trusts, large tracts and parcels of real estate exceeding in value $50,000, to wit:

First—All of block eighty-seven (87) in plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, known as the "Temple Block," of the value of $500,000 and upwards.

Second—All of lot one (1), block eighty-five (85) plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, of the value of $50,000.

Third—Part of lot five (5), in block eighty-eight (88), plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, commencing at the northwest corner of said lot five (5) and running thence south ten (10) rods; thence east ten (10) rods; thence north twelve (12) rods; thence west ten (10) rods, and thence south two (2) rods, to the place of beginning, of the value of $25.000.

Fourth—Part in block eighty-eight(88), plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, commencing at a point ten (10) rods south of the northwest corner of said lot seven (7); thence running east five and one half (5½) rods; thence south five (5) rods; thence west five and one half (5½) rods, and thence north five (5) rods, to the place of beginning, of the value of $5000.

The real estate situate in said Salt Lake City above described and known as the Temple Block and all buildings and improvements upon the same, and which said block and buildings were at the date of the dissolution of said corporation as aforesaid of the value of $500,000 and upwards, and had been acquired by said corporation subsequently to the passage of the act of July 1, A.D. 1862, above mentioned, and which it acquired and held in violation of said act of July 1, 1862, being in excess of $50,000 in value, and the west half thereof only was and is exempt from the forfeitnre prescribed in said act by virtue of the provisions of said act of Congress of March 3, 1887.

Fifth—This court is furthermore informed and given to understand further that in addition to the real estate known as the "Temple block," held and used as aforesaid, the said corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on the third day of March, A. D. 1887, when it became and was dissolved as aforesaid, had theretofore and subsequently to the passage of the act of Congress of July 1, 1862, acquired and was, at the date of its dissolution, holding in the name of certain persons, unknown to plaintiff, the following described pieces and parcels of real estate, to-wit:

First—All of lot one (1), block eighty-five (85), plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory.

Second—Part of lot five (5), in block eighty-eight (88), plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, commencing at the northwest corner of said lot five, and running thence south ten (10) rods; thence east ten (10) rods; thence north twelve (12) rods; thence west ten (10) rods and thence south two (2) rods to the place of beginning.

Third—Part of lot seven (7), in block eighty-eight (88), plat A, Salt Lake City survey, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, commencing at a point ten (10) rods south of the northwest corner of said lot seven (7) and running thence east five and one-half (5½) rods; thence south five (5) rods; thence west five and one-half (5½) rods and thence north five (5) rods to the place of beginning, all of which tracts or parcels of land are of the value of $80,000, which was all and entire in excess of the amount of real estate which said corporation was by law entitled to hold, no part of said real estate was held or occupied by said corporation as a building or ground appurtenant thereto for the purposes of the worship of God or parsonage connected therewith or as burial ground.

This information is filed by the said United States against said real estate by leave of the Supreme Court of this Territory.

Wherefore, and by reason of the illegal action of said corporation of said Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in acquiring and holding real estate in excess of the value of $50,000, and by virtue of the provisions of the acts of Congress aforesaid, all of the real estate hereinbefore described, except the first above mentioned tract known as the "Temple block," became and were subject to be forfeited and escheated to the United States, and since the date of the dissolution of said corporation as aforesaid there has been no legal claimant or owner of said real estate except the United States.

Wherefore, it is prayed that due process issue in that behalf as of monition, or in such other form as to this honorable Court may seem proper, to all parties claiming an interest in said real estate, or any portion thereof to appear on the return of said process and duly intervene herein by claim and plea to the premises and due proceedings being had thereon, that for the causes aforesaid the said real estate and all of the same, except such portion as is exempt from forfeiture, as above set out, be deemed as escheated and forfeited and declared the property of the United States, to be used and disposed of according to law, and as shall be directed by this honorable Court.

W. H. H. MILLER,
Attorney-General United States.
CHAS. S. VARIAN,
United States Attorney for Utah Territory.

THE ATTACHMENT.

Deputy United States Marshal Swan yesterday received the following monition:

"In the matter of the proceedings for the forfeiture of certain real estate, formerly owned and held by the corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The President of the United States of America to the marshal of the district of Utah Territory, greeting:

Whereas, information has been filed in the Third District Court for the Territory of Utah, on the 12th day of February, 1891, by the Hon. Attorney-General of the United States and Charles S. Varian, United States Attorney for the Territory of Utah, on behalf of the United States of America, against the real estate property described in the above information."

Mr. Swan immediately proceeded to attach the property in question. The seizure consisted of serving notices on the occupants of the property, where such could be found, and afterwards having such notices filed and recorded in the County Recorder's office.

REJECTING MORMON JURORS.

The February session of the Third District Court of the Territory of Utah was opened February 16, at 10 o'clock, Chief Justice Zane presiding. There was a full attendance of members of the bar, and a large number of spectators were present.

CALLING THE GRAND JURY.

This was the first business proceeded with. Clerk McMillan read out the names on the list previously drawn, but only seven of the gentlemen answered at this time. They were as follows: Messrs. George Moore, Park City; John Sharp, Salt Lake; James Sharp, Salt Lake; T. C. Wright, Wm. J. Paine, C. E. Wantland and George E. Wallace.

Assistant District Attorney Critchlow, in the absence of Mr. Varian, put the usual statutory questions to these gentlemen with a view to ascertaining their fitness and qualifications to discharge the duty required of them.

Mr. Moore, in reply to Mr. Critchlow, said he was raised in the "Mormon" Church but had never believed in polygamy. Mr. Moore was accepted.

Mr. John Sharp, Jr., said that, as a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, he formerly believed in polygamy, but did not now. His opinion had changed, more particularly since the passage of the law prohibiting it, in 1882.

Mr. Critchlow—We challenge this gentleman (to Mr Sharp): Do you mean to say it would be part of the duties of your office, as an Elder of the Church to teach the people upon the question of plural marriage?

Mr. Sharp—No.

Q—Does not that come within the doctrines which the Elders teach?

A.—It is not compulsory.

To Judge Zane—My understanding is that it would be wrong for a man to live in unlawful cohabitation under existing circumstances.

Mr. Critchlow—Referring to statutory enactments?

A.—Yes.

Judge Zane—You do not know what the effect of the recent manifesto has been among the people, whether it would be considered a violation of the creed of the Church for a man to enter into polygamy now?.

A.—I think it would be, certainly.

Mr. James Sharp was then taken in hand. To Mr. Critchlow he said: I am a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and have been for many years, but I hold no active office. I am a Seventy.

Q.—Is it not your duty as a Seventy to teach the doctrines of the Church?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Also to teach the doctrine of polygamy and the having of more wives than one?

A.—No, sir, and never was.

Q.—Did you believe in polygamy?

A.—Not under present conditions and existing circumstances.

Q.—When did you form this opinion?

A.—I have not believed it was right to practice polygamy, more particularly since the passage of the Edmunds law in 1882.

Q.—Did you not consider it right under the doctrines of the Church?

A.—I think it was permissive for the members of the Church to practice polygamy under certain conditions up to last October.

Q.—With regard to the manifesto or declaration of last October, do you not understand that to be merely a declaration of the principle of the Church?

A.—I understand it to be a cessation of the practice of polygamy by the voice of the Church.

Q.—That manifesto does not go to the actual belief, but as to the practice of polygamy?

A.—My understanding of it is that it goes to the practice of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation.