

mons," that they invariably fall into error even when they seem to be trying to tell the truth, and who usually prefer a lie, so that it puts the "Mormons" in a bad light, at the expense of self-contradiction and refutation of their falsehood on their own pages.

What the *Traveller* says in the extract given above is a bold denial of the facts of history and a feeble echo of exploded slander.

### AN EASY WAY OUT.

In an attempted reply to our showing concerning the sincerity of the "Mormon" people, in the light of history, the "Liberal" organ says today:

"The News has an article on 'Mormon' promises and asks when the 'Mormons' have ever broken any of their promises. It is not a matter necessary at this time to discuss."

Indeed. Why not? Is it because the question cannot be answered in a straightforward way established by proofs? If it is not necessary now to discuss this question, why did the *Tribune* on Tuesday say:

"It is astonishing that the Mormon Church has done this, because it has been fertile in expedients for many years. It is not very much at invention, but it has something else which is almost as good; it is utterly unscrupulous as to what means it shall adopt. Any promise can be obtained if necessary, any profession can be counted on."

It was in reference to this that we presented the article to which the *Tribune* refers, and which contains evidence that the shifting sheet does not want to meet, and therefore says it is not necessary now to discuss.

We repeat, it is but barefaced and vicious lying to state that "any promise can be obtained if necessary" from the "Mormon" Church. And history demonstrates that all its agreements have been faithfully kept, while in many instances the contracts of its enemies have been ruthlessly and willfully broken.

It is easy to dismiss the issue by saying it is not necessary now to discuss it. But the *Tribune*, which started the discussion by making a statement which it cannot bring any evidence to substantiate, is, all the same, once more convicted of lying and inconsistency. It seems unable to remember one day what it put forth the day before. It has the most powerful or convenient forgetter of any paper in the country.

### THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

The legislative ticket made up at the Democratic Convention on Wednesday, is undeniably strong. Taking it altogether it will be a hard ticket to beat. Some of the nominees chosen

for the House would have been considered by the general public, perhaps, more suited for the Council and vice versa. But in either place they would shine as lawmakers and laborably for the public interest. But it may be that their services will be needed more in the lower House, where the struggle between parties is generally greater, and in any case the gentlemen named make together a striking and talented array.

They represent various interests and classes and seem to have been selected with a view to this, for they are likely to draw support from different sources, and if they are elected, public interests will be well sustained. The Republicans will have to bestir themselves to make up a ticket to match this in strength and varied elements of attraction.

Compared with the "Liberal" ticket it towers aloft and broadens out, till the latter is dwarfed and shrunken into insignificance. Whatever objection Republicans may have to this ticket, on party grounds, it cannot be on the score of weakness or unfitness.

### THREE VIEWS OF SILVER.

IT AUGURS badly for the Ohio Democracy that at its State Convention yesterday in Cleveland harmony did not prevail. It is true the present incumbent, James E. Campbell, was re-nominated on the first ballot by an overwhelming majority. But on a motion to make the nomination unanimous the Hamilton county delegation opposed it. Cincinnati is in this county, and the saying is current that as Hamilton county goes, so goes Ohio. The present Lieutenant-Governor W. V. Marquis was re-nominated by acclamation.

Allen W. Thurman, son of the old Roman, was temporary chairman of the convention. In his address he denounced the McKinley bill, the subsidy bill and the efforts to pass the Force bill. He exhorted the farmers to abandon their socialistic projects and unite with the Democratic party as that which would bring them relief.

The platform demands a tariff for revenue only, and characterizes the McKinley bill as a piece of class legislation. A graded income tax is favored. The 1873 demonitization silver law is emphatically condemned, and "the reinstatement of the constitutional standard of both gold and silver, with equal right each to free and unlimited coinage," is demanded. The minority report, however, had something as a substitute for this silver plank. But it was rejected by 399 nays to 300 yeas.

Inasmuch as the minority report took the attitude assumed by Grover Cleveland on the money issue, its action is significant. It advocates honest money, and opposes all legislation which tends to drive either gold or silver out of circulation. This report was sustained by 300 delegates, very nearly half of the convention. This shows that the Ohio Democracy is not a unit for free silver. One of the speakers for the minority said that Ohio had plenty of good Democratic issues to fight over, without taking up the Republican free silver of Nevada, Montana and Colorado.

In the speech of acceptance, Governor Campbell said that the battle in Ohio is essentially a National one, inasmuch as all the National issues of the times enter into it. From him the McKinley bill received the usual Democratic scoring. Another speaker said there was no use to shelve the silver issue. It was a vital question and should be settled sooner or later.

The Ohio platform denounces "the demonitization of silver in 1873." This law is a kind of fifteen puzzle to the average reader. Perhaps no better way of illustrating the conflicting views entertained about it can be adopted, than that of giving a quotation from each school.

Andrew Carnegie, who is looked upon as an out and out goldite, says:

"It was always the last resort to 'debase' the coin. These instances happened long ago. Nations of the first rank in our day do not fall so low. I must pause to make one exception to this statement. I bow my head in shame as I write it—the Republic of the United States. Every one of its silver dollars is a 'debased coin.' When a government issues a debased coin it takes leave of all that experience has proved to be sound in regard to money. Sound finance requires the government only to certify to the real value possessed by each coin issued from its mints, so that the people may not be cheated. Every time the government stamps the words 'one dollar' upon 371½ grains of silver it stamps a lie; disgraceful, but, alas! too true, for the silver in it is worth today not a dollar, but only seventy-eight cents."

Senator Stewart, in reply, says:

"If 371½ grains of Silver are worth less than a dollar in gold, it was the secret and fraudulent legislation which you and your gold associates procured, which made it so. In 1873, when you demonitized silver, 371½ grains of silver were worth 3 per cent. more than a gold dollar. You do not how your head in shame for that fraud. On the contrary, you glorify the crime, because it puts money in your purse. Your argument is that, because the value of gold cannot be changed, it is the only material fit for use as money."

Another authority, John A. Grier, speaking of this 1873 measure says:

"Let us ask, is it not the gold dollar which has appreciated in value rather than the silver dollar which has depreciated? A silver dollar crushed into a shapeless mass is no longer money; yet this lump of metal will exchange for a