The anger of these "Liberal" perverters of facts and laws and judicial decisions over the outcome of the Bennett case, is caused by the quietus which it puts upon the "Liberal" scheme to shut out a number of present monogamists who were once polygamists, from the rights and privileges of the elective franchise, to which they are lawfully entitled when they can in good faith take the oath provided in the Edmunds-Tucker Act. And this is proven in the venom with which the attack on Judge Zane closes, in which his decisions is declared to be "a direct slap is deface of the Edmunds law," in the quotation of the annexed paragraph from the DESERET NEWS, which seems to be the essence of gall and wormwood to the "Liberal" conspirators:

"And now let it be understood as judicially settled that any citizen who is not now a polygamist in practice, and who can take the oath provided in the Edmunds-Tucker Act, is entitled to register and vote, and that it is not only his right but his duty to do so and to help his fellow-citizens in maintaining good order and good government."

We take pleasure in repeating this paragraph. Not so much because it seems to vex our opponents as that it is important and should be fully understood. And we are quite willing that the "Liberal" organ shall copy it again and again, for it is true and proper, and forms a striking contrast to the abuse and misrepresentation which usually fill up its scurrilous columns.

UNJUST AND IMPOLITIC.

THE decision of Judge Anderson, rendered October 31, in the matter of the application of Wm. C. Dunbar for a re-issue of his naturalization papers, which had been lost, and of which there was no record, has been widely and unfavorably commented upon. The general opinion appears to be that the ruling was unfair and its reasoning incorrect and illogical.

Although the ruling was somewhat lengthy, the basis of the judge's conclusion, as set forth by himself, was that the applicant, on his own admission, had been guilty of polygamy. It was admitted by his honor that he had never been convicted of that offense, but the admission of the applicant was deemed sufficient to establish the fact.

Mr. Dunbar made no such admission. He stated that he married a plural wife in 1858, and that she died in 1883. Judge Anderson holds that this is a confession of being guilty of polygamy, but it is not. That offense is the act of marrying a plural wife. There was no law on the subject at the time Mr. Dunbar entered into the relationship, therefore his act at that time was legally innocent.

To offset this position his honor states that the applicant, after the passage of the Poland Act (which was approved June 23rd, 1874) continued to live with his plural wife in violation of that enactment. The judge is at sea on this point. The statute named by him in this connection has no bearing whatever upon polygamy, except in providing for appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States, being "An Act in Relation to Courts and Judicial Officers in the Territory of Utah." The gentleman is evidently laboring under a misapprehension as to the character of that law — hence his mistake. It was not till 1882 that—by the Edmunds Act—the living together of persons in the polygamous relation was made an offense under the law. The applicant's plural wife died the following year, and although he admitted his past relationship there was no admission before the court that he had even violated that statute, the Judge's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding.

Among the numerous logical conflicts that appear in Judge Anderson's reasoning is the position assumed in relation to sentiment and law. He holds up, as an antidote to the fact that there was no law against polygamy when the applicant entered that relation, what he designates as the sentiment of the Christian world which held it to be immoral. This sentiment of the Christian world which holds aloft the Bible as its rule of faith and guide to salvation, is as incongruous as a subsequent, expression of Judge Anderson's when he asserts that the *law* governs these questions. Seeing that such is the case the introduction of sentimental matter is so much surplusage.

His honor granted that, with the exception of the past and extinct polygamous ingredient, the character of the applicant was blameless. Upon that obliterated element alone the application was denied, yet the only ground for supposition appearing in the whole proceeding that Mr. Dunbar had been at any time in conflict with any law of this country was the fact of his plural wife having lived one year after the passage of the Edmunds act. And then it would have to be presumed that he lived with her during that brief time in the "habit and repute" of marriage. It was held that the admission of the defendant that he had been a polygamist had the same force in connection with the application as if he had been convicted of polygamy. It has already been shown that there was no admission whatever of an offense against the law, and if the declaration of Mr. Dunbar can be taken on one point it is competent upon another—he declared his intention to keep the law. Besides all this he is known in the community—including all classes—as an upright citizen. The denial of his application is, in our opinion, both unjust and impolitic.

A "TOUGH" TRIO.

THE quarrel between the trio of leading anti-"Mormon" agitators in the Old Country grows apace. A short time ago we published information culled from a Welsh paper concerning an anti-Jarman meeting held by Bolitho and Barnfield, the two lieutenants of the first named unsavory character, in which that repulsive individual was very correctly denounced as a first-class fraud. He was charged with defrauding the two B's and getting away with the spoils of the anti-"Mormon" campaign.

The mixture of knave and lunatic (Jarman) is seeking to get even with his former henchmen, who have practically dropped their assaults upon the Saints to get after him with a sharp stick. The *South Wales News* gives an account of proceedings of a trial on a charge planted by Jarman against Bolitho and Barnfield for "feloniously carrying away two books entitled, Uncle Sam's Abscess—Startling Revelations by William Jarman, H. G. L. and T. C. K.," whatever those initials may mean.

The trial was conducted at Neath, and the evidence was racy. It appears from it that when the complainant advertised to lecture, his antagonists "bobbed" up serenely ahead of his dates and prepared the people to give him a warm reception. Jarman asserted on the stand that their lectures were disgusting and indecent. Counsel for the defendants stated that they were Jarman's own lectures "beautified and