The matter of plural marriages has for a long time been a cause of trouble and irritation in Utah. There are in the Territory now between 2,500 and 3,000 men living in polygamy. Congress neglected to make proper laws and to take measures necessary to prevent this pernicious practice in its beginning. The consequence of this failure and neglect on the part of Congress one that there is in Utah to day at least 100,000 persons, members of the Mormon church, who believe plural marriages to be right. This hideous wrong has grown with their growth and is so intermingled with their social institutions and the affairs of every-day life that its correction is exceedingly difficult. That plural marriages ought to be stopped all outside of the Mormons admit, that it must be stopped is the voice of the people of all the States. How to accomplish this end is a problem in the solution of which the aid of reason should be invoked and not the aid of passion. So far as the past is concerned it is a serious question as to what ought to be done. To break up the family ties that have existed so long; to declare the children of plural marriages bastards: to turn women adrift in their old age. who have in good conscience believed themselves to be wives, with all the ties of a life-time broken up and doomed to an existence miserable and comfortless, are consequences to be fully considered before action is taken. If by legal enactment plural marriages in the future can be prevented and the institution of polygamy put in a condition of gradual extinction we think all reasonable expectation would be accomplished.

In later years there has been legislation by Congress looking to the prevention of plural marriages. In 1862 a law was enacted by Congress making plural marriages criminal, and the constitutionality of this law has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case above cited, Reynolds *vs.* United States. The success attained by this law in accomplishing its object was not what its friends hoped for or expected. There were some cases prosecuted under the law, but it had little or no effect in preventing plural marriages. The hostility of the Mormon people to the law prevented its execution. They were so large a part of the people of Utah that the law could not be enforced in opposition to the public sentiment created by them.

Ten years afterwards by act of 22d March, 1882, entitled an act to amend section 5352 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in reference to bigamy and for other purposes, and known as the Edmunds law, Congress enacted a very strict and rigid law to prevent plural marriages in the Territories. By this law, among other things, it was provided, that no polygamist, bigamist, or any person cohabiting with more than one woman and no woman cohabiting with a man, who has a living wife in any Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, shall be entitled to vote at any election held in any such Territory or other place, or be eligible for election or appointment to or be entitled to hold office or place of trust, honor, or emolument in, under, or for any such Territory or place, or under the United States.

In said law it is also provided for an appointment by the President of the United States of a board of five persons, who shall have full power to perform each and every duty relating to registration of votes, the conduct of elections, the receiving or registration of votes, and the canvassing and returning of the same, and the issuing of certificates or other evidence of election in said Territory. That said board was appointed by the President; that they entered upon the discharge of their duties as such and refused to enter on the register as voters all the men and women who had entered into polygamy, and that all such persons, both men and women, were disfranchised to the number of about twelve thousand. That no person living in polygamy was elected to any office in the Territory of Utah at the election held under the law above mentioned. From which it will be seen that every man and woman living in polygamy can neither vote nor hold office in the Territory of Utah.

It is claimed by some persons that there have been plural marriages in Utah since the passage of the Edmunds law, contracted and solemnized in secret, but we cannot report any well-authenticated case of plural marriage that has taken place since the passage of the Edmunds law. We think the Edmunds law has had a tendency to prevent plural marriages, and that from the reports of the commissioners appointed by the President under and by virtue of the law of March 22, 1882, we think the effect of the law has been reasonably satisfactory.

We do not think that sufficient time has elapsed to test fully the advantages and disadvantages of the Edmunds law. We think the policy should be to give it trial for a length of time sufficient to give it a fair test, and in the mean time to pass such amendments to it, or laws in aid thereof, as experience may suggest rather than to now repeal the law and pass some radical measure in its stead that would in turn have to be tested by experience.

In House bill 946 it is proposed to provide for the governing of the people of Utah, now about 160,000 people, by a commission of fifteen persons to be appointed by the President of the United States. it is proposed in said bill virtually to repeal the organic act of Utah Territory, to disfranchise every voter in the Territory, whether Mormon or not; to place 160,000 people, with all of their property and every interest, under the legislative control of fifteen persons, in whose selection the people will have no voice. This for a republican government is a very high-handed measure, and should not be restored to as long as there is reasonable hope that other means may be employed that will gradually extinguish polygamy.

We think that a law to provide that all marriages shall be solemnized in Utah Territory before some person whose duty it shall be to file a certificate of the fact in the office of the county recorder or person whose duty it shall be to record land titles in Utah, will have a tendency to prevent secret marriages, and will bring to public notice of all the marriages that take place in the Territory.

