

EDITORIALS.

THE O'CONNELL CENTENARY.

ONE hundred years to-day, August 8th, in the County of Kerry, Ireland, was born a remarkable personage, namely, Daniel O'Connell, afterwards famous as lawyer, orator and political agitator.

Of a staunch Catholic family he was sent, when about sixteen years of age, to be educated at the Jesuit's college, at St. Omer, France; he also spent some time at the English college at Douay; his stay in France was short, as he left at the commencement of the Reign of Terror. When eighteen years of age he commenced the study of law, at Lincoln's Inn, London, was called to the bar four years later, and soon distinguished himself in his profession.

But brilliant as his career as a lawyer promised to be, he was not destined to gain fame and fortune in that profession. He was a genuine Irishman, an ardent hater of English rule, and a natural politician and political agitator; and the condition of Ireland in those days favored the development of his peculiar qualities and talents, and helped to make him the leader of the anti-English party in Ireland.

In January, 1800, he made his debut on the political arena, at a meeting called to petition against the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland, and soon after he became the acknowledged leader of the political reform party in Erin.

O'Connell was a most zealous Catholic, and a question then, and for years after, strongly agitated by Irishmen, was Catholic emancipation—the placing of the Irish Catholics upon an equality, politically, with the English Protestants. The agitation on this subject continued for between twenty and thirty years, O'Connell, during the whole of that time, being the head and front of the movement. Finally, it became so formidable that in Feb., 1829, it alarmed the government, which yielded to popular clamor, and the last of the obnoxious disabilities to which the Catholics under British rule had been subjected was removed, and Catholic emancipation was accomplished.

In 1828 O'Connell was returned a member of Parliament by the County of Clare, but refusing to take the test oaths prescribed by the government in order to exclude Catholics from the House of Commons, he did not gain his seat until May, 1829. The following year he declined to represent Clare, and was returned by his native county, Kerry; and subsequently he represented Dublin, Kilkenny and Cork, and was finally elected Lord Mayor of Dublin.

The agitation which had convulsed Ireland on the subject of Catholic emancipation having subsided on the passage of the act securing that measure of justice to the Irish people, O'Connell proclaimed among his followers the dogma that full justice to Ireland could never be obtained without a repeal of the act of political union between England and Ireland, and forthwith agitation on this subject was commenced under his leadership, and immense gatherings of the people were held in various localities most famous in Irish history, at which O'Connell appeared, delivering violent and exciting harangues, his audiences sometimes numbering as many as half a million people. His connection with this movement gained him the title of "Liberator." A meeting of the repealers was called in October, 1843, to be held at Clontarf, near Dublin, the preparations for which were of such a character as to excite the apprehensions of the authorities, and a proclamation was issued forbidding the assembly. In consequence of this, O'Connell countermanded the order for the meeting, for though an agitator of the most decided type, he was opposed to force, a favorite saying of his being, that he would accept of no social amelioration at the cost of a single drop of blood.

A few days after O'Connell and several of his followers were arrested on a charge of conspiracy, sedition, etc., and they were tried and convicted, O'Connell being sen-

tenced to twelve months imprisonment and fined two thousand pounds. The sentence was set aside on appeal, but the organization called the Repeal Association did not flourish after, although meetings continued to be held occasionally. Dissension, however, broke out among the followers of O'Connell, many of whom were dissatisfied with his peace policy, they being in favor of insurrection and violence. This and the discovery that, although preaching against the oppressions and exactions practised upon the poor of Ireland by the wealthy, he was a middleman—a most hated class among the Irish people—leasing land from landlords and letting it to peasantry, upon whom he practised oppressions similar to those against which he declaimed in others, helped to break down his influence; and the rage and mortification attending the exposure still further enfeebled his health, already broken down by long and arduous public services, and he started on a pilgrimage to Rome, but died, before reaching there, at Genoa, May 15, 1847.

Few men in modern times have had such force to sway multitudes by the power of oratory as that possessed by O'Connell, and few political agitators have had greater influence over their countrymen than he; and though a zealous Catholic, and an Irishman to the core in his antipathy to British domination, he was an indefatigable laborer in the cause of civil and religious liberty for all; and for this cause centennial celebrations are being held in honor of the "Liberator," to-day in various places in the United States, Canada and in Great Britain and Ireland.

MORE "MORMON" PHOBIC RAVINGS.

THE editor of the Gold Hill News, speaking of Utah affairs, asserts that it is no advocate of lynch law, but believes there are cases when such proceedings are justifiable, and says he, in a certain contingency, "we would be the first to go out and hang ourselves." It might be a good thing for the community if that editor were to go right out and fulfil that determination without waiting for any other contingency. He might thus leave his country for his country's good.

The Virginia Enterprise, as usual, is blindly prejudiced and intensely bitter in the expression of its prejudices. It talks foolishly of "Mormon vengeance, avarice, and lust," of "avenging pen" and "avenging wrath of public opinion," against which "it will be vain for Mormon press, prophet, and priest to interpose their puny, withered, and withering arms." It also makes the silly assertion that "for thirty years and more Mormon combination, intrigue, trap and purse have amazed the world in baffling the government of the United States from ferretting out its criminals and in thwarting congressional legislation against the crimes of the Mormon church."

