents in dress as much as in feature. "But you see there are so many things to do in the morning—stock to feed, cows to milk, fires to make, milk to skim, children to dress, breakfast to get—that one can't spend much time in fixing themselves up." All very true; but one doesn't go round barefooted in the morning, or without washing face and hands, because a habit the reverse of all that has been formed.

"My hair is combed in the morning for all day before I leave my chamber," said an elegant housekeeper the other day, and she keeps no girl, and we couldn't help thinking the happiness her husband must have had, just in the one particular of seeing her every morning for twenty years with smoothly combed hair and neat linen collar opposite him at the breakfast table, and of the order and cleanliness in the household of which that one little item was an index. That "cleanliness is next to godliness" should be early and deeply impressed on every child, and it should be taught to shrink from uncleanness and untidiness as it shrinks from vice.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

THE UTAH FIGHT IN CONGRESS.—If Elder Cannon were not a man with four wives he would tremble for his seat in Congress. But having been in the daily habit of looking four able-bodied females in their faces, and those four females being his wives, he is not afraid to look at the hundred and thirty-seven men who have virtually voted for his expulsion. He does it without a pang of distrust or a qualm of apprehension. In the first place they must prove the four polygamous matrons. That will demand a Congressional committee of investigation, who must make the inquiry on the spot in Salt Lake City. That is, it would demand something of the kind if Elder Cannon denied the allegations. But Elder Cannon does not. He won't drop a wife. He will take his stand upon the patriarchal rock of ages and the keystone of the Constitution. He claims that Jacob was a Mormon, and David and Solomon and all Israel were Mormons, as sanctioned by Divine law, and that by the Constitution of the United States Congress is precluded from framing "any law respecting an establishment of religion," and therefore has no right, nor can have any right, unless by an amendment of the Constitution to pass a law which will interfere with the religion of Mormonism, of which polygamy is a chief dogma. This is the ground which Elder Cannon has taken, and upon which he proposes to stand, with his four wives, and pound Congress on the head with the Constitution, if it takes him all summer. It is a very pretty fight, and there is a great deal to be said on both sides. It looks as if the resolution pointed directly to his expulsion, and as if the hundred and thirty-seven members had determined to take the Constitution in their teeth and turn Elder Cannon into the cold. But he is not out yet. He will stand on the Constitution, and on Jacob and Solomon, on the four Mistresses Cannon, and on the rest of his polygamous privileges, and make a stout fight before he is forced to take up his carpet bag and walk.—*St. Louis Republican.*