tribute a case of the twelve lynchings charged against the territories. Still more notable is the fact—and it ought to be borne in mind by and modify the expressions of lecturers and writers who discuss this great national disgrace — that in what are called the northern states there has been an increase in lynchings of ten over those in 1893 and of three over those in 1894, the number for 1895 being 27.

Language is but faintly capable of expressing the horror and the shame with which law-abiding people regard these outrages upon order and civilization. They constitute one of the darkest blots upon American history; and much of our boasted advancement will properly excite a sneer from foreign observers until we shall be able to eradicate the hideous fact that each year an average of two hundred human beings are lawlessly murdered by infuriated mobs of their fellow citizens.

THE TEMPLE LOT CASE.

Among the decisions rendered by the United States Supreme court yesterday, January 27, were two in which Utah people are directly interested. One was the case of William Garland against the Bear River canal company, on appeal from the Utah Supreme court, in which Mr. Garland's appeal was dismissed. The other involved the Temple lot in Jackson county, Missouri. In this case the organization called the Church of Christ, commonly known as the Hedrickite church, had possession of the Temple lot. The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, generally known as the Josephite church, set up a claim to the property, alleging that that organization was the successor of the Church of which the Prophet Joseph Smith was President, and began suit to gain possession of the property. The Hedrickites contended that the Josephites were not the legal successors, and based their own title on purchases under tax sales and in various ways. The case was first heard before Judge Phillips, in the district court, Missouri, and he upheld the succession claim of the Reorganization. The case was taken up to the circuit court of appeals, Judge Caldwell presiding, and Judge Phillips's ruling was reversed as being contrary to the facts. Thus the "legal adjudication of succession," by which some persons seemed to place a great store, was set aside by the higher court as illegal.

From this decision of the circuit court of appeals the Reorganization dissented, and took steps to have it set aside. This was through an application for a rehearing, which was fully presented to the court. The proceedings and result are thus succinctly set forth in the following press dispatch:

ST. LOUIS, Dec. 10.—Several important opinions were handed down by the court of appeals at its sitting yesterday. One was of the Church of Christ, of Independence, Mo., et al, as appellants, vs the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, appellees. The decision was adverse to the interests of the Reorganized church, as their petition for a rehearing was overruled. One of the most important points in the controversy was as to which faction taught the doctrine originally promulgated by Joseph Smith, and each accused the other of heresy. The orthodoxy of polygamy, among other things, was argued at great length, and an elaborate attempt was made to show that such an institution was never authorized by the founders of Mormonism.

From this ruling the Reorganization appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, by asking for a writ of certiorari. This review of the case, the dispatches from Washington relate, was denied by the Supreme court, which thus affirms Judge Caldwell's opinion, and gives the Temple lot to the Hedrickites. It is held by them through purchase, as stated, while to the question of succession raised in the controversy between the two parties litigant there is no legal decision in force; if any is to be implied upon this point from the whole proceedings in the case, it is adverse to the Reorganization rather than otherwise, but virtually the question is just where it was before the Temple lot suit was instituted.

CRITICISM FROM THREADNEEDLE STREET.

The governor of the Bank of England is a very important and generally a very conservative authority in the financial world. His views carry much weight, as they ought to do; and it would be deemed the hight of temerity, if not impudence, for any one of less experience and responsibility to venture to criticize his monetary suggestions. Nevertheless, there is more or less of this temerity or impudence on daily tap in the western American newspapers of the present time, and if his worship will read his exchanges regularly, his digestion will be kept in a constant state of high activity.

While his intentions appear to be honorable, his manner of fault-finding with and his general meddlesomeness in the affairs of this country are becoming really obnoxious. He not only wants us to know that British confidence in American securities was seriously diminished by the Venezuela message, but he also wants us to know that he does not approve of the popular reception which the message was accorded. Of course this is a great sorrow to us all, but there seems to be no present way of correcting it at this late day. Then he finds cause for complaint in what he calls "railway defaults," which, however, he is good enough to say are not new elements of distrust. But currency derangement is one of our grave crimes—the money question persistently refuses to stay settled; and most grievous of all is the fact that "your Congress declines to insert the word 'gold' in its bonds, which raises a doubt in the minds of the investors."

There ought to be consolation for the governor of the Bank of England, and for foreign capitalists generally, in the fact that no one is forcing either American money or American bonds upon them. If they do not like our securities, because of our sentiments, they are not required to take them. Sentiment is one of the last things with which your bondholder has to deal; it rarely enters into his calculations at all. He wants his interest regularly, and his principal at maturity; and this, no matter what American policy or sentiment has been, he has always had on time so far as government bonds are concerned. Moreover, he has always had his money in his favorite gold, being in this respect more humored than perhaps the strict letter of the bond required. Just what actual ground he has for complaint is therefore not clear; and as to grumbling being one of his time-honored traits and distinguishing attributes—the fact does not make it any the less offensive or intolerable. His money bags ought to receive his attention to the exclusion of all criticism of those who keep them so well-filled.

A STALE LIE'S PROGRESS.

The bogus interview with the alleged "Bishop" Hart in Kansas, the complete falsity of which has been shown several times in these columns, is still swinging round the journalistic circle, having progressed now to the sphere of the weekly and weakly religious press. The Christian Statesman of the 18th inst. quotes it with much unction, and as a concluding comment says: "The Mormon problem has advanced to a more dangerous stage, as the future will prove, unless we are greatly mistaken."

The last clause is the only thing which will save the Christian Statesman from the charge of bearing false witness and being a false prophet. That the land is still afflicted with blind, bigoted and small-hearted editors of religious papers is easily seen when such senseless stuff as the Bishop Hart-Kansas interview, in which there is not a single scintilla of truth, is republished and credited after a dozen denials of it have been given and accepted by all who love truth better than a lie.

THE VACANT JUDGESHIP.

It is urged, with a great deal of truthfulness and force, that the judiciary should be separated from and placed far above common party politics. The NEWS heartily endorses the idea, and has defended it many a time and oft. A new occasion for its enunciation comes now in the voluntary retirement of Judge Howat of this judicial district from the position to which the suffrages of the people elected him last November. That he is a Democrat and was nominated by a Democratic convention, is a well-known fact; but that he could not have been elected solely by Democratic votes is equally well known. His success at the polls was therefore the triumph of a majority who desired the success in judicial offices of the best fitted nominees, regardless of politics. Practically he was under obligation to hold the office as a non-partisan, a promise which he no doubt sincerely intended, and which his colleagues no doubt sincerely intend, to fulfill.

His resignation, therefore, seems to make necessary the selection of a non-partisan successor. It need not by any means follow that the man chosen to