The Enterprise further says, "If we were to offer a single word of advice to the Mormon papers it would be silence." Very good advice, which we individually take as seems good to us, speaking when we choose, and holding our tongue when we have nothing to say. But here is quite a gem of its kind from our Virginia contemporary, which is as unique as the one we have presented above from its neighbor, the Gold Hill News—

"If we were to offer advice to the Mormon priesthood, it would be to send their messengers to that portion of the jury composed of Mormons, and tell them to find John D. Lee guilty of the crimes of which, peradventure, he is guilty."

Wonderful advice indeed. The next time the Enterprise advises anybody, we would advise it to mix up a little good sense with its advice, and then the advice will not be utterly ridiculous. Here is a newspaper of ability recommending "the Mormon priesthood" to interfere, to interfere unwarrantably, with the due course of law and justice, to do an illegal thing, to tamper with a jury under oath to bring in a verdict according to

evidence and law, to tell that jury to find a certain prisoner "guilty of the crimes of which peradventure he is guilty." Was ever such cracked-brain advice given before? Peradventure implies doubt, uncertainty, and means perhaps, peradventure, may be.

It may be the custom in Nevada, and it may be a favorite and frequent custom with the Enterprise, to interview juries and exhort them to find persons guilty of crime of which they merely may be guilty, but it won't do in Utah, and the "Mormon priesthood," we confidently believe, have better sense, and a more perfect regard for law and justice than to indulge in any such folly, or commit any such crime.

The Fenton (Mich.) Gazette evidently imagines that a Mormon has no right to live, judging by the following—

"To day is reported as the 28th anniversary of the advent of the Mormons into Salt Lake, and is a holiday among the Saints throughout the Territory. It is just 28 years longer than they should have been allowed to remain."

TAKE CARE OF THE CHILDREN.

Now is the time to take care of the children. The present Summer has been comparatively healthy, but this has been the hottest week of the season, and the excessive height of temperature is exceedingly enervating. It tells upon the little children, and its debilitating effects can be seen in their frequent languidness, peevishness, and fretfulness, and felt in the inelastic, moist, flabby, clammy condition of the flesh on their little limbs and bodies, revealing great relaxation of the system, and consequently a predisposition to attacks of disease, or at best a greatly reduced power of resistance to the same.

Parents and others who have the care of children, particularly the lesser ones, should be especially careful that they be protected from exposure to the extreme heat of the day; that they be not needlessly irritated, but rather calmed, soothed, comforted, and kept as cheerful as possible; that they be lightly and properly clad; that, as the heat decreases and the mornings and evenings get cooler, they be kept out of drafts of air, and otherwise prevented from taking cold; if possible, whereby a sharp and sudden and dangerous check is given to the opened pores and relaxed system; that extra cleanliness be particularly observed with them; and that their food be plain and simple, fresh and good, with little if any meat, and no unripe or decaying fruit, decaying vegetables, or decaying food of any kind. In short, keep the little things clean, cool and comfortable.

With these precautions and others of a cognate nature, which are likely to suggest themselves, the mortality among the smaller children, those which are peculiarly liable to sickness at this season, may be kept down to a comparatively low figure.

THE LEE TRIAL.

ON Saturday afternoon, Aug. 7, according to our dispatches from Beaver, the jury in the trial of John D. Lee for murder at Mountain Meadow in 1857, told the court they could not agree on a verdict, and Judge Boreman discharged them, thus ending the present trial of Lee.

The jury are reported to have stood nine for acquittal and three for conviction, precisely as the jury stood in the late Brooklyn scandal case. The Lee jury were also reported to be composed of eight "Mormons" and four "Gentiles."

The prosecution appear to have taken pains to let it be known some time before the trial ended, that they had no expectation or hope of securing a verdict of guilty, and one of the counsel for the prosecution is reported to have had the very bad taste to say as much to the jury, and to charge the failure

to the religion of a portion of the jurors, as if it was impossible for them to disagree upon the value of the evidence. We may say this was inexcusable insolence, besides being unwarranted by the facts as reported. If there were nine of the jury for acquittal, then there must have been at least one "Gentile" juror for acquittal. There may have been more. For aught we know, all four of the "Gentile" jurors were in favor of acquittal. Where then is the propriety or the fairness of charging upon the "Mormon" jurors the sole responsibility of the failure to convict, and of virtually charging it even previous to the time when the jury were discharged, or had retired to consider the evidence. Besides, the jurors are the sole judges of the value of the evidence, and what right has any of the counsel, or any other man, to tell the jurors that if they fail to bring in a verdict of a certain kind it will be because of the particular religion of some of the jurors? The jurors were accepted by the court as competent to try the case, and they were sworn to try it on its merits, according to law and evidence. For counsel to tell jurors to their face that he thinks they will not return a just verdict is insolence of the most barefaced and audacious kind.

Although the present trial of Lee is ended, the defendant was not acquitted, the indictment remains, and he is subject to a new trial on the same charge, whenever counsel and court may determine upon instituting the same.

