

order on the Titling store, of the kind which the poor who are aided by the Church, and others into whose possession the scrip comes, may take to the storehouse and exchange for provisions, food, etc. It is not "money" at all, but merely a due bill or order for merchandise, such as is common in many parts of the country. The "curlies" are worthy of a place in the Birchard or any other library, but the Journal's idea thereof is a good thing to be quickly rid of if one desires accurate information.

OF THE PARTRIDGE FAMILY.

Bishop Edward Partridge was the first Bishop ordained in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He died in Nauvoo, his death doubtless hastened by the persecutions which he endured in Missouri. He left several children, three of whom—Edward Partridge, president of the Utah Stake of Zion, Mrs. Emily P. Young, of this city, and Mrs. Caroline P. Lyman, of Millard county—are still living; and he has numerous descendants living in different parts of the State. In a late issue of the New York Tribune the following obituary notice appears, with a very good likeness of the late Bishop Partridge's brother, James Harvey Partridge, and as it may be of interest to the relatives and friends of the family, we republish it. The statement has been made that nearly all the early members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints were either of New England birth or of New England parentage, and the Partridge family, as will be seen from the obituary, is an old New England family:

James Harvey Partridge, probably one of the oldest of New York's public school teachers, died suddenly on Sunday evening at his home at Cranford, N. J. He was in his usual health up to within a short time of his death.

Mr. Partridge was descended from the old Puritan stock of New England. He was the son of William and Jemima (Bidwell) Partridge, and was born on his father's farm, Pittsfield, Berkshire county, Mass., on June 8, 1810. Mr. Partridge, who was, on the maternal side, a near relative of Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme court, was graduated from Union college in 1838. In April of the following year he came to New York for the purpose of following a scholastic career. From 1839 to 1844 he served as assistant teacher in public school No. 3. Then he was appointed principal of the old ward school No. 33, in West Thirty-fifth street, near Ninth avenue. In 1856 he was made principal of the then ward school, now a grammar school, in West Twenty-eighth street, near Sixth avenue. He occupied this place until the summer of 1870, when, resolving to relinquish active routine work, he retired to his farm at Cranford. Subsequently he devoted himself mainly to literary work. He married, in August, 1858, Sarah K. Farnham, of Bidford, Vt., who died in 1883. During her life Mrs. Partridge was prominently identified with charitable work, and was officially connected with many charitable and philanthropic institutions in this city. James F. Partridge, the only child of the union, died in 1870.

Mr. Partridge gained considerable repute as an author of scientific and educational works, and was a frequent contributor to scientific publications. He

was well known also as the possessor of a wide range of knowledge on educational subjects, and as a learned Biblical scholar. He was said to have one of the finest private reference libraries, and one of the best collections of stereopticon views in this part of the country. In politics Mr. Partridge was a staunch Republican. Inducements were frequently extended to him to enter public life, but he always showed a disinclination to avail himself of opportunities in this direction.

The funeral services will be held tomorrow at his home in Cranford, at 12:30 p. m.

THE WATCHWORD.

The lawmakers of Utah—and this includes also municipal and county authorities when they assume legislative functions—need be left in no doubt as to the feeling of the people with reference to official salaries and emoluments. The State, its leading counties, and its larger cities are heavily in debt, and their people are tax-ridden well-nigh to the limit of endurance. One of the arguments against Statehood was that the boon would be attended with vastly increased expense and heavier burdens upon the citizen. The News regarded the argument as unworthy, and still says—for liberty is a treasure not to be measured by dollars and cents, and it is not to be considered too costly at any honorable price. At the same time we placed ourselves on record, and here reaffirm the position, as prepared to fight against extravagance, waste, high salaries and high taxation. The people cannot and should not stand it. Their eyes will be upon the men in the Legislature, in the county courts, and in the city councils who are so heartlessly indifferent to their constituents' condition as to plunge wildly into the expenditure of public funds. And the News will take especial pleasure in giving all such officials the notoriety they deserve, to the end that their names may be known in honorable official remembrance no more forever.

Retrenchment everywhere, in every salary, every disbursement and in every line to the limits of exact necessity carefully provided for—this must be the policy. And woe to the party or the person who fails to heed it!

LAWSUITS BETWEEN CHURCH MEMBERS.

These inquiries come from a "Subscriber" at Colonia Juarez, Mexico:

First—Can a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints enter a suit in a district or circuit court, against another member of the same Church for debts or any other civil case, without first preferring charges and passing through the Church court?

Second—If such suit is entered by one member of the Church against another, would it become the duty of Bishops to withdraw the hand of fellowship from the member who entered the suit?

Third—Are the rules uniform in Mexico, the United States and Canada?

The reply to the first question is affirmative in a large number of cases. In cases involving title to lands, water, and others of like character, the Church courts would not consider them if re-

quested to do so, as the Church discipline is such that it will not attempt the adjustment of any controversy where there might be a possibility of conflict with the laws of the land. The Church courts are virtually tribunals of friendly arbitration, and no more. In civil cases such as proceedings for debt, disputed accounts, etc., outside of the exception noted, members of the Church are expected to have recourse to the Church arbiters or courts, so that the dispute may be settled in the amicable feeling which should exist between brethren, and without expense to either party, before proceeding to litigation which is always attended with ill feeling and an outlay of money. In applying this rule, corporations whose stockholders may be Church members are not included, and have no standing in the Church courts, which are for the benefit and discipline of members individually.

As to the second question, if a Church member disregarded the rule to settle difficulties within the Church as far as possible, it would be the duty of the Bishop to consider a complaint made against him for his violation of Church discipline. As to the withdrawal of fellowship, the Bishop's court must pass on individual cases according to their merits, in the judgment which those in authority exercise.

Third—The rule is uniform throughout the Church—the laws of the land must never be infringed upon.

LYNCHING.

To the horrible details, and to the number, of lynchings committed during the year 1895 in the United States, more newspaper attention was directed and more public indignation excited than toward the same class of crimes in any other year in our history. This is fairly to be regarded as indicating a proper and desirable condition of public sentiment, for the record shows that, at least in number, cases of lynching have been steadily decreasing during the last three years. There were ten less in 1894 than in 1893, and nineteen less in 1895 than in 1894, the number last year being 171.

But past experience unfortunately reveals that periods of decrease in this form of murderous lawlessness have generally been followed by the other extreme; in 1890 only 127 lynchings are reported, but the next year there were 192, and in 1892, 235; and those who argue from analogy are therefore disposed to regard it as reasonable to expect a jump to 200 or over next year, quite as much so, at least, as a drop to a lower number than last year's record shows. The total number of mob murders in the United States in the years beginning with 1885 and ending with 1895 is 1,977, which is a startling comment on our civilization.

As to the record of last year, it is worthy of note that in twenty-three of the forty-four states there were no lynchings at all, and that the only states north of Mason and Dixon's line in which mob law ruled were California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Nebraska, South Dakota and Washington. Utah was then classed as a Territory, but happily did not con-