

good deal of exasperation among members of the party in power in this city, as well as among people not belonging to it. A question has been raised regarding the competency of the architect with whom the contract was made for plans, specifications and superintendency of construction, as will be seen by the documents which appear elsewhere in the News. It is appropriate now to examine, from the evidence presented, the status of the discussion.

Mr. Apponyi's work was referred to Mr. Hale, another architect, of this city. The latter severely criticised the drawings and specifications. Mr. Apponyi was given a hearing before the joint committee, and he disposed of Mr. Hale, whose objections to the work submitted to him for inspection were overturned.

It does not require any stretch of conjecture to infer that had Mr. Hale floored Mr. Apponyi before the committee as completely as he had appeared to do it on paper, the committee, or a majority of them, would have been satisfied to go no further. Seeing that the boot was on the other foot, someone else must be found whose criticisms could, by some means, be made to stick. Hence the reference of Mr. Apponyi's work to Mr. Charles E. Illsley.

It will be seen by the report of the gentleman last named that he also assumes to demolish Mr. Apponyi's plans and specifications. This causes the Salt Lake Tribune—which has been the inveterate and malicious enemy of the architect who secured the contract, from the beginning—to chuckle. It will be observed, however, that it cackles over a one-sided story. Mr. Illsley's report is *ex parte*. Perhaps if Mr. Apponyi gets a chance at it he will serve it in the same way he did the criticisms of Mr. Hale. We believe, with Solomon, that "he who judgeth a matter before he heareth it is a fool." To base a judgment on a hearing of one side of a question is absurd as well as wicked, because in ninety-nine instances out of a hundred it will be colored by the reporter.

The coloring process is certainly apt to be applied if there be a motive present for its use. It appears from the document itself supplied by Mr. Illsley that he is an interested party. It is evident that he anticipates, in the event of Mr. Apponyi being rejected, that he himself will be awarded the contract. Who that wishes to do justice would base a re-

jection of a contract upon a report of a competitor for it? We do not pretend to be able to judge of the competency of Mr. Apponyi's work, but we have some very decided ideas about justice. Hence we say that there can be no excuse for attempting to repudiate that gentleman's labors or render the contract made with him nugatory on the mere basis of an *ex parte* statement from an interested person.

It is to be presumed that the previous City Council and County committee who accepted Mr. Apponyi's work and the "Liberal" officers who later entered into the contract with him did not assume their positions in the dark. As intelligent agents of the people they doubtless considered well the steps involved before taking them. It is well known, however, that Mr. Apponyi incurred the bitter hatred of the Tribune gang and the rabid wing of the "Liberal" party because he expressed himself to the effect that he considered the hoisting of the carpet-bag—the insignia of the party—over the stars and stripes to be an indignity to the national flag. For this he has been abused and cursed and an idea is prevalent that the war waged against him is more on that ground than that of incompetency as an architect. If he is really incompetent he ought not to be entrusted with the important work involved, but there is *prima facie* evidence that he is not being fairly treated. *Ex parte* statements from interested parties are not proof. He has disposed of one set of criticisms of that character; he should be given a chance at the other.

THE GREAT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY

THE tremendous victory which the Democrats have gained fairly takes the breath away from their opponents. In some instances it seems to have taken away their sense. For instance, here is the Republican organ of the "Liberals" in this city, declaring, as a settled fact, that "the trouble is not due to the tariff."

And yet the evidence comes from all parts of the country that the McKinley measure has been the chief cause of this great uprising against Republican mal-administration. It aroused the people of New York to their emphatic protest against Republicanism. It has brought apparent defeat to the distinguished Congressman himself. It has spread disaffection in the Republican ranks

everywhere, and fired the hearts of Democrats to united and determined work.

Connected with the wretched new tariff law is the force bill, in the mighty revolution that has taken place. This obnoxious measure, designed to give control of the elections into Republican hands, has almost equally provoked the thinking public to an unmistakable expression of disapproval. Together they have led the party on the road to its doom.

The "Liberal" organ, which is a monomaniac on the silver question, lays the whole trouble to the demonetization of silver. As the same paper has put the blame of this, in times past, almost entirely on the Democratic party, the state of mind it is in just now in attributing this Democratic triumph to the silver question is obvious and needs no description.

The millions of ordinary voters are not troubled about silver. It is not discussed by them to any large extent. In the West and among mining people and districts, and at financial centres, of course it is an ever present issue. But commonly, in other parts, it does not form a popular topic. There are subjects that are forced upon the attention of the citizens in rural and manufacturing regions that almost shut the silver squabble out of sight.

The remarks of Grover Cleveland, which come by telegraph, are clear and pointed and go right to the heart of the matter. The country has had time to reflect on the question of tariff reform since the last presidential election, and thousands of voters now see how they were hoodwinked by the protectionists.

There will be still more time for the discussion of this subject before another presidential campaign. It will be generally seen that while neither party expects or intends to establish absolute free trade, the Democrats have endeavored to reform the tariff on lines that would lead to the benefit of the farmer and the consumer, which means also the benefit of the laborer, while the Republicans have worked into the hands of the great manufacturers and capitalists at the expense of the toiling masses.

In spite of the shrewd action of the Republican party to strengthen itself by the admission of new States pledged to its support, and though the Senate of the United States will be for some time in the hands of that party, yet the outlook for a return to Democratic rule is very promising to the disciples of Jackson and Jefferson.