

the majority of them—who are above and beyond being governed by the mental and unsympathetic trivialities which encompass smaller souls. Such men clasp humanity as a whole, being moved with enmity towards none. They are cautious about basing their estimate of a community on the averments of persons whose minds and sympathies radiate within an exceedingly limited circle, and who shut out or smother every fact creditable in any way to those who differ from them in matters of religion.

Not only do we wish the Presbyterian party an agreeable sojourn in our city, but a pleasant and profitable trip to the coast, and after having accomplished the object of their western journey, a safe return to their eastern homes.

A SHAMEFUL CASE.

THE grand jury in the First District has ignored the case against O. C. Ormsby, as well as other cases of a similar character. This indicates that, as in some instances in other judicial districts, there have been unnecessary if not vindictive attempts at prosecution. The government has been put to needless expense, and many individuals to a great deal of trouble, anxiety and suspense, to say nothing of monetary loss, and all for no good purpose, unless fees to certain officers may be considered a good purpose viewed in contrast with the wrong done to the innocent.

Dr. Ormsby's case is a flagrant one. He was arrested while coming from the bedside of a sick child at the residence of his alleged plural wife in Logan. The evidence before the U. S. Commissioner showed that when the deputy-Marshal called at the house, Dr. Ormsby was just coming from the room idly dressed, with hat on and overcoat on his arm. That he had been summoned to see the child, who was seriously ill, had returned to the drug store for medicine, and had gone back with it and administered it himself, and was just leaving when the officer came. These facts were testified to by a number of witnesses, including a young man who boarded at the house and was present during the whole time that the Doctor was there, and the deputy-Marshal who plainly and frankly stated how the defendant was dressed when he made the arrest.

The Commissioner, whose name is Fletcher, finding not the slightest evidence against the defendant, had the impudence to lecture him about his "indiscretion" in not taking an officer with him to visit his sick child, and bound him over to the grand jury. We expected the case would be ignored, for from what we could learn there was positively nothing in it, except an intention on the part of certain persons to trap the Doctor, and so he was watched with the result we have explained.

A most sensational and vulgar version of the affair was concocted for publication in this city, and was wired to the East, explaining what a high position the defendant held in the "Mormon" Church and as a Sunday School official, and how he had in public supported the manifesto and in private had violated it, with sundry

salacious comments showing the state of mind of the dastardly manufacturer of scandal for the press.

We have refrained from mentioning this matter until now, preferring to wait for what we foresaw would be the outcome. Will the local sheet that published the libel on Dr. Ormsby make any reparation, by giving as much publicity to the facts as it did to the falsehood? Not very likely. Will the papers east that were furnished with the lying dispatch be now supplied with the truth? Not at all likely, nor would they probably give it any prominence if they received it.

There should be some way to punish people who trump up false charges for spite, who cause arrests for fees, and who write up things they know to be untrue for the purpose of injuring an opponent and of prejudicing the public against a creed or a community.

A MANIFEST INJUSTICE.

THE taxpayers who have been mulcted of fourteen per cent. out of the returned special school tax, will applaud the action of Mr. Pike at the meeting of the Board of Education, in bringing up this matter for investigation. Of course the attorneys who conducted the contest before the courts which resulted in the refunding of the money, ought to be well paid for their services. Nobody objects to that. But a manifest injustice has been done to a large number of the taxpayers, in this way:

When application was made to the Board of Education for the returned taxes as advertised, many applicants received the full amount. Others were told to go to the Third District Court. On applying there they received their money minus fourteen per cent. Most of these taxpayers had no idea what this deduction was for. They had not contested the tax. They had not authorized any attorney to appear for them. Some of them had paid the money under protest, because they understood it was likely to be declared illegal. But why should people be fined for protesting verbally when paying a tax they had been informed was unlawfully levied?

We can understand why those taxpayers who engaged counsel to contest the tax should be called upon to pay the expenses. We could understand a general deduction of a small amount upon all the money returned, in view of the fact that all the taxpayers were benefited by the suit. But why one part of the people who made no legal contest should be mulcted fourteen per cent of their money, and the rest of them be paid in full, is something that even if it can be explained justice naturally rejects as an imposition.

If Mr. Pike's action shall result in the full ventilation of this matter and the demonstration of what is right in relation to it, he will accomplish a good work and in any event is entitled to credit for bringing it prominently to the front.

The allotment of wall space in the Fine Arts building to various nations for the hanging of pictures, to be exhibited at the World's Fair, has been made as follows:

SILVER COINAGE.

One more letter on the coinage question appears in our columns today. It will be seen that our correspondent, as is often the case in a dispute, differs from us chiefly on a misunderstanding as to the meaning of words. We took the ground that in making gold the standard, Congress did not violate the Constitution as our friend seemed to intimate, when insisting on the duty of Congress to coin silver under the provision empowering that body to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." He admits that Congress has the right to establish either a single or a double standard. That point, therefore, is settled.

Next as to his statement that "Congress has refused to coin silver and regulate the value thereof." We denied this, and showed that the Government had been coining silver. To this he rejoined by repeating the assertion and stating under what restrictions silver has been coined, thus proving our point and disproving his own assertion. It now appears that he meant "Congress had refused to coin and regulate the value of the silver dollar of our fathers," which, whether it be true or not, is another proposition. Congress is not required to "coin the silver dollar of our daddies," but simply to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." So much for that point.

Now as to the money of the United States being made available as money in other countries. It does not follow, if American coin passes current in England and English in America, that any great shipping of coin from this country would be the consequence. If the silver question can be settled by its remonetization at a satisfactory ratio with gold, we cannot see how any injury would result if American coins passed current in other countries for their equivalent in the money of those countries. At any rate this has not been made clear by anything our correspondent has advanced.

But this is a minor question and not necessarily involved in the main issue, on which we think his views and ours harmonize, with the exception of the propriety of holding the international conference on the silver question. It may be that the underlying purpose of calling it was political. But even if that were so, the discussion of this important matter, which cannot but affect other nations as well as this, will in our opinion aid much in leading to the removal of the obstructions in the way of the white metal, and will certainly make prominent the views of the nations that are represented, on gold and silver as money, and this will be of general interest and value.

We do not think there is any cringing or subservience in one nation requesting other nations to join it in the consideration of a question which must necessarily be of international moment. Therefore, whatever may have been the prime motive in the action for an international silver convention, there does not appear to us anything servile in calling it or injurious to the United States in its probable results. But, anyhow, we want to see silver restored, and so we have no contention on the main point with our silver correspondent.