Your committee therefore report in lieu of House bill 946' and as a substitute therefor, the accompanying bill, being a bill to provide for the solemnizing of marriages in Utah Territory and requiring certificates of all marriages to be recorded and for other purposes, and recommend that the same do pass.

THE SANPETE QUARRY QUESTION.

On Wednesday last we published an article upon an alleged attempt to jump a stone quarry in possession of Edward L. Parry, near Ephraim, Sanpete County. Since that time we have been called upon by Mr. S. E. Bamberger, whose name appeared in connection with the affair somewhat prominently. He gives an explanation of the matter, which is in substance that the quarry in dispute is not the one that has been worked by Mr. Parry, but another from which the latter had not yet taken any rock. He had, however made some agricultural improvements upon the land, such as sowing a quantity of lucern. In Mr. Bamberger's opinion Mr. Parry was spreading himself too widely in the quarry business, as he already possessed a valuable property of that description. He had covered the quarry in dispute with a desert land claim, which would not hold, Mr. Bamberger stating that he holds a stronger claim at law.

In addition it is claimed by the gentleman who called upon us that Mr. Parry's whole course in relation to the Sanpete stone business has been to cramp it up within a narrow circle. At first the agency for it so far as this city is concerned, was limited to one prominent builder, through whom all orders must be given. Subsequently another prominent building firm was placed on an equal footing with the other, that being the position to-day. It is claimed by Mr. Bamberger that Mr. Parry refuses to fill any orders for this section of the Territory except through one or other of these agencies, and that he has repeatedly asked Mr. Parry to fill orders for him, but he has, after giving promises to do so, failed to pay any practical attention to them.

Our visitor asserts that this presistent course of running the stone business in a narrow channel has, in limiting the sale, stood in the way of the business of the railroad of which he is President, and his object in paying any attention to the stone business at all has been to break up this monopoly and policy of contraction. The situation has caused considerable feeling on both sides, hence the existence of the dispute.

Although we admit the pluasibility of Mr. Bamberger's reasoning in the abstract, so far as the main question is concerned we are confirmed in the position we assumed in our former article. No facts he has yet alleged tends to change it in the least. We reasoned upon the disputed ownership of the property upon moral grounds, which are on the side of Mr. Parry because he was first in possession; he took what appeared to him the best possible steps to maintain proprietorship; he stands ready to amend any defect in his preliminary proceedings in seeking to attain his object. That being his position, no subsequent claim, no matter how technically proper in point of law, can in justice supersede his, which consists of priority, possession, and legality, so far as his object or intention is concerned.

So far as relates to Mr. Parry's alleged attempt to spread himself too widely in the quarry business, we are not prepared to say much, except it be that in that regard he does not appear to be in a position much different to that in which Mr. Bamberger finds himself. Each of the principals in this dipute is already in possession of a quarry besides the one over which the contention has occurred, the gentleman last named holding that the stone from his is not inferior in any respect to that of the other.

With regard to any policy of contraction or monopoly. we are opposed to that wherever it exists. If, however, it could be proved to a demonstration that such is the marked tendency of Mr. Parry, it would be invidious to assail him on that account, in view of the prevalence of the same disposition. We mean in reference to monopoly. We believe we have heard something on this subject before, and positively are of the opinion that we could shake a stick at some things of that sort that cause Mr. Parry's little affair to pale into insignificance. Not that we think anything objectionable should be excusable in Mr. Parry or any other man because of its extensive existence, for "every tub should stand upon its own bottom."

So far as a policy of contraction is concerned, or a course that would confine a trade within limits that are inexcusably narrow, in Mr. Parry's case he would be the person who would suffer the most from it. The wider the trade in his rock the better for him. We think with Mr. Bamberger, however, that the employment of middlemen generally has that tendency, and where trade can be carried on directly between the producer and consumer it should be done. The latter gets the benefit of the profit made by the intermediate avenue, the article is cheapened, popularized and the sale increased.

We apprehend the anxiety of Mr. Bamberger to swell the trade of the railroad in which he is interested and hope to see it prosper. The enterprise shown by its owners deserves it, and we will take pleasure in supporting everything that will legitimately tend in that direction. Mr. Bamberger's business ability is well known and he is just the kind of a man to forward the material interests of a new country, because he is absolutely irrepressible, and remarkably active.

All circumstances considered, we hope no more will be heard of any further dispute on this quarry question.

THE KIND OF MEN THEY ARE.

Some men in speaking of the "Mormons" impute all that is vile to them, and in the gall of bitterness credit them with not one redeeming trait. Others, while opposed to their religious views and practices, candidly acknowledge their sincerity, self-denial, indomitable courage and, from their own point of view, untainted virtue.

