

been counting strongly on the decrepitude which usually attends such advanced years keeping Gladstone practically out of the fight henceforth, must have experienced something like an awakening after a long and dreamy sleep. It doubtless seemed to them as though the Grand Old Man was undergoing rejuvenation, or that a special heritage of his early vigor had been bequeathed by Providence in order that the later statesmen might have some relish of what their predecessors had to undergo time and again. It was certainly an astonisher, and the differences in the astonishment was made manifest on one side by the prolonged and deafening cheers and on the other by blank dismay. It was undeniably the case that it was a complete triumph for Mr. Gladstone and his supporters, and no better evidence of this can be had than the fact that the only response made was brief, ineffectual and without demonstrations of approval.

The juncture, considering the turn affairs have taken before the Parnell Commission, was a most happy one for the Home Rulers, and was improved to the fullest extent.

### THE CONTEMPT CASE.

AN OBSERVANT reader perusing the report of what occurred March 1 before the Supreme Court would find no difficulty in bringing the entire picture of this somewhat celebrated case before his mind's eye, and analyzing its points. Mr. Baskin, who appeared in behalf of the trustees, seemed at a great disadvantage. His statements to the Court can scarcely be dignified by the title of "an argument," as they were profusely diluted. He was "weary, stale, flat and unprofitable." He is nothing unless he is fiercely antagonistic. Yesterday he had the appearance of being imbued with the idea that such a course would not be prudent. Doubtless his "reading lesson" of a few days before, imposed upon him by Judge Judd, was running through his mind. Mr. Baskin's mental obfuscation seemed to be so dense as to render him unable to perceive that Judge Judd yesterday offered him a way out of the difficulty in which his clients had become involved through being adjudged guilty of contempt. The associate justice not only made a hole out of which the trustees and attorneys might conveniently creep, but al-

most greased the plank along which they might readily slide. To a mind in a condition of ordinary clearness the Judge's intimation that the proper thing to do was to withdraw the paper which had the signatures of the trustees attached, and which embodied the contemptuous matter that had brought down upon them the wrath of the Court, amounted to this: "Now, the Court is disposed to be lenient and to let down your clients as easily as possible comporting with the dignity of this tribunal. Here is a way by which you can give the Court this opportunity. Why don't you accept of this offer, which almost amounts to a proposition?"

Mr. Baskin innocently remarked that such a thing had not "occurred" to him! This is fearful. It might have "occurred" to anybody in a condition of mental clearness, if he wished to purge the respondents of the contempt of which these people had been adjudged guilty. But the peculiar feature connected with this affair is, Why it did not "occur" to him at the moment when it was suggested by the Judge. It finally "occurred" to Mr. Baskin that he had nothing more to say, and he resumed his seat.

Judge Zane then proceeded to make a plea for the trustees. His observations presented an anomaly. He mixed himself up with his clients interminably, so as to render it almost impossible to untwine them. At one moment it would appear as if the trustees had been doing what had been offensive to the Court, and at another he would insist that "the language was not theirs," the implication being that it was his. Thus he kept shifting from one foot to the other until it became difficult to tell upon which he was standing.

Now, it is evident from the position taken by him, that he was under a mental cloud as well as his associate attorney; otherwise, he would have accepted of the proffer of the Court delivered to Mr. Baskin through associate justice Judd, and withdrawn the offensive paper. If he was not thus befogged, then he kept on making his singular remarks for the purpose of engaging in a game of what he himself designates as "snap and bite!" His effort to show cause why his clients should not be punished for contempt reminded one somewhat of an incident which happened in the British House of Parliament. One member called another a "great rascal."

The Speaker decided that he should withdraw the objectionable language and apologize; and the apology was to this effect: "I stated that the honorable gentleman was a great rascal, and I am sorry for it!"

Judge Zane was apparently anxious to get a few extra blows at Mr. Dyer, but it was evidently very difficult for him to accomplish this without giving the Court a sanguinary nose. He made a thrust at the Marshal—rather than the Receiver—on the tithing question. He stated that the "government did not believe in tithing," and yet Mr. Dyer had rented the old premises known as the General Tithing Store, giving the constructive and bona fide proprietors an opportunity to continue the business.

Judge Zane will not attempt to deny that although the government may not believe in the doctrine of tithe-paying, yet it has shown a powerful disposition to grab it after it is paid. But this feeling on the part of the Government bears no comparison with a similar genius exhibited by parties no farther away than Salt Lake City. Very likely the Government does not believe in paying tithing; it is even questionable whether it believes in repentance and baptism by immersion in water for the remission of sins. Yet these two principles, like tithing, are strictly scriptural. If the Government does not choose to accept of those doctrines, perhaps it will be admitted that it has no right to prevent others from accepting them as orthodox.

The silliness of this petty and contemptible idea uttered by Judge Zane is, in our opinion, wholly unworthy of a man of honor and intelligence. More than this, it is absolutely childish, and furnishes an evidence that the gentleman who spoke it has reached a condition of mental flabbiness that is deplorable. Does he presume that if the premises in question had not been rented to the owners of the property—for they are the constructive and only proprietors—that that high-handed and dishonest outrage would have prevented the people who desire to pay tithes, as a religious ordinance, from carrying out their views in that respect? Surely such consummate rubbish as this was never presented before a court of justice at any time in the annals of the jurisprudence of this country until this late date, when it is done by a man who, at the same time, speaks of American liberty.

But this is not the part of Judge