

BECOMING EXERCISED.

A SPECIAL to the NEWS states that Associate Justice Anderson delivered his charge to the grand jury at Beaver, December 3d. He informed that body that bigamy, polygamy, adultery and fornication are common crimes in this Territory and that many of the people are guilty of them.

This reminds us of what took place a few days ago before the same Judge, when he was officiating in the Third District Court in this city. When members of the "Mormon" Church appeared as applicants for naturalization they were questioned by the whips of the "Liberal" party as to whether they believed in the principle of plural marriage, and whether they had committed any of the offenses defined in the Edmunds-Tucker Act.

As an offset attorneys for the "Mormon" applicants asked "Liberal" aliens who appeared in court for the same purpose whether they had been guilty of adultery or fornication. Whereat one of the active whips of that party treated the matter disdainfully, stating that 999 out of every 1000 males who had arrived at maturity had been in that business. Of course he meant the males of the non-"Mormon" section. One of the witnesses for an applicant made a similar declaration.

Judge Anderson came to the relief of that portion of the "Liberal" 999 who might appear for admission to citizenship. He ruled substantially that a few breaches of sexual morality were neither here nor there as affecting a man's moral status. Unless he habitually engaged in such practices, he could not be designated as a man of bad moral character and there would be no barrier on that ground to his admission to citizenship.

Can it be that Judge Anderson begins to think that sexual offenses, when committed by the liberal proportion defined by Mr. Lippman, are really serious, or has he reference to another section of the community? In these times consequences appear to depend a good deal upon "who is who." "The times," in a judicial sense, seem to be sadly "out of joint."

THE COMMISSIONERS COMING.

THE Utah Commissioners have been notified by the Secretary of the Interior that they are needed at their post of duty. They, or a majority of them, will be here next

week and are expected to arrive on Monday the 9th inst. All citizens who desire a fair and free election will welcome these officials, and rejoice that at least an opportunity will be afforded them to do justly by both parties in the political contest. That deputy registrars have been discriminating against members of the People's Party is too notorious to be disputed. There is yet time for these officers to purge their record and make some show of fairness. It is a dangerous thing to conspire against the free exercise of the elective franchise. Any man who does this exposes himself to the operations of the criminal law. If the "Liberals" have, as they claim, a majority of the legal votes in this city, there is no need to resort to the contemptible tricks and subterfuges and obstructions which have characterized their conduct of this campaign. But what could be expected after the record of its managers is read and considered? We hail with pleasure the coming of the Commission.

JUDGE ZANE'S LATEST RULING.

AS ANNOUNCED in Tuesday evening's DESERET NEWS, Judge Zane has decided to hear applications for naturalization each day from 10 to half-past 10 o'clock in the morning, and from half-past 4 to 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Also to permit only the District Attorney or his assistant to take part in the examinations. Suggestions of other attorneys may be made to the District Attorney. This ruling, the full text of which is given in another column, was in consequence of a request made in behalf of the District Attorney, who desired to be represented in all applications for citizenship, and to have a time fixed when they should be heard.

The order of the court will have the effect of securing more order in the court. Every jackanapes will not now be allowed to obstruct proceedings and air his immoral views of morality, as was permitted during examinations before Judge Anderson. But does it not look a little peculiar that no sooner has it been ruled by the Court that no "Mormons" need apply for naturalization, than a rule is established which prevents any awkward questions as to "the good moral character" of "Liberal" applicants? While "Mormon" applications were heard, any objector was permitted to interfere; now that they are excluded, no one but the "Liberal" officials

may take part in the examination. Of course that is all fair and just, and there is no purpose in this but the facilitation of business.

Judge Zane announces that "for the present, at least, the court will respect" the decision of Judge Anderson, and therefore any person who is "at present a member in good standing and in full fellowship of the Mormon Church" will not be admitted to citizenship.

At the same time His Honor wishes it to be understood that "every man, whether a Mormon or Gentile, that appears before his court, shall be treated with respect—his rights will be regarded and he will be treated impartially and fairly." How this will be done when all that is necessary in order to exclude a man from naturalization is to show that he is a "Mormon," is rather difficult to comprehend.

A man of such "good moral character" that not a speck or a flaw can be found in his moral record, who believes the Constitution to be an inspired instrument and that all laws made in pursuance thereof are supreme, who is ready to make oath of allegiance to the government and to obey the laws of Congress in regard to polygamy and other offences therein defined, who has resided in this country five years, and in this district one year or more, and who is known to be sober, industrious, peaceable and law-abiding in every particular, cannot be admitted to citizenship, solely on the ground of his religion, namely, that he is a member of the "Mormon" Church. But a "Gentile" who has committed sexual sins which are classed as crimes in the statutes of the United States as well as in the moral code of Christendom, who occasionally gets drunk, who is sometimes quarrelsome and disorderly, who has no religion at all, may be admitted to citizenship as "a man of good moral character attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same." Does not this look as if the momentous question to be decided was, is he a member of the "Liberal" party or not, if so admit him, if not exclude him?

Judge Zane says of the decision of Judge Anderson, "It cannot be said that the effect of the decision is to interfere with religious beliefs or the free exercise of religion." Indeed! Well, suppose the decision was that no person who is a member of the Catholic Church shall be admitted