

floral tribute was inscribed 'Washington Infantry, 1890.' The detail was escorted to the cemetery by Captain Schmidt, a veteran of Creighton's regiment, and were met by the survivors of the Seventh Ohio upon reaching the grave yard. After placing the floral emblem upon Colonel Creighton's grave, Lieutenant Niebaum made an address in which he briefly stated Colonel Creighton's connection with the Washington Infantry previous to the war. Captain Schmidt also spoke of Colonel Creighton's career on the field with the Seventh Ohio volunteers, which were better known as 'Creighton's Roosters.'

"The veterans then escorted the detail to the regiment's monument, which they were engaged in decorating, and presented the boys with their regimental badge.

After leaving the cemetery the detail was treated to an inviting lunch. On the return march from the Garfield monument dedication, the Washington Infantry, accompanied by the Montooth band, on invitation of Mrs. Creighton, wife of the deceased colonel, visited the residence of Thomas J. Quirk, brother of Mrs. Creighton, on Bolivar Avenue. Arms were stacked, clothes brushed and dust washed off the boys' faces, after which the whole party partook of an excellent spread, which was quite royally attended to by the boys, as they were tired and hungry, having walked twelve miles. Outside of the infantry very few organizations marched back from the cemetery. After supper the band serenaded the worthy hostess, and as the company came to attention Major George Bonn, president of the Regimental Association, presented the company with a picture of Colonel Creighton. Captain Shannon returned the thanks of the company in a few well-chosen words. Saturday the boys spent in seeing the city, and many took a trip on the lake. The Major E. A. Montooth band made quite a hit by their splendid appearance and fine music.

Mr. Thomas Quirk and Mrs. Eleanor Creighton, widow of the dead hero, are cousins to President George Q. and President Angus M. Cannon.

### NOT AN ENCOURAGING PROSPECT.

THE grangers of Minnesota are not to be numbered among the worshippers of the court of last resort. They seem to think they have the right to criticize even that august tribunal. At a recent meeting of the executive committee of the Minnesota Farmers' Alliance, some of the doings of that judicial body were roughly overhauled.

A call was issued for a State convention, and in it a number of national issues are treated upon. The McKinley tariff bill is severely criticised and described as "protection gone mad." And several decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are strongly denounced, the statement being made, after particularizing dangerous rulings of the court, that it "aspires to even a greater degree of infamy

than the Dred Scott decision achieved for it, because its recent decisions contemplate the enslavement of the whole American people."

This is a very serious charge. And, coupled with the fact that other granger organizations in different States have used equally vigorous language concerning that eminent tribunal, it indicates that the veneration which has been felt for it during so many years is beginning to depart from the public mind. This is unfortunate, both for the court and the country.

It is to be deplored that any influences but those of law and equity should have power in the determining of questions which are of vital importance to the nation. That either politics or public feeling should bias a body supposed to be elevated far above them both. That as parties succeed each other in power, rulings of the same court are changed to comport with the difference in political complexion. When public confidence ceases to be reposed in the judicial department of the government, the affairs of the nation may be justly considered in a dangerous condition.

Among all the denunciations of the Supreme Court which have been recently uttered, we have not heard of any charges that this faultfinding is "treasonable," or "disloyal," or in indicating any "lack of fealty" to the government. Nor are there any propositions to disfranchise the grangers and others who have had the temerity to express their disapprobation of the peculiar decisions rendered by that body. It is only when the "Mormons" venture to criticize the reasoning and the rulings of the court that the loyalty shriekers get in their shouting work.

We do not like to see the court treated with disrespect. We do not approve the use of the strong language employed by some people in denunciation of the court. But we maintain the ground we have always taken as to the rights of citizens in relation to the court, and consider that it is just as much open to public criticism for its official doings, as the legislative and the executive branches of the government.

When the court evidently panders to popular sentiment, and in doing so swerves from the straight path of judicial principle, or uses for argument platitudes that are transparently inapt and irrelevant to the subject matter, there is no good reason why any person or paper should

refrain from pointing out the error. This we have taken occasion to do, and may do again. And those who take this criticism as a token of "treason" must be very much at a loss for an excuse to find fault.

We are sorry that the supreme bench, to which the nation looks for a final arbitrament of the most important legal questions, involving the lives, liberties and properties of the citizens, should be open to the criticisms to which it has been justly subjected, and that the respect and confidence which it should command are gradually fading from the public mind. The prospect this opens is not pleasant to the patriotic vision.

### WHAT NEXT?

THE immigration officials of New York seem to have dropped upon a hideous plot to disrupt the American Republic. As usual the conspirators whose machinations might — had they not been nipped in the bud by vigilant patriots — have sealed the doom of the nation are "Mormons." They are members of a family of Scandinavians, under the leadership of the husband and father, Andreas Olson. In the background of the plot the ominous figure of a "Mormon" Elder looms up more or less conspicuously.

It appeared that the company of Sa uts on the way from Europe was likely to stand the test of close scrutiny to which they were subjected at virtuous Gotham, for the purpose of ascertaining whether there had been any violation of the anti-contract labor law. The zealous and patriotic officials were doubtless in despair at their inability to discover a case, when their intelligent activity was rewarded by finding, doubtless with the aid of an interpreter, that the aforementioned "Mormon" Elder had promised to find work for Andreas Olson.

This startling development appears to have made it perfectly clear to the officers that the said Olson and his family were totally unfit to live in America, and should be returned to the country whence they came. The basis for this official position is, we presume, that Brother Olson having a prospect, owing to a promise that had been made to him that he could get employment, was under a labor contract. It is easy, when a "Mormon" is the object of attack, to assert that a one-sided promise is a contract, although a contract is