

capital have signified their intention to precipitate a conflict if possible on that day. Unbusiness exists in Austria lest the army may favor rather than fire upon the populace, and in Germany the prospects that the peace of the day will be unbroken are not reassuring.

In London there is no present indication of violence, but the demonstration will assume enormous proportions. Half a million marchers will join in the parade, after which twenty orators will simultaneously address the assembled multitudes from twenty different stands. Gladstone is to be one of the speakers.

The proceedings of the day will be well calculated to make crown-wearers tremble. If the laboring world can act in concert to make the first of May a universal fete day, a similar condition of union for the accomplishment of some other object can be attained; and when the world of bone and sinew comes to the conclusion to unite and change the existing order of things in respect to any governmental or social question, from whence is the power to come that will be able to withstand it?

The outward show of strength which the wage-workers may make in the different nations may have the effect to increase the rigor with which those in power will labor to suppress the movement; but it is doubtful if such efforts will not tend to infuse the toiling masses with a firmer determination to unite and resist the wrongs they suffer under existing conditions. When the laboring millions of the civilized world unite in a common cause, and move on the same day, it is safe to calculate that gigantic developments are at hand.

AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

IOWA has a law, enacted in the interests of prohibition, which provides for the seizure and confiscation of intoxicating liquors, including such as are imported from other States, as well as those made at home. The Supreme Court of the United States declared this statute unconstitutional, so far as it operated to destroy or escheat property conveyed from one State to another. Property so transported comes under the protection of Congress by virtue of the powers conferred upon that body by the constitution to regulate inter-state commerce, and the Iowa law was a violation of the enactment of Con-

gress known as the inter-state commerce law.

We are willing to take this decision as an omen favorable to a just outcome of a very important case, pending in the same court, and involving similar questions, carried thence from Utah. It is plain that the highest tribunal in the land has not lost all its jealousy respecting enactments that look to the confiscation of property by methods that violate the Constitution; and the only question now pending is, Will that court be as watchful of the rights of an unpopular religious organization, as it has shown itself to be over those of the manufacturers of and dealers in intoxicating drinks?

THE DISFRANCHISEMENT MEASURE

THE House Committee on Territories have agreed, by a strict party vote, to report favorably the bill providing for the disfranchisement of the Latter-day Saints of Utah.

Mr. Saunders, of the Utah Commission, when he appeared before the committee, made a blundering admission. It was to the effect that the need for this additional legislation existed in the fact that the Edmunds-Tucker statute failed to produce a serious split in the People's Party. It was hoped the "Mormons" would break up politically and vote largely with the "Liberals." Instead of doing this they voted almost solidly together. In order to wipe out such a disagreeable element of opposition more effective legislation was needed. The wholesale method was the most desirable—the passage of a law that would extinguish the entire vote of the "Mormons."

That is about the substance of Mr. Saunders' plea. It is an astounding one. It is a new theory in the politics of a republic. When the vote of a party becomes troublesome to the opposition disfranchise its members. The gentleman told the truth as to the reason for the proposed law, but in bluntly announcing it he manifested an absence of adroitness that was somewhat troublesome to his own kind.

In its report on the measure it appears that the committee, recommending its passage, urges as a reason that "No religious right is invaded by the bill."

In the light of the proceedings of the committee nothing could be more shamefully false or exhibit more effrontery than such a gauzy claim. This can readily be shown

by the treatment accorded an amendment on this point offered by Mr. Springer. It was as follows:

"Provided, that no person shall be deprived of the right to vote, hold office or sit on a jury on account of his religious belief or opinions."

This was rejected on a strict party vote. Mr. Springer's amendment was a negative proposition; consequently the action of the majority of the committee was the affirmative of it and meant this:

"Provided, that a person shall be deprived of the right to vote, hold office or sit on a jury on account of his religious belief or opinions."

Actions are more forcible than words, therefore the language of the report made by the committee disclaiming an invasion of religious right is so much flatulency, when placed alongside of the fact of the crushing of the protective proffered amendment and the assault on the right of religion in the measure itself.

"No constitutional objection can be urged to its passage," is another proposition of the committee. That is a most unphilosophical way of getting rid of an important political problem. Perhaps the assertion may, however, be considered correct according to the recently announced status of the constitution as defined by a distinguished senator—the will of the majority. Take the instrument as it stands, however, and no measure that could ever be offered could be more properly or powerfully objected to on constitutional grounds. The inhibition against the application of religious tests to decide qualifications for voting or holding office is strong enough and sufficiently weighty to grind the bill to atoms if it were directed against it. But it is getting common now to regard the Constitution as a relic of antiquity that ought to be discarded or placed in a museum as a pointer backward to old times when men had not sufficient sense to frame an organic act that would, when acted upon, preserve for all time the freedom and rights of the people against the onslaughts of tyrants.

If these invasions of the fundamental law of the country continue the nation will soon be in the position of the consumptive patient who, when asked the question, "How is your constitution?" replied, "Its gone, but I'm getting along the best I can on the by-laws."

A discontented man is like a snake who would swallow an elephant.