

by the city "Liberal" organ, as evidence of the benefits accruing from the rule of that party. While sham self-congratulation emanates from a journal which has accused the "Liberal" city government of "boodles," embezzlement and bribery, all honest and straightforward members of the party will recoil from the exhibit "with horror." We know that the present administration has inspired a large body of thoughtful "Liberals" with shame and disgust. But former charges hurled against the city officials by the newspaper referred to is now changed to sickly smiles of assumed approval, for a purpose.

It will be observed that the revenue for the year was \$917,615, while during the year previous, under the benign and honest rule of the people, it was, in round figures, \$569,000. This latter amount included a large sum derived from the sale of lands, which was therefore obtained in a way that had no impoverishing effect upon the taxpayers. Thus under "Liberal" rule the revenue has been double. The working people who own their homes have reason to know the process by which this money was squeezed out of their hard earnings.

Speaking of this tremendous swell in the revenue, the Mayor remarks, with refreshing frankness, which is only equaled by the mildness of the expression, "This increase seems large." "Seems, Madam! Nay, it is."

The instruction imparted by this information to the effect that the revenue was nearly a million dollars in 1890, is heightened by the consideration of the fact that, according to the Mayor's showing, when the "Liberal" government assumed the reins of rule, on February 19th of last year, there was a balance in the treasury of \$256,188.72. Place this statement in conjunction with that which occurs in the report to the effect that there was on hand January 1st, 1891—all that was left of the \$917,615—the sum of \$87,865.75, and it becomes interesting. It will also be in place to recall a remark lately made in the City Council, by the Mayor, to the effect that the city finances are getting into such a condition that it may become necessary to sell the Warm Springs property.

Mayor Scott's comfort is of a doubtful character, having a somewhat doleful sound. To prove this point it is only needful to allude to that portion of his report in which he promises an increase of the city revenue—which means reaching down further into the pockets of the people—and an "increase" of the city's expenditures. So let the beneficiaries of this benignant state of affairs—the taxpayers—lift up

their voices and rejoice at the reasons existing for "Liberal" self-congratulation.

We defy any man or body of men, after a careful examination of the improvements made in this city during last year, to intelligently and justly show that the enormous amounts expended have been properly and judiciously disbursed. We might consistently use a much stronger and harsher term. We may as well say that we question the honesty of the administration as a whole, and in this position we are strongly sustained by statements that have frequently been made by the Salt Lake Tribune.

Under the head of "permanent improvements," upon which large sums have been expended, the Mayor points to one in particular—the joint city and county building. The allusion to this noble structure is quite entertaining. On this monument of "Liberal" progress there has been expended of the people's money the snug sum of \$10,810.41. Perhaps when the taxpayers read this item of expenditure, a committee of them will set out on a still hunt to find that "permanent improvement," which only exists in the "mind's eye" of the Mayor. A hole in the ground costing nearly \$11,000 is a remarkably economic "permanent improvement."

It will profit the taxpayer to note some of the expenditures, such for instance as \$11,739.50 for crossings and sidewalks on one street alone—South Temple; Capitol Hill reservoir, \$11,000; Emigration Canyon pipe line to convey water, \$35,000; waterworks, \$177,959.35; expenditures in the water-master's department, \$63,786.16. This latter outlay relates to irrigation only. And so it goes. We commend the report to the calm, dispassionate perusal of an afflicted public as a fair basis on which to found a proper estimate of "Liberal" rule in Salt Lake City.

The increase of crime has made strides in keeping with other peculiarities of the present government. On this point Mr. Scott supplies some suggestive figures. In 1890 the police made 3139 arrests. The report admits that this is double the number made in 1889. If the offenses committed, and which were notoriously known to the public because of their aggravated character—including murder—in which the perpetrators escaped, were added to this exhibit, it would tell a most woful tale of progressive criminality. During the year 645 people were, for various causes, detained in jail. The report states that this number is three times as large as

that of 1889. It is probable, however, that the Mayor did not admit the full difference. He did not give the figures for the year previous. The Tribune gave them on the 22nd inst., when it stated that the detentions in jail in 1889 numbered 103. This makes the number more than six times greater in 1890 than in the year preceding.

We have not the time nor space to refer further at present to the official exhibit of the first year's business under "Liberal" misrule. But, as we have before remarked, it should be carefully scrutinized and weighed by every intelligent citizen. If this is done, the conclusion must inevitably be that the pockets of the people have been depleted and their money blundered away and squandered with appalling recklessness, while the morality of a once exemplary city has been frightfully impaired.

HIS WATERLOO.

THE fiery Ingalls has, at last, met his Waterloo. By an overwhelming majority the Kansas legislature rejected him as its representative in the United States Senate. He fought vigorously for a fourth term. He is supplanted by a gentleman named Pfeffer, a member of the Farmers' Alliance of Kansas, and editor of the Kansas Farmer.

Ingalls delivered a speech in the Senate about two weeks ago, which attracted much attention. It was said to be a bid for the Alliance vote, and a shrewd bit of diplomacy to enlist in his behalf the farmers and workmen of the country. One paragraph from that speech will illustrate the tenor of the whole. Here it is:

"The evil, Mr. President, the second to which I adverted as threatening the safety of the republic, is the tyranny of combined, concentrated, centralized and incorporated capital. And the people are considering this great problem now. The conscience of the nation is shocked at the injustices of modern society. The moral sentiment of mankind has been aroused at the unequal distribution of wealth, at the unequal diffusion of burdens, at the benefits and the privileges of society. At the beginning of our second century the American people have become profoundly conscious that the ballot is not the panacea for all the evils that afflict humanity, that it has not abolished poverty nor prevented injustice. They have discovered that political equality does not result in social fraternity; that under a democracy the concentration of greater political power in fewer hands, the accumulation and aggregation of greater amounts of wealth in individuals is more possible than under monarchy, and that there is a tyranny which is more fatal than the tyranny of kings."

This is a vivid picture of the existing social and industrial condition of the United States. It had no effect on the Kansas farmers. Evidently they