

this necessary? Why not punish for polygamy the individuals who commit it, as we do those who commit murder, without disfranchising those who belong to the murderer's church or confiscating its property?" And who can answer it consistently with the policy which works denial of their civil rights to men as a penalty for their religious belief?"

There is a good deal more in this decision than now appears. When the judicial branch of the government joins in measures of expediency that are encroachments upon the guarantees which should be equal to all religions, associations and individuals, and does this for the purpose of suppressing an unpopular ecclesiastical body, patriots devoted to the national welfare, who can see the probable effects of such expedients upon other organizations and individuals, may well be moved to serious alarm. It is the "Mormon" Church which is to be despoiled today. What Church will be the object of popular wrath and governmental pillage tomorrow?

#### IT KILLS POLICE REGULATIONS.

THE following, from the New York Press, a Republican journal, on the Iowa liquor case, is significant:

"On close scrutiny there seems to be a large load of dynamite in that recent decision in the United States Supreme Court touching the original packages in which liquor can be carried through State lines. The gist of the decision was that no State can intercept the packages in transit over its territory because the interstate railroad law, which Congress has created, fully permits the transportation of commodities between States, and, further, because liquor packages are not exempted in the operations of that law. Of course, as in the case of Iowa, this knocks prohibition a deadly blow on the head. It completely kills the police regulations against this traffic which may be on the books of any State or Territory of the Union. But this is not the worst of it. Senator Wilson, of Iowa, a most able lawyer, by the way, and a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, discovers a new and alarming danger in the decision. He contends that it practically robs the States of all the police power and control over the liquor traffic. It removes even the scant barriers of a license. He claims that under the decision a person in New York City who wants to avoid the payment of license can get his liquor from New Jersey in the packages desired and then sell them here with perfect freedom as a privileged commodity under the federal interstate law, which supersedes any and all laws of the State on that subject. 'True,' he says, 'there can be but one sale in the original package, but that may practically answer all the purposes of a saloon.' Here is 'a pretty do.' The Court, standing as the interpreter and bulwark of Federal law, cannot permit a State to impose restrictions on a traffic which is not excluded from interstate commerce. If it does it nullifies an act of Congress."

The New York Herald said the following on the same subject:

"See where this decision leaves New York. A liquor dealer of this city has only to send a truck to Jersey City for a supply of whisky in flasks, or to Hoboken for a load of beer in bottles. He is free to sell this in the metropolis without an excise license and without the payment of any tax. The State has no power to stop him, nor the excise commissioners any authority to interfere with him. It may be that the State may prevent a regular saloon traffic in such a case by prohibiting the drinking of such liquors on the premises where sold. But even that would require legislation at Albany. This is an amazing turn of affairs, not only for New York, but every State in the Union. It enables liquor dealers to evade and defy local prohibition, tax, or license laws. It paralyzes the power of the State to deal with the liquor traffic. The only remedy is Congressional action. The Supreme Court concedes that Congress may come to the relief of States. A bill for that purpose has already been introduced in the House by Mr. Boutelle, of Maine. Unless Congress acts, any commonwealth may be left at the mercy of the liquor traffic."

The New York Observer thus echoes the same refrain:

"If the principle of the decision is maintained, then any State may be flooded with liquor from another State, and no State law of any kind can prevent its sale and distribution. This decision, as announced, is so revolutionary in its operation that it is difficult to realize that it is reasonable or just. It is fatal to the idea of any relief from any evil by the use of local option. If the Supreme Court has found that this is the law, then, as in other cases where the Court has made decisions repugnant to the moral sense of the nation, there is no remedy except in some modification of the general law. At the present moment the liquor question in Great Britain is being agitated in Parliament. Perhaps this decision of the Supreme Court will force the matter to the front as a National question. It cannot be that an intelligent, educated Christian nation is powerless to curb and fetter the most dangerous beast that fattens in its pastures."

#### THEN AND NOW.

By courtesy of Mr. Richard Holton, formerly employed in the office of the Northampton (England) Mercury, we are enabled to examine a fac simile of its first issue, dated May 2nd, 1720. It is a diminutive affair of twelve pages, seven and one-half inches long, by six inches wide, the first being entirely occupied by the title and imprint. A comparison between it and the present form of the Mercury, which is an ably conducted eight page (24x27 inch) paper, enables a person to form an adequate idea of the progress of journalism, during the period named. The fac simile was obtained by means of photography and zinc plates. Care was taken to have it upon paper similar to the kind used in 1720; consequently an exact

counterpart is the result. The Mercury presented a copy as a souvenir to each of its subscribers.

The little 1720 sheet furnishes the public of that time with the mortuary report of the city of London for the ten days from April 19th to April 29th, the total number of decedents being 515. Some of the causes of death are stated in language that would not in our day be considered polite.

Here is a sample bit of information which is indicative of the times in which it was given:

From the General Postoffice letter, in Lombard Street, April 26:

They write from Paris that 300 archers being appointed to take up all beggars and vagabonds, and to send those who are not able to work to the hospitals, and those who are to Mississippi (of which latter 300 were sent away the 27th) had laid hands on divers trading people of credit, and killed three that resisted; upon which the people rose upon them, killed eleven of the archers, and wounded many more. The next day there was the like insurrection, when several more of the archers were killed. The parliament have assembled on this occasion, and made a representation thereof to the government.

The following shows how matters were dismissed with a few lines in those days that would burden several columns in our times:

Yesterday eight men and one woman received sentence of death at the old Baily. Among them John Keine, for murdering his wife, George Davis, for robbing the Sword Blade Company, and Elizabeth Cranbury, for poisoning her father-in-law with arsenic.

Robert Coles was convicted of felony, for embezzling his master the Lord Cobham's jewels, to the value of £1600 or £1700 delivered to him to carry to the Lady Cobham's father, till their return out of the country. The evidence against him was very full, and not in the least contradicted, only himself said he did carry the jewels according to the directions.

About thirty-three were ordered for transportation.

William Pitt, Esq., is chosen Member of Parliament for Bridgewater, in the room of Mr. Doddington, deceased.

Last week the Oxford stage coach was robbed between Uxbridge and London, by the same highwaymen, as is supposed, who robbed the Bristol mail, one of them having a scar on his forehead, as was likewise a gentleman on Finchley Common, by a highwayman, who took from him forty-four guineas, then cut his horse's girths, and rode off with his booty. The latter of these robberies was committed in sight of four wagons.

Some days ago a woman beat another, who was her lodger, so unmercifully on the breast that she murdered her upon the spot, for which piece of barbarity she is committed to the Gate-house.

A man lately taken up near Maidenhead Thicket, and charged with robbing the Cirencester stage coach, has been examined by a justice of the peace, who has committed him to Reading Goal. He is said to be a butcher's son of Thame, in Oxfordshire.