

some utterances of Gompers in speeches and editorials.

Not long ago a lawyer called my attention to the law of contempt so far as it applies to federal judges. It is brief and explicit, and under that law there can be no contempt of court except in the presence of the court, or so near thereto as to interfere with the administration of justice.

Contempt of court was thus defined by Congress right after a federal judge in one of the Southern courts had sent an editor to jail for contempt.

Under the law, and it is the only one on the statute books pertaining to contempt, Gompers was free to write and say anything he pleased about a federal judge, so long as he was not in contempt in the presence of the court, or near enough to interfere with the administration of justice.

Legally it is much easier to be in contempt of a country justice of the peace than to be in contempt of a federal judge.

When Justice Holmes defines contempt as a crime, and considers the acts of Gompers, Mitchell and Morrison contempts, it is a judge-made crime and not a law-made crime he is talking about.

If a judge wants to stop something and there is no law on the statute books to give him the power, he makes a handy little law of his own by issuing an injunction prohibiting somebody from doing something that isn't a crime.

Then if the fellow disobeys the judge's arbitrary order, or injunction, he is yanked up before that august and swell-headed personage and punished for disobeying the judge. The crime was created in the judge's imagination.

That was also a cute little trick that came handy often to crooked judges who wanted to deprive citizens of their constitutional right to a trial by a jury of their peers.

If contempt for contemptible judges and contemptible courts is a crime, then crime is darned near unanimous in this country; and if the will of the people is law, then contempt of court is lawful; and it follows that this "crime" is legal.

This decision settles this particular case because the Supreme Court gets the last guess on what the law is; and a count of noses revealed the fact that a majority of the gowns voted to stand by the statute of limitations and escape going on record as to the matter of contempt.

—o—o—

DOCTOR DICKENSON SAYS NEWSPAPERS SHOULD PUBLISH BOTH SIDES OF THE STORY
BY JANE WHITAKER

"There are two sides to everything. You have given one side when you write of the mother of the illegitimate child, but we women physicians who try to do what we think is best for the mother and the child, who act purely in the spirit of humanity, should have our side heard, too."

The speaker was Dr. Frances Dickenson, a director of the Mary Thompson Hospital, who had sent for me to tell me the true story regarding the adoption of the baby which Vida Hagen had just returned to her by a decision of Judge Owens, after it had been adopted by foster parents who had never let any one know it was not their own flesh and blood.

"Quite a little criticism has been given Dr. Louise Acres in this matter," Dr. Dickinson continued. "And I do not think the criticism is fair. On the day of the trial I approached Mrs. Catherine Waugh McCullough, who has been carrying on the fight of the mother to regain the child, and I said to her:

"What are you trying to do, Mrs. McCullough? Take a child that has