er the possession of certain realty, as follows:

No. 1630, against David M. Stewart et al., to recover a parcel about 20 rods square in block 18, plat A, Ogden City, known as the Tithing Yard.

No. 1672, against R. J. Taylor and Lewis W. Shurtliff, to recover lots 8 and 9 in block 8, plat B, Ogden City, being 2 acres of land, known as "Tabernacle Grounds."

No. 1671, against Robert M. Quarris and the Church Association of Weber Stake of Zion, to recover the greater part of block 46, plat A, Ogden City, known as the Shurtliff residence.

The city of Ogden has intervened in cases Nos. 1650 and 1671, claiming title in the first as a bona fide purchaser, and in the second by dedication to public use.

The property involved in the three cases is estimated to be worth in the aggregate over $250,000. The opinion of counsel for the present receiver, John A. Marshall, Esq., is that the city has no claim; that the receiver will probably recover in case No. 1672. No opinion expressed to No. 1671. These cases are at issue, and, I am informed, will be pressed for trial by the receiver.

I should here state, perhaps, that the counsel for the Church claim (and have so testified in a hearing upon a reference of the former receiver's accounts and acts) that there was an agreement between the former district attorney and the former Solicitor-General and themselves that these actions in the First District Court should be dismissed and that this was in part an inducement to the Church solicitors to sign the statement of facts before referred to. Mr. Williams, the attorney for the former receiver, emphatically disclaims any knowledge of such agreement, and I am informed by Mr. Marshall that the former district attorney has written to him to the same effect. However, an application to file amended answers setting up the decree of the Supreme Court as final and a bar and this alleged oral agreement as a bar has been denied.

There is a suit pending in the Third District Court against the receiver in which Mary R. Iliff, as complainant, brought to quiet title to a part of lot 4, block 39, plat B, Salt Lake City survey. This suit will not be defended, as the receiver makes no real claim.

On the 13th day of July, 1890, the Court directed the receiver to make a full report of his doings, and appointed J. B. Rosborough, Esq., as special examiner to examine and report thereon.

On July 5th the receiver filed his report, and objection having been made by the receiver to Mr. Rosborough, on the 15th of July, Marshall N. Stone, Esq., was appointed.

The examiner proceeded to take testimony, and after a full and prolonged examination filed his findings and report. I enclose copy of the orders of reference and copy of the report of the examiner, which you will observe present also the findings proposed by the United States. In due time I shall file exceptions to such part of the report and refuse to find as I deem necessary. In the mean time, on the 16th of July, the receiver resigned, and his resignation was accepted with the usual reservation, and Henry W. Lawrence appointed, who immediately qualified by giving bond in the sum of $300.000.

The receiver has sold the sheep in his possession by order of the court, and the personal property in his possession October 1st and the value thereof may be stated as follows:

4732 shares of Deseret Telegraph Stock (no present value).....	
800 shares of city gas stock, par value $100.....	$ 80,000 00
Cash on hand in various banks.....	291,812 83
Credits due on sheep.....	10,000 00
Total.....	$381,812 83

The rents of the realty in his possession hereinbefore mentioned amount to $1000 monthly. In the final report of the former receiver mention is made of certain parcels of realty in Nebraska, and the opinion ventured that steps should be taken to recover the same, its value being stated at $25,000 or 35,000. The present receiver submitted the abstracts of title to Mr. J. F. Gardner of Omaha, recommended as a lawyer of repute and standing, who returned his opinion adverse to the claim of the receiver and the United States. I have examined his opinion and fully concur with him in the conclusions reached.

The abstracts and opinion will be forwarded to you for your investigation should you deem it necessary. The foregoing will, I think, sufficiently advise you of the condition of affairs. It only remains for me to specially direct your attention to some matters which seem to me to be of pressing moment.

By reference to paragraph 4 of the examiner's report you will ascertain that up to July 15, 1890, the expenses of the administration amounted to $54,924.86, about 17 per cent of the sum realized. The court has heretofore approved every expenditure and that is the end of it. But it would seem desirable to close this business, and as soon as possible, as it seems to me that a receiver is too expensive a luxury for the fund.

In this connection would it not be prudent to determine at once the effect of the decree, and whether the receiver can proceed to take possession of other property should any be discovered? If the decree is final in this regard there is no use in keeping a receiver and his counsel as an annex to the fund. The cases against the realty can be pressed and determined and the fund can be paid into the registry of the court, there to remain until Congress provides for it.

Moreover, in my judgment no other personalty will ever be discovered. Further, can the Attorney-General proceed, under section 13 of the act of 1887, to institute proceedings to forfeit and escheat other realty (if any) subject to be escheated, and, if so, would it be best to investigate the Temple properties and titles at Manti and St. George?

Findings numbers 14 and 15 proposed by the United States (see enclosed report) sufficiently explain my view in this connection.

There are several parcels of realty which the present receiver is convinced was the property of the Church. The proof, of necessity, must be made by hostile witnesses who have a real personal interest in defeating the government.

The determination of these matters will of necessity be expensive and the result uncertain.

Since the foregoing was written I have filed exceptions to the examiner's report, and enclose a copy herewith.

Very respectfully,

CHAS S. VARIAN,
United States Attorney.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

HINTS TO WRITERS.

There are now, we think, 120,000 words in the English language, says an exchage; the possibilities in the use of synonyms are remarkable, and we should say that to the study of synonyms the young writer should apply himself diligently. To the newspaper writers we are looking with solicitude and hope, for the reason that, outside of the columns of the press, our literature does not appear to be making any progress at all. Our literature of the press is, on the other hand, constantly improving, and in the last ten years that improvement has been marked.

Still there is a chance for improvement, and it occurs to us that the besetting sin of our newspaper writers at this time is a devotion to absurdisms—for example, the too common usage of that negroism "like" for "as if"—"it looks like it was going to rain." This absurdity runs riot in prints south of Mason and Dixon's line, and has crept across the line here in the West to shock us with a sporadic appearance in our diurnal publications.

There is no such word as "wended;" the past of "wend" is "went." A man cannot be said to have wended his way. He either went his way or he has gone his way.

"Likewise" is often erroneously used for "also;" likewise couples actions or states of being; also classes together things or qualities.

Commence should not be used when begin can be instead.

Transpire is never a synonym of happen.

Weary is a transitive verb only; it is, therefore, highly improper to say "One wearies of life."

Do not use "in our midst" when you mean "in the midst of us."

Do not use "anyhow" when you mean "anyway."

Be exceedingly careful in placing that small but potent word "only." Nine times out of ten it is misplaced.

"Do not confound 'evidence' with 'testimony.'"

Never use "above" as an adjective. "The above extract" is a barbarism. Nor should you ever use "then" as an adjective—e. g. "the then king"—awful!

Do not confound "try" with "make." You make—not try—an experiment.

A common error is the use of "excessively" when "exceedingly" is intended.

Do not confound "never" and "ever;" "never is an adverb of time, "ever" may be an adverb of degree.

The sun "sets" and a hen "sits."

A proposal and a proposition are different things.

Be careful not to confound "alude" with "refer" or "advert."

"So" is an adverb of degree and "such" is and adjective of kind.