

Italy in any proper requirement she may make. She has a navy, the United States has none. Suppose Italian war vessels appeared outside of New York, Boston and San Francisco, would the flapping of our eagle's wings frighten them away? Not by any means. Then it must be remembered that the Italian government took occasion to remind its subjects a few years ago, not to put implicit trust in the agents of American capitalists, who were over there, urging laborers to go to America.

"The Mafia" society is [no doubt] a villainous organization. Its members were organized assassins. They were criminals at home and are criminals here. But that does not excuse the venality and corruption of American judges and jurymen. The Italians are of the same religion as was Hennessey, the murdered policeman. Hennessey's countrymen both here and abroad take their law, religion and morality from Italy. It will be seen that this is an Italian question from beginning to end.

"The one important feature about the affair is, that the judge, the jury, the lawyers, and all concerned in the administration of the law are what are termed 'Americans.' It was the corruption of the judicial branch which caused assassins of Hennessey to be acquitted. So says the Mayor of New Orleans. Then why were not these men lynched as well?"

That is all very well as far as it goes. But Italy understands very well its inability, financially and otherwise to cope with such a nation as the United States. We do not believe there is the slightest danger of war as growing out of this unfortunate affair. The danger lies rather in personal vengeance against Americans both in Italy and America. As to the officials who are charged with improperly acquitting the accused Italians, there is no actual proof that they were bribed or improperly influenced in any way. It was only surmised that they had been bought off. But the proofs of the guilt of the accused Italians were considered conclusive by the public and this with the determination to strike a blow at a secret murderous society prompted the lynching.

It was one of those popular uprisings which, whatever good may arise from them, are always to be deplored, because they are lawless and the result of passion and desire for revenge, and are as likely to be directed against the innocent as the guilty. They are signs of a barbaric condition of great corruption in the administration of justice or society and indicate a very low grade of "Christian civilization."

DEATH OF PRINCE NAPOLEON.

DISPATCHES from Paris announce the death of Prince Napoleon, commonly called "Plon-Plon," at Rome, on the 17th inst. His full name was Napoleon Joseph Charles Paol Bonaparte.

He was the second son of Jerome Bonaparte, and cousin to Emperor Napoleon III. He was born at Trieste, September 9, 1822. His youth was spent in the principal cities of Europe.

In 1845 he visited Paris under the name of Count de Montfort, but was not permitted to remain long there. After the revolution of 1848, he returned to France, and was elected a member of the Assembly. In 1849 he was appointed French Minister to Madrid. In 1853 he was created a French Prince with a seat in the Senate and Council of State. He also received the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, and the rank of General of Division.

In 1854 he fought in the Crimean war, and was present at the battles of Alma and Inkerman. It was here he received the soubriquet of "Plon Plon," because of his sudden retirement from his post on the ground of ill health.

In 1855 he was appointed President of the Imperial Commission of the Universal Exhibition. In 1858 he was placed at the head of the new ministry for Algiers and the colonies. In 1859 he married Clotilde, the daughter of King Victor Emanuel of Italy.

He served in the French army during the Italian campaign of 1859, but participated in none of the battles. He quarreled with the Orleans family in 1861, but when challenged by the Duke d'Aumale to fight a duel, "Plon-Plon" did not want to fight. At the Kensington Exhibition of 1863, he presided over the French Commission. He had a misunderstanding with his cousin Napoleon III in 1867, but it was speedily settled.

He was a great traveler. He visited the United States during our civil war, and made the acquaintance of Lincoln, Seward and other distinguished Americans.

He sought a military command at the opening of the Franco-Prussian war, but Napoleon would not give him one. He was sent, however, to Italy, hoping that he might secure for France, the co-operation of his father-in-law Victor Emanuel. In this mission he failed. After the fall of the Bonaparte dynasty he resided in England.

He was considered a shrewd politician and a fair diplomat, but he was rather capricious in his methods of action. His last mission to Italy was said to have a political object. He wanted to warn Humbert of the dangers of the Dreibund in the House of Savoy. He also wanted some marriage unions consummated which would strengthen the Italian throne as well as his own family.

His death in Rome was attended by intense physical pain, as well as by disgraceful scenes on the part of churchmen and politicians. The Roman churchmen say that he died in full harmony with their religion, and received the last rites with the true spirit of a believer. The politicians, on the other hand, say that extreme unction was administered after his lips were sealed by death, and that he died a Rationalist.

The dispatch says that Church and Throne disputed for the possession of the body, each desiring to use it as a trophy. "Bigotry on one side and a thirst for power on the other, added protracted horrors to his dying agony."

He leaves three children. One, named Victor, was present at his death. Victor is the lineal successor to the Napoleonic crown, and will be Napoleon the Sixth, if he ever comes to rule France, a rather improbable contingency.

A VERY MEAN ASSAULT.

"One of the wages of hasty legislation, in the declining hours of Congress, is the incorporation of an important bill, which, but for the incompetency of Delegate Caine might have secured to Salt Lake City a government institution. The discovery made that the act approved on March 3, providing for the erection of three United States prisons, and the confinement therein of United States convicts, is rendered absolutely inoperative for the purposes it was intended through a blunder in drawing the bill. Its intention was to authorize the Attorney-General and the Secretary of the Interior to purchase three sites and cause to be erected on them suitable prisons for the incarceration of United States prisoners convicted of crimes by any courts under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. One was to be north and another south of the thirty-ninth parallel of latitude and east of the Rocky Mountains, while the third was to be west of the Rocky Mountains. Not a cent, however, is appropriated for the site, etc., as authorized, although it is said that the limit of cost for the guidance of the architects in preparing the plans and estimates shall not exceed \$500,000 each. Moreover, not a cent is appropriated over for the expense of preparing these plans and specifications, preliminary to the purchase of ground and erection of buildings. A correspondent says it seems [to] be a clear case either of gross oversight or of stupidity on the part of those who had the affair in charge, and closely resembles the case of the new Philadelphia mint in that its framers doubtless thought an appropriation, at least an initiatory one, was carried in the bill, when in reality it was not."

The foregoing appears in the Salt Lake Times of Tuesday, March 17. It is about the meanest thing we have seen in that paper. It is a miserable attempt to cast blame upon the Delegate from Utah, when it is clear that he was in no way responsible for the error which it is claimed was made in the bill.

Careful reading of the article in the Times will make this manifest. Mr.