

Pontiff should declare himself he would be found pointedly against all forms of social heresy.

On the other hand, his sympathetic interest in the labor question in Ireland and other places has encouraged the belief that he would recognize the impending social revolution and place himself and the church thoroughly *en rapport* with it. One of the most prominent and influential Catholics in England has made it his business to impress upon the church by pen and mouth the importance of the changes that are taking place. He pointed out that a cataclysm no less gigantic than that which swept away the feudalism of the middle ages, was gathering itself for the present day of the world—not, indeed, with the purpose of merging petty principalities into powerful empires, but with the view to weakening the arm of monarchical power and strengthening that of the masses; and he urged with fervid zeal that the church had now an opportunity to win back the temporal power of which it has been within a few decades so ruthlessly shorn.

In the face of such a hopeful appeal on one side, and of the more tangible benefits that are promised from a friendly course toward the powers that be, on the other side, it is not difficult to see why the Pope should have come to select the intermediary course. Apart from the good diplomacy which such a choice indicates, it is not certain that Leo XIII. has not also chosen with the utmost good sense. Between the partisans of either side of the conflict there must be a happy line along which the intelligence and culture of the world can range itself. But whether that will be the line on which a final settlement shall be reached is more than doubtful: revolutions are apt to run to extremes. Meanwhile, the conflict is on; and if Pope Leo's encyclical has withheld from either side the sympathy which both expected, the conservative observer will also have to admit that it has done little to soothe the hostile elements or postpone the inevitable struggle.

AN INTERESTING INDIAN TRIAL.

ON Monday next the young Sioux chief Plenty Horses will again be placed on trial at Sioux Falls for the killing of Lieutenant Casey during the recent Indian war in Dakota. The accused is the son of Living Bear, who is a cousin of Chief Two Strikes, one of the warlike Brules who led a band of hostiles; and he was on scouting duty when he shot Casey, who was near the Indian camp on a spying expedition.

This was on January 7th. The story of the affair, briefly told, is that Casey left General Brooke's camp with two Cheyenne scouts to take a look at the hostile Indians who were encamped some miles away. The old chief Red Cloud managed to hear of the impetuous young officer's intention and sent a warning to him to turn back. He persisted, however, in his determination to view the hostile tepees; and though he finally consented to listen to Red Cloud's advice, his discretion was too tardy to be of avail to him. He was just turning his horse to start back when the fatal bullet crashed into the back of his head. Soon after peace was declared, Plenty Horses was arrested and confined in Fort Meade, near Deadwood, and from there taken to Sioux Falls, S. D., where he was tried on the charge of murder.

The new trial of the defendant is made necessary by the disagreement of the jury at the former hearing. It will be remembered that his attorneys advanced the unique and startling plea that the Indian, being actually at war with the United States, could not be charged with the crime of murder as defined in the statutes, because he had simply done what everybody else does when he goes to war—tried to kill as many of the enemy as he could. They claimed that the treaties with the Sioux did not take away their right to declare war, a right which the United States recognized by sending a force of soldiers into their reservations. This point, although overruled by the court, doubtless had some weight with the jury. Altogether the case is interesting, not only because of the feature we have named, but because the accused, notwithstanding his red skin, is accorded the right of a trial by jury at all. This of itself is a welcome innovation, and marks a long step forward in the government's treatment of its aboriginal wards.

THE DENVER CONGRESS.

WHAT is now known as the Trans-Mississippi Congress held at Denver, which opened on the 19th inst., adjourned at midnight on the 22nd, to meet again at Omaha next October. It was purely advisory in its purpose, and was composed of representatives from the States and Territories lying between the Mississippi river and the Pacific ocean. Its particular object was to devise ways and means for the promotion of the welfare and prosperity of the Western portion of the United States. It is gratifying therefore to note that in its deliberations there was

except in one small instance, complete absence of sectional or party strife. In this respect it transcends in dignity and in good sense the Kansas City affair by a head and shoulders.

The resolutions adopted are such, however, that the country at large will not accept them without hearing further discussion. The demand of \$10,000,000 from Congress for improving the Mississippi river is not an exorbitant nor an unreasonable one. This river is an inter-state highway, and in a sense would be an adjunct to foreign commerce if maintained in a proper condition. The government supervision of railroads is demanded. Subsidies for steamships are recommended. Congress is asked to pass the Torrey bankruptcy law. It is recommended that all the arid lands, except mineral, be ceded to the States. Government patronage for mining interests is asked for. The regulation of immigration is demanded, also the completion of the jetties at Galveston. After a good deal of discussion a report favoring the free and unlimited coinage of silver was adopted; and even the advocates of a lottery system were given an opportunity to show their strength.

The admission of New Mexico and Arizona into the Union was favored in the committee on resolutions, while the same justice to Utah was opposed, chiefly by a Utah delegate. This is rather an anomalous part of the proceedings, and constitutes the one exception above referred to. The congress was assembled to devise ways and means for furthering the prosperity of the West. Yet here is a measure by which that prosperity could be accelerated, and it is opposed by the very men whose duty and whose pleasure it should have been to advocate it. Under existing conditions Territorial government within the domain of the United States is a political excrescence. In the case of Utah it is a living contradiction to our national system. We are aware that the individual who led the opposition to our admission has a monomania on the subject and with him the disease is incurable. Perhaps there is in his action some purpose; his perpetual threshing of old straw, his insane ravings about religion and Americanism clearly indicate a hidden motive, and it is not very creditable one.

It is some satisfaction to know that notwithstanding the *Tribune* editor's opposition in committee, the resolution on Territorial admission as adopted by the congress contained no clause of exclusion against Utah. She was left as favorably recommended as the rest.