

of these people in the East; the trouble was, people at a distance had not heard enough about them. It was an inspiration to look at them. In contemplating what they had done he recognized a greater power than that of man, that had been over it all. He bid all present God-speed and hoped they would enjoy more than their highest anticipations.

Other prizes were then distributed. The Old Folks' choir sang the "Continental Railroad Chorus." Brother Goddard pronounced the benediction. A hearty repast was partaken of and the old folks were conveyed in carriages to the depot and were safely placed on the train. On the way, by actual count, there were found to be persons over 90 years of age, three; over 80, seventy-nine; over 70, 493; committee, nine; aides, thirty-six; choir eight; other passengers one hundred and sixty-nine; total 793.

The trip home was enjoyed by all on the train. Lemonade, cakes and candy were profusely distributed, as they were during the morning trip, and the choir sang some pleasing melodies. The city was reached at 7:40 and the old folks were safely taken to their respective homes.

The excursion was successful in every sense. The committee have worked like beavers and they are all entitled to praise. They are William B. Preston, George Goddard, C. R. Savage, Wm. Eddington, Wm. Naylor, Wm. L. Binder, John Kirkman, Andrew Jensen, Nels. A. Empey. Their names will be had in honorable remembrance for their kindness to the aged. All who have contributed to this worthy endeavor will feel rewarded for their good deeds, in knowing they have gratified these sires and dames who are nearly done with earthly life. May the feeling of veneration for the grey-haired and wrinkled which is exhibited in these efforts for their happiness, abide and increase in the land!

ABUSING WITNESSES.

THE dispatches a few days ago contained a racy and readable item. It was in regard to how a Chicago lawyer got the worst of it in an oral skirmish with a witness. This occurs so rarely that when it does we are willing to read of it. It seems that a young man named William Pinkerton, a son of the late Allan Pinkerton, the noted detective,

was being cross-examined, and finally the questioning attorney asked him if his father had not discharged him for stealing. The witness flamed up in an instant, and as soon as he could find words he used them, not for the purpose of answering the evidently malicious question but to reply in a manner as forcible as unexpected. He said in substance that the man who asked the question was an infamous liar. This was a clear contempt of court, but the provocation must have justified the outburst, as the judge overlooked it and severely reprimanded the attorney.

There is no question that lawyers in many instances abuse their privileges, when conducting cross-examinations particularly. Having the right to ask leading questions and suppose cases, they will sometimes suggest an infamous or disgraceful transaction and ask the witness if he was not connected with it, and all this merely for the purpose of causing him annoyance or of placing him temporarily in an equivocal situation. When this is done and the witness replies as young Pinkerton did, it is not much to be wondered a source of wonder that he does not check the attorney who engages in such reprehensible conduct.

At times, as we all know, witnesses are too stubborn or too willing, as the case may be. This is often carried to such an extent that the attorneys having them in hand must resort occasionally to devious and artful methods to draw out what they actually know as well as their opportunities for knowing, what their veracity is, their interest, if any, in the outcome, and so on. There can be no just complaint at such tactics at such times when not carried to an unwarrantable extent; and it is this freedom which is so often taken advantage of. Perhaps nowhere in the country have there been more instances of it, in proportion to the bulk of judicial business transacted, than in Utah. It is all wrong, and the fact that it can easily be righted is all the more reason why it should be.

TROUBLE FOR TANNER.

RUMORS are flying over the country to the effect that Corporal Tanner, the recently installed commissioner of pensions, is conducting the affairs of his office with a high hand and an outstretched arm. If the statements made concerning him

are anywhere near correct, it may be reasonably anticipated that an official cyclone will strike him not later than next winter, and perhaps before the snow begins to fly.

The corporal is a thorough-going smasher. There are no halfway processes in his method of doing things. All he appears to see is what he wants, and then he goes to work and clears the way for its attainment. It seems he wanted to be in a position to grant a heap of increase pension claims. The supervisory committee stood in the way. This body was no more than a row of small potatoes in the eyes of the progressive Tanner, so he simply relegated it to a shelf in an obscure corner, and concluded to run the machine independently.

This way of doing things may seem to some unthinking people to be a species of generosity justifiable because of the fact that the government has so much money on hand as to make its disposal a knotty problem to deal with. But it would hardly be claimed that the solution of this national difficulty should be left to the discretion of the Commissioner of Pensions. Neither should the clearing up of so grave a financial question be brought about by emptying the national coffers into the laps of people who in all probability have no proper claim upon their contents. Generosity of that nature reminds one of the trite old saying—"It is easy to cut shoe laces out of other people's leather," and it seems as if even a Tanner had little or no compunctions about going into that kind of business.

One of the most prominent faults found with President Cleveland by a certain class of his opponents—especially members of the G. A. R., was his bold conservatism—if the term be appropriate—in declining to sign pension bills on the ground that many of the claims of those to whom awards were made in them were dishonest. His vetoes in that line were cited against him in the presidential campaign, and doubtless affected the vote to no small extent. President Harrison will see that a policy to the other extreme by the present Commissioner, would damage the administration and tend to sustain the position taken by Mr. Cleveland. Consequently there is probably some official trouble ahead for Corporal Tanner, who has come to be pretty generally recognized as a hard-headed extremist.