Were it not for the unjust unpopularity of the Latter-day Saints they would be universally viewed as a whole as a most heroic people. Individual instances of courage under exceptionally trying circumstances exhibited by the Elders on missions are of common occurrence. After his companion had been slain and when the guns of the murderous mob were pointed at him, one young man said—at the same time calmly folding his arms over his breast—"Shoot." Another subsequently, in the same State of Georgia, when the weapons of death, in the hands of assassins, were aimed at him said: "I guess I am as ready to die now as I ever will be at any time," and resigned himself to what appeared to be his inevitable fate. A few days ago, in Mississippi, as related in these columns, one of a number of ruffians, who had assembled to murder a couple of Elders, stood with his gun cocked. The weapon being in such a position that had it been discharged it would have injured or killed some small children who were in the house, one of the intended victims of the mob, Elder Flake, coolly stepped up and put down the hammer of the gun.

Such circumstances could be told by the score, as showiug the metal of which the brethren are made. Were they engaged in another cause than proclaiming that God has spoken from the heavens once more and revealed the fulness of the everlasting Gospel they would be lauded to the skies. As it is sectarian whiffits whose narrow souls are enraged at the success of the brethren and their own want of it, make it a business to defame them.

FAVORING FREE GOVERNMENT.

Yesterday we published extracts from speeches made in Congress in relation to a bill requiring the President in his selection of Governors of the Territories to confine the appointments to persons having a two-years' residential qualification. Some of the remarks were particularly clear in relation to the right ot the people of the Territories to free government, the principles of which we have always strenuously advocated.

Mr. Brent, Delegate from Washington Territory, was particulary happy, and believing his speech will be read with interest, we present it in full:

"There is to-day, Mr. Speaker, one State in the Union that has less population than any one of the eight Territories which have been named, with one single exception. And that State has the right not only to have one of its own citizens act as its Governor, but also the right to elect that Governor by the people of that State.

Yet these Territories, and some of them with three times, yes, with five times the population of that State, their people all citizens of the United States, as loyal to the Union as any citizen of the United States, as intelligent as any other citizens of the United States, are denied the right to have one of their own citizens chosen as governor, unless the appointing power may so choose in the selection of that governor.

We all know from experience that pressure is brought to bear upon him to appoint some man from some of the older States who has become obnoxious to his friends, who are influential, and who, to get rid of him, go to the President and persuade and besiege him to appoint this friend of theirs to be the governor of some far off-off Territory, in order to expatriate him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is it right that the people of the Territory should be so far ignored that they are to be denied the right to have as their governor one of their own citizens, a man acquainted with their wants and necessities, who would know how to administer the government there better than any man who might be chosen from abroad, who has no interest in their welfare, who has no concern in remaining in the Territory except so long as his commission may last?

But the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Eaton) and other gentlemen have suggested that we can not put this limitation upon the appointing power of the President as to require the selection of the governor of a Territory to be made from citizens of that Territory. Mr. Speaker, was Congress obliged to pass the law giving to the President the power to appoint these governors? Is Congress obliged to continue that law in force? Has not Congress the power to-day to repeal that law and allow the people of the Territories, as they ought to be allowed, to elect their governors for themselves? If Congress will not go this far, then I say it is just and right to these Territories that a citizen of the Territory, one who has an interest in the prosperity of the Territory, should be selected.

It is said that there should be some one to represent the Government of the United States in the making of the Territorial laws. Why should not the people of the Territories be allowed to make their own laws? But you do not go that far under this bill. Congress still retains the power to annul every statute passed by every Territory. You still reserve the power to wipe out all Territorial legislation, as well as the Legislature that made it, at any moment you please. Yet gentlemen are afraid that power will be absorbed by the people of the Territories to the detriment of the Government of the United States.

Why, sir, this government is based upon the right of men to self-government. This right is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, and throughout the Constitution it is intended to be secured to the people of the United States. When the Northwest Territory was organized it was for the avowed purpose of giving the people of that Territory the right of self-government so far as it might be compatible with their situation. The reason full power of self-government was not given to them was simply that they were not considered able to support a government of their own, not because they were incapable, mentally or otherwise. Those people were regarded as equals in every respect with the people of the States, except that they had not the adequate population and means to support the burdens of government; consequently the full power of self-government was withheld by Congress until, and only until they might be able to support a government for themselves. Most of the States that have been admitted into the Union from a Territorial condition have been admitted with far less population than now exists in any of the Territories of the United States.

The New York Bible Society agents are again stocking up the hotel bedrooms with bibles.