

Two other ladies wore crowns at the opera last week. They were Mrs. Ogden Mills and Mrs. Dr. Seward Webb. But their crowns were mere vulgar affairs compared to the Vanderbilt diadem. However, they are warranted to be superior in texture and in fabrication to any worn by the one-horse kings of Europe.

All these crowns were brought over from Europe last summer, and entered this country free of duty. What will the tariff advocates say to this? Is Mrs. Vanderbilt's \$300,000 gewgaw to be admitted duty free, and the two-dollar woolen shirt of her coachman to be taxed 40 per cent.

The wearing of these crowns is exciting much comment. Some of the more fashionable clubs in New York are talking critically of the innovation. What would Andrew Jackson or Thomas Jefferson or Patrick Henry say to such arrogant assumptions of royal appendages on the part of American women? What do we say ourselves? Simply that such doings, if persisted in, will lead to a repetition of the horrors of the French revolution on this continent. The people may smile at present, and indulge in a joke over this mock royalty, but jokes and smiles will not be the only expression of the popular sentiment.

It is stated that Mrs. Vanderbilt was sorely annoyed when told that Queen Victoria wore her crown at the opening of Parliament, only, or on very important State occasions. Our American "Queen" has no Parliament to open, but she might assist at the dedication of a new freight house, or passenger depot, and then wear her crown.

What with this rage on the part of American women for aping royalty, for marrying European Counts and for displaying their hoarded or inherited wealth, our country is assuming an attitude that threatens to subvert old institutions, and obliterate old customs. This adoration of wealth ought to be stopped. This worship of the dollar is a curse. The query "how much is he worth," should be set aside, and the question "What is in him," be substituted. Republican institutions cannot flourish and continue by the side of mock queens, fustian lords, and purse-proud plutocrats.

#### UNWISE LEGISLATION.

THE State of Indiana is deeply agitated over the protection of what is called, home interests. This protection assumes the form of legislation tending to cripple Chicago.

Natural gas is a product that, one would think, did not come under pro-

tection laws. The State Legislature of Indiana, has, however, passed an act prohibiting the piping of natural gas by artificial pressure. Any person found using pumps for forcing gas can be severely punished. The gas was being conveyed to Chicago by natural pressure mostly, but the Hoosiers want their gas at home. They hold that they can prohibit the exportation of any natural commodity from their State.

Another bill which has just passed one branch of the Indiana Legislature relates to beef, prohibiting its sale within the State, unless inspected by Indiana officials. This law provides for a meat inspector for each city and town, and allows him three cents a pound for inspection, to be paid by the person selling the meat. Such a law as this has been passed by several States already, but the United States Supreme Court declared them unconstitutional.

Should both these bills become State laws in Indiana, Chicago intends to test their constitutionality. It is held that the State power of special legislation is entirely exceeded in these enactments.

But there may be some other motive in these laws than protection. Last year the removal of the Chicago stock yards, from their present location into Indiana was seriously considered. In fact ground was purchased beyond the State line ostensibly for the purpose. Some hitch followed, and the removal matter was dropped. Perhaps the Hoosiers consider themselves aggrieved because of the non-removal of the yards, and by silly, senseless, ludicrous legislation of the kind mentioned, hope to harass the meat kings, and compel them to settle in Indiana, whether they like it or not.

#### IDAHO POLITICAL FETTERS.

"No person shall be permitted to vote who is not registered as provided by law, or who is under guardianship, idiotic or insane; or who has at any place been convicted of treason, felony embezzlement of public funds, bartering or selling, or offering to barter or sell his vote, or purchasing or offering to purchase the vote of another or other infamous crime, and who has not been restored to the right of citizenship, or who at the time of such election is confined in prison on conviction of a criminal offence, or who, after passing the age of eighteen years and since the first day of January, 1888, has been or is a polygamist, or is living or has lived in what is known as patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or in violation of any law of Idaho or the United States, forbidding any such crime, or who in any manner teaches, or has taught, advises or has advised, counsels or has counseled, aids or has aided, encourages or has encour-

aged any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal, plural or celestial marriage, or to live in violation of any such law, or to commit any such crime, or who has been a member of or contributes or has contributed to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society which teaches, or has taught, advises or has advised, counsels or has counseled, encouraged or aided any person to enter polygamy, bigamy, or such patriarchal or plural marriage, or which teaches or has taught, advises or has advised that the laws of this State, or of the Territory of Idaho before its admission as a State into the Union, or of the United States, applicable to the Territory of Idaho, prescribing rules of civil conduct, are not the supreme law."

The foregoing is the text of the provisions in the third section of the election law which has just passed the Idaho State Legislature, relating to the "Mormon" citizens of that State. Particulars of its passage will be found in another part of this paper.

The design of the measure is plain on its face. It is to prevent any person who has been a member of the "Mormon" Church since January, 1888, from taking any part in the political affairs of the State.

The bill only awaits the signature of the Governor to make it a law. That will be appended, no doubt, without delay, and this singular sample of Idaho legislature wisdom will acquire the name and dignity of a statute. Whether it will pass into history and practice as law, remains to be seen.

There is a provision in that ancient document, fast becoming obsolete among many so-called Americans, called the Constitution of the United States, which forbids the enactment of any *ex post facto* law. There is a judicial body expressly established to determine whether laws passed by the nation or by any State of the Union is in accord with the supreme law of the land. If this measure does not come before that tribunal to be tested, and if it shall stand the test we will lose two confident guesses.

If this law is not *ex post facto*, it seems to us that there cannot be an enactment which may be properly so designated. It is not only a person who is a member of an organization or society that does certain things who is to be as an alien, but one who has been since January 1st, 1888, a member of such a church. And it is not only such present or past membership that is to destroy all political privileges, but present or past connection with, or support of an organization which has done or aided in the doing of such things; no matter what may be its present acts or status or teachings.

Our friends in Idaho have this to