

One of the writers hails from Limerick, so says Mr. Finerty. It is true. But stop a moment. Remember the tremendous import of that word Limerick when mentioned in connection with Utah. Let the Congress of the United States remember it, and let the editors of American newspapers remember it. In the word there is a fearful import.

On the 3rd of October, 1691, was signed the treaty of Limerick. By this William of Orange became king of Ireland, and the following of James was forever destroyed. It is just a round two centuries since that fearful day. There was a Patrick concerned in that affair. He was the gallant Sarsfield. Macaulay was not very complimentary to the Irish adherents of the Stuarts, yet he has a compliment and a panegyric for Patrick Sarsfield, the hero of Limerick, the soul of honor, the heart of chivalry and the bosom of patriotism. Oh, brave Sarsfield! What a heart and soul were thine!

By the provisions of this treaty the Irish soldiers and their families were to be transported in safety to France. And the clause relating to the people read: "The Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland; or as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles the Second. \* \* \* And their majesties as soon as their affairs will permit them to summon a parliament in this kingdom will endeavour to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security in that particular as may preserve them from any disturbance upon the account of their said religion. \* \* \* The oath to be administered to such Roman Catholics as submit to their majesties' government shall be the oath above mentioned, the oath of allegiance, and no other." These were some of the provisions of that much talked of treaty. The Irish leaders did not stipulate for a great deal, but they hoped for much from William. Had they held out a little longer the history not alone of Ireland but of Europe might be different. Two days after the signing of the treaty, 18 ships of war, 6 fire ships, and 20 great ships of burden, and brought on board 8 or 10,000 arms, 200 officers and 3,000 men" arrived in Dingle bay from France. Besides, the Irish could have held out much longer. Macaulay says they could have held out the winter, and with help from France could kindle anew the war in Ireland from Kerry to Donegal. Certainly, William had his hands full on the continent of Europe. He had a proclamation ready, offering terms to the Irish, when news of the intended capitulation of Limerick reached him, so that there was every reason why the treaty of Limerick should have been held sacred by England. As to James the Second, the British Islands, Ireland included, were fortunate in getting rid of him. But the baseness, brutality and cowardice of James does not justify the treachery and unfaithfulness of

William. The treaty was broken even before the ink was dry.

The Irish soldiers and their families were to be transported to France in safety. Cork was the point of embarkation. The roads leading to it were thronged with women and children, even suckling babes, who tramped the weary journey to leave their country and follow husbands and fathers. When the vast multitude arrived at the sea side it was found that transportation for the whole could not be had, and most of the women and children remained behind. This is how Macaulay describes the scene:

"After the soldiers had embarked, room was found for the families of many. But still there remained on the water side a great multitude, clamoring piteously to be taken on board. As the last boat put off there was a rush into the surf. Some women caught hold of the ropes, were dragged out of their depth, clung till their fingers were cut through, and perished in the waves. The ships began to move. A wild and terrible wail rose from the shore, and excited unwonted compassion in hearts steeled by hatred of the Irish race and of the Romish faith. Even the stern Cromwellian, now at length, after a desperate struggle of three years, left the undisputed lord of the blood-stained and devastated island, could not hear unmoved that bitter cry, in which was poured forth all the rage and all the sorrow of a conquered nation."

Even Cromwellian soldiers were moved. Just fancy cutting the fingers off the women to detach them from the boats. Good Limerick editor, when you read this, remember that women and children were similarly treated in the State of Illinois some fifty years ago; that they perished of cold, hunger and fatigue on the weary journey from Nauvoo to Council Bluffs—remember this and govern your pen accordingly. And you, business manager from Waterford, read the treaty of Limerick and the penal code which followed it.

Macaulay and others tried to prove that Sarsfield was responsible for the treatment of the women and infants at the Cove of Cork. This can be disproved by a glance at the life of King William, by Harris, and by Curry's Review of the Civil Wars. John Mitchell in his History of Ireland says:

"Now, by referring back to the military articles of the treaty, we see that it was not Sarsfield, but Ginkell, on the part of King William, who was to furnish shipping for the emigrants and their families; that it was not Sarsfield but Ginkell that was to form an estimate of the amount of shipping required; and that it was not Sarsfield but Ginkell who could alter the arrangements at the last moment."

Of course, Sarsfield guaranteed to his people ample accommodation, because General Ginkell on the part of the king so stipulated in the treaty. Macaulay and other English historians endeavor to take the odium of the business off their country, so much are they ashamed of what was done. But to attempt placing the blame on Sarsfield is about as sensible as trying to blame Brigham Young for the persons who perished on the plains while jour-

neying to Utah. And I remember reading one book which actually treated the matter in that way.

The treaty was violated, and the terrible penal code of Ireland (which Dr. Johnson said was worse than the ten pagan persecutions of Christians) was enacted to prevent Romanism in Ireland. Did they do it? Think this matter over, Members of Congress, and perhaps Patrick Lannan was not an accident in connection with Utah. At another time we will glance at the penal code itself, and see how the transubstantiation of Ireland's penal code compares with the polygamy of Utah. The Irish carpetbaggers made England believe that Irish transubstantiation was cannibalism, just as Utah carpetbaggers now exaggerate and perjure themselves about polygamy. JUNIUS.

#### COMMENTS OF NOBLE AND MILLER ON THE MANIFESTO.

The following is a dispatch from Washington, October 6. — The Washington correspondent of the New York Herald sent the following interviews with the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General tonight:

"This is, indeed, important news," said General Noble, when I informed him of the action of the General Mormon Conference. "I am glad to hear of this and hope the action is taken in all sincerity. Mr. Caine called upon me last Saturday and left a statement in which he protested against the recent report of the Utah Commission and the report of the Territorial governor. He assured me that polygamy was no longer practised in the Territory of Utah. I told him that in the face of the statement of my officers, I could not accept his mere denial of the facts as evidence in rebuttal. I must have proof. I told him the reports I had received declared that forty cases of polygamy had come to the knowledge of the federal officials and I suggested that he investigate each case and disprove it if possible. He said he did not suppose he would be able to discover the identity of the accused. I told him I would aid him to get the names by instructing the authorities to give him the needed information, and he assured me he would investigate the truth of the papers and would report on them. I further informed Mr. Caine that the simple declaration of President Woodruff that the Mormon Church no longer countenanced polygamy was not sufficient to convince the government that the practice had been given up, for the head of the Church had no authority to change its tenets, that action should be taken by the supreme council on this subject. It is rather singular that it should have been taken so soon after our conversation. However, it is by proofs of repentance that their sincerity will be measured; it is so easy to pass resolutions. Man is always resolving and yet failing to keep his resolutions. If the action of the Mormon conference brings forth the