

the non-Mormon suffragists. The switching and changing of votes, so common in popular elections everywhere, is something to which they are strangers. They are steadfast, reliable, conservative and honest in their political promises as well as in every other.

All this being not only true but conceded to be true by those who do not like the Mormons on general principles, isn't it about time to stop this everlasting babbie about threatened dangers and a "return to old conditions," as well as fantastic appeals to the people to assert their independence and beware of those among their leaders who want to rob them of their liberties? Does anybody know of the necessity for such warnings or the basis for such fear? It is the merest drivell. Decrepit hack-writers and senile mouth-warriors keep constantly clamoring about the "Americanism" to which they seem to think they have a sole right, and the independence on which they act as though they had an exclusive patent. A half dozen dotards, mostly scribes, harp on these few strings with a persistency that is really pitiful, when a moment's lucidity would convince them that there is not the least shadow of foundation for their silly scares and swelling rhodomontades.

Perhaps we misunderstand the texture of this community, but our opinion is that almost unannouncedly they are ready to quench the only remaining feature of the "old conditions"—the nightmare ravings of soured politicians, the cruel petulance of narrow bigots, the despicable suspicion of every Mormon's act. For our own part, with the ready determination to battle for and carry out every promise the Mormon people have ever made, and to resist to the uttermost every infringement of the rights of man and every assault upon true Americanism, we shall henceforth take particular pleasure in tearing the mask from, and exposing to the people here and the world elsewhere, the hypocrisy and baseness of the diseased few whose present course cannot be otherwise regarded than as a desire for discord, disintegration and ruin.

BRAYERS ON "AMERICANISM."

The following, from the Sacramento, Cal., Bee, is submitted for the consideration of certain persons hereabout who are almost continually boasting of their "Americanism" and "Americanizing" influence, and in doing so seek to cast improper reflections upon the patriotism of others who differ with them in religious views; not that it will work "a change of heart" in the persons referred to, for they are usually too arrogant and selfish to admit that there is real Americanism in those who do not worship at the same shrine as themselves, but just the same it is an accurate description of an existing condition:

It makes any true American citizen, one whose Americanism is not a thin veneer put on for political effect, disgusted when he hears some men prate about their Americanism; men who are either so ignorant that they do not grasp the true meaning of the Declaration of Independence and cannot fathom the glorious essence and spirit of the Constitution, or else so densely bigoted and so

maliciously prejudiced that they refuse to see and neglect to learn; men whose evident idea of liberty is unlimited license for themselves and those of their beliefs and practices, and unconstitutional restrictions for others who worship God at another altar. Not that these men are themselves worshippers in any true sense of the word. They have merely stolen the livery of certain sects in order to serve therein their own unholy political ambitions, and to do the dirty work of the devil of race prejudice and creed hatred. They are not Americans, for their acts demonstrate that they despise the very foundation principles of the American government; they are not good citizens, for a good citizen is a man who will grant to every other citizen the undiminished enjoyment of every right, prerogative and privilege under the Constitution and the laws which he claims for himself.

THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH.

In the guarantee of the right of free speech it is of course understood that the freedom relates to such speech as is not injurious to the well being of the state. In this Republic the people, individually and collectively, have the constitutional right to express their views in the form of approving, criticizing, or denouncing, if they so choose, the actions of public officials, so long as that expression can lay a good claim to respectability of character and does not work unjustifiable injury to men or institutions.

In the case of the judiciary of this land, the right has been conferred to regulate expressions and actions as to courts so that these will be given the respect which is due them in order to secure maintenance of good order and the supremacy of the law. If attorneys were allowed to be disrespectful to judges in court, or anybody could disregard the duly issued process of a judicial tribunal, it would bring into contempt that department of government which ought to be held in the highest regard. Hence courts are authorized to restrain contemptuous language and conduct. But sometimes courts have gone too far in this matter.

This latter may not be the case in the rule promulgated by the Utah Supreme court Monday, but it seems to come pretty near being so. The court formulated as rule No. 23 an order that "improper, insulting or contemptuous language or conduct of attorneys, or to or concerning each other in court, or to and concerning the court, or any member thereof, either in or out of court, will be considered and treated as a contempt of court." This, it will be noted, extends to the use of language outside of the court, and may be readily applied to any criticism wherein the judge of a court may be disagreed with, even though he may have committed a judicial blunder of the most serious character, or may be criticized as a citizen and not as a judge. This seems to be stretching the contempt blanket a little more than the occasion requires, and while it may be in harmony with the letter of the statute, the spirit thereof hardly can be that an attorney must be as formally respectful in his conversational references to a judge outside of the court room as within it. In this connection we note

the language of Chief Justice Zane in dissenting from the adoption of the rule. He said:

I dissent from the order adopting rule No. 23. Attorneys using improper language in court should be called to order and dealt with for contempt, if the language demands it. I should be very slow to call lawyers, editors, or other persons to account for contempt for language about the court out of its presence. During twenty years of service upon the bench I have not at any time deemed it necessary to do so. Moreover, insulting language to a member of the court out of court could hardly be a contempt of the court, unless designed to influence the action of the court.

It is within the right of free speech to criticize the action of the court as such; and it is within that right to sometimes apply to a person who may be a judge language of a more emphatic character that would be fitting when addressed to that same person as a member of the court. There is a vast difference between contempt for an individual who may be a judge, and contempt for the judicial position or action of that individual. While everybody may have the highest respect for the present members of the Supreme court both as men and as judges, and none have any fears that they will apply the rule to its expressed extent, yet we cannot but feel that the chief justice has laid down the proposition which would be safer for the court in due respect for itself.

THE SALARIES QUESTION.

The matter of salaries to public officers is still an important theme in the mind of the taxpayer in this State. The sentiment upon this point is so marked that the members of the State Constitutional Convention adopted a low salary schedule which received the unqualified endorsement of a great majority of the State; and the State Legislature performed no labor that was more satisfactory than following in the wake of the convention. In its action it was necessary for the Legislature to leave a large measure of the salary-fixing work to county commissioners. There was an effort to have nearly all so left, but the Legislature wisely fixed a maximum.

Now that the various county commissioners have been arranging the schedule of wages to be paid to officials and employees, much personal and political influence is being brought to bear to have the figures raised here and there to a point not commensurate with the service rendered. In some counties the commissioners have steadfastly adhered to their judgment of what was right; but in others there are indications of a softness in the backbone of some commissioners that is not altogether approved by the people.

We are not in favor of making salaries unreasonably low; the public should give a fair remuneration for service it receives. But we are opposed to this business of making public office a private snap. The eagerness of some men for office is due solely to the fact that they can get fifty or a hundred per cent more for their time there than they possibly can earn in legitimate