

people may therefore take the law in their own hands, is shallow and dangerous and unworthy of civilized and enlightened Americans. The people have delegated their powers and expressed their will. In the Constitution of our country they have stated how that power should be exercised, and they are bound by their own act in the framing and acceptance of that instrument.

It is declared therein that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; that no person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws; that no person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; that every accused person shall be confronted with the witnesses against him and be tried by an impartial jury and have the assistance of counsel for his defense. Every one of these provisions was violated by the self-appointed judges who condemned Italians, and were at once the accusers, the judges and the executioners of the undefended and defenseless men.

Even if all that has been alleged against them were true—we do not know anything about that except that the matter is legally in doubt—then the lynching was lawless and in defiance of the provisions of the Constitutions of the State of Louisiana and of the United States, and the power of the people even in a republic must be exercised under the law or it is barbarism and subversive of every recognized principle of civilized government.

But for all that, war would not make the wrong done any better, or afford any satisfaction to reasonable beings or nations. The recall of the Italian minister is an error, which we hope will be soon repaired. It is a step in the direction of hostilities. The presence of the Charge d'Affaires, left to attend to current business, has no significance in the direction of continued diplomatic relations; it is necessary that he should remain for the present. The recall is a rupture between the two governments. But it is possible that this may be cured without any further measures in the way of a conflict. Mutual explanations will probably result in the restoration of amity, and fraternal relations between the two countries will be resumed.

But if this proves to be impossible, although the navy of the United States is almost demoralized and the army is not by any means on a war footing, the patriotism of the people is such that arms and men and money would be forthcoming in such weight and in such a manner that any nation or alli-

ance of nations might well pause before provoking the storm that would ensue and which would shake terribly the earth and fill the world with misery and mourning.

A "LIBERAL" METHOD OF GIVING RELIEF.

AFTER showing, in his annual report, that the present city government had disbursed nearly one million dollars of the people's money during 1890, Mayor Scott assured the public that in future expenditures would continue to be increased. In the face of the fact that both the "Liberal" journals of this city have asserted that comparatively nothing has been done with all this means, the Mayor and Council adhere faithfully to the promised policy of increasing the popular burdens and swelling the expenditures.

Last summer there was a good deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the imported street sprinkling service. The grounds of protest were that the sprinkling district was too large, the price (8 cents a foot frontage) too high, and the service inadequate. Numbers of people asserted that they received their notices directing payment of assessment, while the sprinkler, up to that time, had been conspicuous by its absence.

March 31st the Council, after its usual fashion, covered these points of complaint "Liberally." (1) They increased the sprinkling district to thirty miles of street. (2) They added two cents for sprinkling a frontage foot, making the rate ten cents in place of eight cents.

Another point connected with this imported sprinkling is that storekeepers whose buildings are erected in close proximity to each other in the central part of the city, are charged the same as the suburban residence property holders, for whose benefit much of the sprinkling will be done along portions of streets where there are no buildings.

Taxation, to be just, should, so far as practicable, be in proportion to the benefits derived. The positions of the beneficiaries in this regard are widely divergent. Those who have stocks of goods to protect from the dust, and whose frontage is limited to a few feet, receive a benefit much greater than the residence proprietors in the outlying portions of town, yet the latter must pay a much larger amount than the former.

March 31st one of the Councilmen remarked, deprecatingly, that an even frontage foot tax all round would compel the residence holder on Sixth East Street to pay as much as the store-

keeper on Main Street. While the rate is the same, the property holder distant from the centre pays, as a rule, a great deal more in the aggregate. Besides, many of the outlying property holders protest that the imported sprinkling on the distant streets does little or no good, the traffic being limited. The present city government is, however, much like the hotel keeper who insisted that his guests should take soup as well as the other viands provided, because of it being a rule of the house.

DISINGENUOUS RESOLUTIONS.

If the lovers of whited sepulchre sham wish to enjoy frequent feasts in harmony with their tastes, gratification is within their reach. They have but to read the accounts of the proceedings of the sessions of the City Council. If the haters of hypocrisy wish to be nauseated they will do well to avoid the perusal of those narratives of official hotch-potch. No citizen should, however, fail to notice the saccharine resolution adopted unanimously March 31st, in connection with the acceptance of the resignation of City Attorney S. A. Merritt.

This "stale, flat and unprofitable" falleged expression of appreciation of the "able and impartial" services performed by the resigning attorney, combined with the crocodile tears shed over his retirement, should be compared with the treatment accorded his legal advice. In a number of conspicuous instances his "able and impartial" services have been treated with undisguised contempt. The reason for this has been apparent—the Council had no use, in certain matters, for "able and impartial" services. What they wanted were legal services that were unscrupulous and partisan.

As an instance, it is not necessary to go beyond the response of the retiring attorney to the request of the Council, for advice as to their legal right to sell the public grounds known as Pioneer Square to a private corporation. Col. Merritt's opinion was really an able elucidation of the law and the popular right involved in the question. It was against the right of the Council to sell, however, consequently the "able and impartial" opinion was treated contemptuously. Yet, according to the resolution of last night that advice must have been the product of sound legal capacity and conscientious regard for the rights of the people, whom the Council are erroneously presumed to represent.

The resolution of last night—speaking of its adoption as a whole—was as bogus as some of the councilmen—those who were never elected to office