

posed to have been the work of the Italians who were lynched.

Now all this may be true. But up to the time of the lynching, and indeed, up to the present date, none of these points have been established beyond a reasonable doubt. If persons are entitled to "the benefit of a doubt" when placed on trial, they ought to have that benefit under other circumstances. And it is the danger of death to innocent persons which is one reason why an angry mob should never wield the power of execution. The death penalty ought never to be enforced except upon the most satisfactory proof of guilt and by the legally appointed executioner.

The *New York Globe*, of March 21st, has a long and thoughtful editorial on this question, from which we make the following extracts, which we think will be approved by conservative and fair-minded people everywhere:

"At any time a mob is a serious thing, even to think of. Whenever the machinery of the law has seemed to break down and the citizens of the community have felt impelled to take the administration of justice into their own hands, the uniform result has been demoralization. Human life, in ordinary times, deemed sacred, comes to be held as less than nothing; even in common cases pressure is placed upon a judge or jury, and often in the same cases, when at most the punishment would be light, a victim has been sacrificed merely because in that community there was no longer any serious regard for human life. So, too, the individual who deemed himself injured went a step further, and executed for himself that vengeance which he assumed to think the law would not give him. It is doubtful whether in a single community where men thus took the law into their own hands, public sentiment has recovered its equilibrium in a quarter of a century. A blot not only remained, but there has been the continual danger of a new outbreak of the angry passions of organizations or individuals, and a consequent laxity of public morals with a prejudging of the guilt of accused persons, and a settled distrust of the administration of the law, however honest and vigorous it may have been.

"It is claimed, however, that the condition of affairs becomes so serious that nothing but an appeal to mob violence can correct it. This is carrying the doctrine that like cures like to a most dangerous extreme. If, instead of setting themselves the task of correcting the bad tendencies that seem to make mob violence a necessity, the good citizens who engage in this business would go to work gradually to overcome these tendencies, the community so afflicted would be put on the way toward a new and permanent cure. But the mob does not, in reality, right a single wrong. Its operations are quite generally directed in a blind way. It strikes right and left, and there is no doubt that in many cases, its victims are guilty of crimes deserving legal punishment; but on the other hand it adds murder to revenge by entering and executing judgment upon innocent men. So common is this, that it would probably be safe to assert that one-half of all the victims of mob violence in this country, during the last half century, have not been guilty of the crimes with which they were charged. When the seriousness of such a result comes home to the thinking man he is not likely long

to remain an advocate of mob violence as a method of avenging even the greatest wrongs.

"It is sometimes asserted that the action of a mob is the very highest assertion of manhood; that the men who execute its decrees have in them the stuff heroes are made of, and that in this way they show that they themselves and the communities of which they are representatives have not become effete or inert. But it is not an act of heroism when a mob of hundreds or thousands of men of position and influence, armed to the teeth, go to a jail, batter down its doors, overcome by force its loyal keepers, and hang and shoot like curs accused men whose guilt has not been proven, and who are without power to defend themselves, or harm their assailants. Heroes and good citizens never try to make themselves believe that two, or any other number of wrongs, make a right. So any suggestion of heroism had better be kept back for use at some more opportune time than this last and bloody occasion in New Orleans. * * * In any event it will be the part of wisdom not to claim that the violence of a mob is an evidence of high civilization."

THE LATE ACTOR BARRATT.

THE late Lawrence Barrett was a great favorite with Salt Lake theatre-goers, either alone or in company with Mr. Booth. His stage pictures may not, as is claimed, have been inspirations, but they were wonderfully woven and elaborately depicted. It may be said of him that what he lacked in innate genius he made up and more than made up for in exactness, minuteness, perfect care and the most untiring industry.

As a Shakespearean delineator he was not so satisfactory as when presenting the masterpieces of other great minds, as for example, "Yorick," "Francesca da Rimini," "Richelieu," etc.

His career was one of the most successful, artistically and financially, on record, and yet at the zenith of his fame, when that and fortune too were fully secured, he played as earnestly, as intently and as carefully as though his foot were just pressing the lowest round of the dramatic ladder. In this respect he differed from most of his predecessors and cotemporaries.

In politics Mr. Barrett informed the writer that he was a Republican, but preferred being regarded as an altogether national man. He hoped to see the day when the Southern question would disappear from politics, and the people of the country would once more look to the other side of Mason & Dixon's line for Presidents as they did in the days long ago. It having been a supposition that he was a Free-thinker, or at least an advanced Liberal in the field of ecclesiasticism, he was questioned regarding this and denied it almost indignantly. He was not a communicant or member of any

church, but respected each for its individual worth.

Actors are generally long-lived people. Mr. Barrett, however, fell somewhat below the average of longevity of great artists, having died at the comparatively early age of fifty-three.

THE SQUABBLE OVER THE SEAL.

"THE Behring Sea Controversy" is the subject of an exhaustive article by Edward J. Phelps, ex-Minister to Great Britain, in one of the principal Eastern magazines. The article is worthy of consideration, inasmuch as it comes from an able lawyer and an experienced diplomat. He has made a careful study of the points at issue. He regards the Alaskan seal fishery as the most important in the world, and one of the chief causes which led to the purchase of Alaska by the United States.

One of Mr. Phelps' contentions is that the seal is not a fish, but an amphibious animal whose fixed habitation is on the Alaskan shore. The seal, therefore, belongs to the territory on which it is domiciled and where it reproduces itself. But the seal has migratory habits, and in these rest the chief trouble. At breeding time it crosses an arm of sea to reach the Pribyloff Islands, also Alaskan territory. The Kanucks avail themselves of this migration, and lay in wait for the seals, large numbers of which are then slaughtered.

This proceeding Mr. Phelps regards as exceedingly ungentlemanly, and synonymous with robbery. He inquires whether the United States government is not bound to protect its property and the industries of its citizens; and he asks it as if an affirmative answer was expected. He also wants to know if the barbarous destruction can be tolerated because it takes place in waters that admit of dispute as to whether they are an open sea or not. To this he expects also an affirmative reply. He leaves his readers to conclude that because seals are the produce of Alaskan soil, they should be protected in their migrations, no matter where they may roam, even if it were up the Mersey to Liverpool.

Some time ago Great Britain acquiesced in an arrangement to settle the question by arbitration. Russia was to be invited to act as a kind of moderator. The proposition was to limit the season of the year in which seals might be taken. This scheme fell through, because Canada would not consent to it. England has tried ever since to evade or to procrastinate this issue. The question now, which Mr. Phelps wants to be explained is,