

THE DESERT WEEKLY

PIONEER PUBLICATION ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION.

ESTABLISHED 1850. JUNE 1850.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

NO. 2.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1890.

VOL. XLI.

JEALOUSY.

There's a fearful tyrant roaming
Up and down this little world,
And where'er he gets a lodging
Thickly envious darts are hurled.
Eyes see through no rose-lit lenses,
Ears convey no well meant word;
But with senses all perverted,
Every ugly passion's stirred.

If he stops beside the hearthstone,
He will vent his bitter ire,
Till upon its sacred altar
Fiercely burns unhallowed fire
Until every tie is severed
Which binds his kindred heart,
And from home's once happy shelter,
Peace will evermore depart.

Who, that's seen this evil monster,
Who, that's heard its hateful growl—
Seen the strife which marks his pathway,
And his dark and gloomy scowl—
Would a moment give an entrance
To their heart for one so vile,
Banning from its sacred precincts
Love and charity's sweet smile.

Oh, be watchful; he is going
Up and down the wide world o'er,
And where'er he seeks admittance,
Shut in haste the bosom's door;
Lest, too late you sit repenting
At the folly you may see;
For this fearful, roaming tyrant
Bears the name of jealousy.

—B. Clint n, in the *Harvard Fireside*.

PETITION FOR REHEARING.

In the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1890.
The late Corporation of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints vs. The United States—No. 1031.

George Romney et al. vs. the United States—No. 1054.

The appellants in the above en-tioned causes, under the rules of this court, submit their petition for re-hearing, and assign the following causes therefor:

FIRST.

If it shall be finally determined that Congress possessed the power to pass the act of March 3, 1897, disincorporating the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," and that said incorporation thereby became dissolved, the decree of the court below is unauthorized by said act of March 3, 1897, under which it professes to have been entered.

By section 17 of said act, after an-nulling the legislation for the incor-poration of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," and declaring that said corporation was thereby dissolved, it was provided that the Attorney-General of the United States should take such pro-ceedings in the Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah as should be proper to exe-cute the foregoing provisions of this section, and to wind up all affairs of said incorporation conformably to law. But nowhere is any au-thority conferred upon the Supreme Court of the Territory of Utah to take cognizance of any suit or suits that might arise out of the provi-sions of the third section of the act of July 1, 1862, relating to the ac-quisition and holding of real estate by religious corporations within the Territories of the United States. On the contrary, by the thirteenth section of the act of March 3, 1887, it was made the duty of the Attorney-General of the United States to institute and prose-cute proceedings to forfeit and es-cheat to the United States the prop-erty of corporations obtained or held in violation of Section 3 of said act of July 1, 1862, and in the findings of facts it is stated that such pro-ceedings had been instituted and were pending in the proper district courts of the United States within said Territory, by informations filed on behalf of the United States.

But notwithstanding that fact, found in the findings of fact, the court below proceeded to adjudge and decree that all of the real estate set out in the findings of fact was the property of and belonged to the late corporation of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," and the same was held in trust for said corpora-tion, and furthermore, that the legal title to said real estate, and every part and parcel thereof, had been acquired by said late corporation and its trustees subsequently to July 1, 1862, and that prior to said date neither said corporation nor its trustees had any legal title or estate in and to said real estate or any part thereof, and that none of said real estate except block 87, in plat A in Salt Lake City, known as Temple Block, had ever been used as buildings, or grounds appur-

tenant thereto, for the purpose of worship of God, or of parsonages connected therewith, or for burial grounds by the said late corporation of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," nor was said real estate, except that part known as the Temple Block, necessary for such purposes by the incorporated relig-i-ous sect known as the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." Thus adjudging and decreeing against the appellants the questions involved in the several informations pending in the district courts of said Territory.

SECOND.

It is nowhere provided in any act of Congress relating to the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," or the Church property held by church corporations in the Territories of the United States, that any of such property should be forfeited and escheated to the United States except the real estate held in violation of the third sec-tion of the act of 1862, and by the thirteenth section of the act of March 3, 1887, the property which shall have been declared to have escheated to the United States, un-der the provisions of the first-named act, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior and the proceeds applied to the use and benefit of common schools in the Territory in which such property may be. This property was not be-fore the court except as it had taken the same into temporary custody by its receiver, but the personal property of the Church which had been held and administered by the said corporation for the use and benefit of the Church, and which the law did not attempt to declare forfeited, is by the decree of the court below held to have escheated by operation of law, and to have become the property of the United States, subject "to the costs and expenses of this suit and of the receivership by said court in-stituted and ordered."

That Congress did not intend by the legislation in question to inter-fere with church property any fur-ther than to appropriate and apply that which might have been acquir-ed in violation of the third section of the act of 1862, is strongly sup-ported by the fact that, in the act of March 3, 1887, which undertakes to,