The offence with which Lee stands charged was committed nearly eighteen years ago. The Territory at that time was in a state of civil war, the Federal Government, upon the strength of vile misrepresentation, having sent hitherward a large army, supporting a few set of federal officials, to subdue the people of the Territory as a foreign people are subdued, and about the time of the commission of the offence martial law was actually declared. During the subsequent winter the people had enough to do to take care of themselves and prepare to defend themselves and their families and property from hostile aggression.

In the Spring of the following year commissioners treated with the Governor and people of the Territory, explained and softened matters, and entered into an agreement for the peaceable entry of the federal officers and army, which accordingly and in a brief time took place.

After the installation of the new officers, the ex-governor urged upon the new governor, A. Cumming, the propriety of instituting an investigation of the affair at Mountain Meadow, with connection with which Lee stands charged, and offered to use his influence for an impartial investigation. Judge Cradlebaugh, with a number of troops did go down into or toward that part of the Territory, ostensibly with a view of investigating the matter, but no trial took place, nor has any been had in connection with that affair until this present summer.

A question that suggests itself very forcibly is, Why did not the government officials fully investigate the matter and bring to trial those who were guiltily concerned in it? It is a poor excuse to say they could not. They had almost plenary power in their hands, and were backed by a posse of some 4,000 regular troops, excellently officered, and splendidly equipped. The local tribunals were practically stifled. The people desired that a full inquiry be made into the circumstances, and that the guilty parties be brought to justice. Yet virtually nothing was done from then till last year, when indictments were found against certain persons the first of whom has just been tried. This negligence on the part of the federal officers seems inexcusable. Why was the Mountain Meadow tragedy allowed to slumber until 1874, before any indictments were found against any of its participants, and till 1875 before the first of them was tried? Surely there is some great reason for the delay, or great negligence in the U. S. officers whose duty it was to investigate the affair. The only reason that appears is that, so far as any investigation was had, nothing could be found criminating certain persons, and that the officials, if they could not criminate those particular persons, did not care about criminating anybody.

MORE "MORMON" PHOBIC SAVAGERY.

To the Territorial Enterprise of Virginia, Nevada, may perhaps be awarded the palm due to the savagery of newspapers upon the "Mormon" topic, that journal being thoroughly insane just now when anything pertaining to "Mormonism" is broached. The Enterprise professes to think that nothing is more evident than that the "Mormons," at the word of "their prophet and leader, would begin a war of extermination against all Gentiles." Thus assuming that this war of extermination is likely to be the grand business with and towards the "Mormons," the Enterprise sagely concludes that the Federal Government should be first in the field and be up and at it, and that "it is not worth discussing further than is necessary to make clear to our people and our government their duty."

Here are some of the things proposed by the savage and sanguinary Enterprise—

"One thing is made more apparent by this trial than it has ever been before, and that is that all the rights of citizenship should be taken from Mormons. They are not fit to either help make or execute laws. They cannot, without committing perjury, ever take the oath to defend the Constitution of the United States."

"We would not oppress these people, but would put it out of their power to commit further infamies. We would have the government make it a penal offence for a man to have more than one wife. This is not oppressive."

"We would take from them the right to vote or hold office. * * * This is not oppression."

"We would, * * * as far as possible, prohibit the landing on our shores of converts to Mormonism. We would give to the Gentiles of Utah the control of affairs, and station soldiers enough there to insure the execution of the laws. Heretofore we have treated Mormonism as a humor, which mild remedies would eventually cure; now we would prescribe for it as an ulcer, which nothing but a heroic practice could ever eradicate."

All this is highly edifying, meekly Christian, eminently republican. Allow no more "Mormons" to land in America. To those who are here deny all rights and privileges of citizenship. Give the governmental power over them altogether into the hands of their most bitter, malignant, rabid and unscrupulous enemies, and station an army in Utah to enforce the execution of all laws which those enemies would make. "This is not oppression"—it would only be putting it out of the power of the "Mormons" to commit any infamies by putting into the hands of their enemies absolute power to commit all such things upon the "Mormons," and protecting those enemies in this heroic, truly Christian, and truly republican work at the point of the bayonet. Yet, forsooth, there is no oppression in this. Such is the tiger-like logic of the Enterprise. As to the ulcer business and the cutting out of the same, the Little Giant, in his last campaign, tried to make capital on that point, but he made a slight mistake, and it killed him politically.

ENGLISH WAY OF ADMINISTERING JUSTICE.—The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 3, says—

"Colonel Baker, the dear friend of the Prince of Wales, who was, not long since, arrested for committing an indecent assault upon a young lady in an English railway car, was yesterday tried for the offense and sentenced to a year's imprisonment, and to pay a fine of \$2,500. All his wealth, influence and friends availed him nothing in his effort to avert the course of justice. We must say that we like the way these English people have of administering justice, especially when the accused happens to be a person of rank or high standing. Nor do we believe the Queen will interfere in behalf of Baker. Some years ago a person of similar rank and position was convicted of felony, and sought pardon on the ground of previous high standing. His petition was returned with the simple indorsement: 'The greater the criminal, the greater the crime'—or words to that effect."