

of one of the most gigantic and inexcusable robberies ever attempted in the name of law.

DRAMATIC DISPLAY.

A SINGULAR scene was presented Feb. 11 during the proceedings in the investigation before Examiner Harkness; at least so we are enabled to judge from a perusal of the report of what occurred, and from the statements of those who were present. By this means one is able to form a more or less correct conception of the picture, especially a person familiar with the actors who appeared in the play. One of the most conspicuous among these was R. N. Baskin, recently returned from Washington. He entered the room where the examination was being conducted with long and rapid strides, and at once assumed the role of the slenderly-built heavy villain of the drama. His manner was as ferocious as that of an untamed gorilla as he planted himself unceremoniously in the chair usually occupied by one acting as counsel for the Supreme Court. Very appropriately, Mr. John M. Zane took a position behind him, forming a suitable background to an uninviting rontispiece.

The attitude of Mr. Baskin expressed as plainly as words could, "I am come; now there will be something done! Look at me, gentlemen; I am going to run this whole business!"

The curious feature in connection with this matter was the fact that he stated he was present as an attorney for the petitioners "by courtesy of court counsel." But as an attorney present "by courtesy" he did not act courteously as an attorney. He was evidently smarting under the rhetorical "slings and arrows" with which he had been wounded at Washington by the speeches of Messrs. Caine, Richards and Wilson. His splenetic soul flowed out ferociously after the manner of an infuriated spit-fire feline. He made a descent upon Mr. Williams, the witness on the stand. Before the latter gentleman could get through answering one question he would hurl at him half-a-dozen intermediate interrogations. Judge Powers, counsel on the other side, protested against such an extraordinary proceeding, and he also was interrupted in the same manner.

This conduct of the fiery and impetuous Baskin was characterized as unprofessional, ungentlemanly, and discourteous. Judge Harkness,

who, by the way, has a vein of dry humor running through his judicial system, gave vent to one of his characteristically caustic jokes, and threw it in the direction of the untamed attorney "by courtesy." He stated in substance that Mr. Baskin did not mean to be unprofessional, ungentlemanly or discourteous; it was merely "his way!" This was a stinger, if Mr. Baskin had only possessed sense enough to see its point. It meant, evidently, that he could be guilty of the rudeness of which Judge Powers accused him and still be ignorant of it. This is a horrible reflection.

The extraordinary manner of proceeding of Mr. Baskin ought to be coupled with the fact that he is, in the most pronounced sense, what has been aptly designated "an active politician." Consequently, it is more than likely that his ferocity, passionate explosions and spluttering interruptions were the green fire introduced into the tragedy for the purpose of producing a ghastly effect. Men of his class deal more in effects than in facts. In their line of business the former are frequently of more use than the latter. Fortunately, the witness was cool. Not being entirely free from the tactics of the "active politician" himself, he knew how to meet the attack. He showed considerable adroitness by making, and properly too, the Attorney-General of the United States a barricade which prevented the intrepid Baskin from carrying his position by assault. Every time Baskin approached the main issue of the case Mr. Williams referred him to the Attorney-General.

During most of the time this scene was in progress the principal court attorneys, Messrs. Marshall and Critchelow, warmed their physical structures by remaining in close proximity to the stove, watching the battle from afar, occasionally joining in with a shot or two from single-barrelled legal shot-guns.

The side scene to the main one described in the foregoing consisted of the entrance into the room of Judge John R. McBride. His appearance created no sensation. He glided over to where Mr. Powers was posted, and planted himself just in the rear of that attorney. He thus formed a cloudy background to another picture, with Judge Powers as a rocky foreground, enabling this gentleman to stand out in all his conspicuous angularity, which is very striking, except when

he settles down in his chair in a homogeneous heap. Mr. McBride was not so towsy and tufty as usual. He ordinarily wears the aspect of a Dakota haystack after a blizzard. He had been to Washington, and was sprucely trimmed. He maintained an unbroken silence. Perhaps the reason for this may have been that he was suffering from a cold contracted forty-three years ago owing to getting his feet wet while riding through tall grass damp with dew, as he was performing the role of pathfinder amongst "lo! the poor Indian" of the Salt Lake Valley.

Thus the play goes on with changing scenes, alternating between heavy business and "high life below stairs."

VERY INCONSISTENT.

OUR Provo correspondent gives information of a singular situation in that town. It is proposed to establish a Methodist University in Utah. A number of prominent professed Latter-day Saints of our neighboring city on the south are desirous of having the intended university located there. Their anxiety is very pronounced, being exhibited by liberal donations of money. Some of these prominent professing Latter-day Saints have even favored the proposition of tendering for the use of the Methodists the site selected for the future erection of a holy temple, in which sacred ordinances for the salvation of the living and the dead could be administered.

No wonder our correspondent expresses a sentiment akin to disgust at inconsistency so manifest and glaring. We are with him upon that point.

It is perfectly consistent for the Methodists to establish themselves and broaden their borders in this Territory. This is their right, and they should and must be unmolested, in the fullest sense, while thus engaged. But why is it inconsistent for Latter-day Saints—prominent or obscure—to take such a position as that assumed by certain parties in Provo? Is it not liberal? That which is not consistent is not liberal. There is neither liberality nor reason in a community manufacturing clubs to break their own backs.

The history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints shows that in the mobbings, drivings and persecutions that it has endured, the Methodists, as a sect, have taken an exceedingly conspicuous part. This