Templeton hotel, before an Examiner appointed by the United States Circuit Court for the Western Division of the State of Missouri. The case is a suit brought by the Reorganized Church, commonly called "Josephites," against the Church of Christ, commonly called "Hedrickites," to obtain possession and title to a piece of land in Independence, Missouri, known as the Temple Block.

About four years ago a notice was served on Mr. Richard Hill, who was then president of the "Hedrickites," but is now their Bishop, that if the land was not vacated and possession given to the Josephites, suit would be brought to claim it. The Josephites bought a piece of ground across the street facing the Temple Block, and it was given out among their people at a distance that they held title to the Temple Block itself. When it was discovered that this was not correct, a pressure was brought to bear to "remove the cloud to the title"—a title that had no existence, and instructions were given at the "Josephite" Conference of April, 1891, to Bishop Kelley, to commence proceedings for the purpose.

In the following September, suit was entered by the Reorganized Church, as a corporation in Iowa having its headquarters at Lamoni. The grounds for the suit were a quit claim deed from Maria Louise Johnson, a surviving descendant of Oliver Cowdery whose three children, now dead, were alleged to have received a deed to the land from Edward Partridge, Bishop of the original Church founded by the Prophet Joseph Smith, who purchased the property in his own name. The Reorganization also claim a title in equity to this land as successor to the original Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The "Hedrickites" have held possession of the property, or part of it, for twenty years and part of it for fifteen years. Granville Hedrick was a member of the Church in its early days. After the death of the Prophet Joseph he formed a church which he believed to be after the first pattern, called it the "Church of Christ," received the Book of Mormon and revelations up to 1834 as genuine, and repudiated all after that date which he considered conflicted with them. At Bloomington, Illinois, in 1864, he predicted that the way would open up for his followers to go to Independence in 1867. In that year they went, numbering about fifty souls, and commenced to get title to the land now in question.

Their claim is that Edward Partridge purchased the land in his own name in 1832. His wife and three daughters executed a quit claim deed to James Pool, which was duly recorded. This covered a tract of 63 acres, which was conveyed in parcels to different parties. The land became divided into lots of 82½x168 feet each, and the Hedrickites purchased from time to time and obtained title by warranty deeds to eight of them, which they have surrounded with a fence and on which they have a small meeting-house.

The defendant organization filed an answer in thirty days after suit was entered. After this the plaintiffs made an amended complaint, having to pay the costs of this and the new answer of defendants which was duly filed, and finally an Examiner was appointed, merely to take testimony in the case but not with powers as a court. A stipulation between the parties was made to this effect in January of the present year, and in February testimony was commenced to be given at Independence, Missouri.

If the equity claim of the Josephites should be established, it would place in jeopardy the whole of the 63 acres purchased by Edward Partridge, on which houses have been built and occupied for many years,—the Temple lots only being vacant—and also about 1600 acres south of Kansas City, which Bishop Edward Partridge entered when he went to Missouri for the Church in 1832.

That "equity claim" involves the question of which is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The Josephites claim that theirs is the successor to that Church, that it became disorganized at the death of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Utah is apostate, teaching and practising polygamy and other doctrines not taught by the Prophet Joseph and contrary to the tenets of the original Church.

On this question testimony was taken in Independence, Mo., in February, the witnesses being James Whitehead, William B. Smith, Joseph Smith, W. W. Blair, H. A. Stebbins, John Brackenbury and others of the Reorganized Church; Mr. Treaver, of Kansas City, and P. P. Kelley, of the "Josephites," appearing for that body, and Mr. C. A. Hall, president of the Hedrickites and Mr. J. N. Sothern for the defense.

The examination here commenced on Monday, March 14th, Bishop E. L. Kelley and Attorney P. P. Kelley for the "Josephites," Messrs. C. A. Hall and James A. Hedrick for the defense, assisted by Attorney R. H. Cabell, of this city. It has been very clearly established that the Prophet Joseph and his brother Hyrum taught and practised plural marriage; that Wm. B. Smith did the same; that it was taught to the Twelve and others in Nauvoo; that the secret spiritual wife system of John C. Bennett, which was denounced by a number of persons over their signatures and published in the *Times and Seasons*, was essentially different from the system of celestial including plural marriage taught by Joseph Smith; that the endowments given in Nauvoo were the same as those given in Utah, and that revelations to the Church were given at different times which were not made public till afterwards.

Messrs. Hall and Hedrick, with their attorney, have conducted themselves like gentlemen, and have had the good wishes of all with whom they have met during their stay. The Kelleys have acted like pettifoggers, exhibiting neither a Christian spirit nor that courtesy that is usual among civilized people. They have insulted and browbeaten aged and infirm ladies and gentlemen, and exhibited that bearing that might be expected from persons engaged in a scheme to obtain the property of others.

In law and in reason the land in dispute belongs to the people who have bought and possessed it so long, and who hold it sacred for the purpose designed subject to the voice of the Lord unto them as to its final disposition. If there is an equitable title to it anywhere else, by virtue of a trust to Bishop Edward Partridge, then it vests in this Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which has never been disorganized, but has continued from April 6, 1830, to the present day, and which will never seek to steal that which it cannot obtain by lawful and proper methods.

THE MICHIGAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION BILL.

ABOUT two years ago the Legislature of Michigan passed a law providing for the choice of presidential electors by congressional districts. That is, the law provides that one elector shall be chosen in each congressional district and one from each half of the State, which is divided by a north and south line for the purpose. These two classes of electors are commonly known as representative and senatorial electors respectively. This bill was passed by a Democratic Legislature and signed by a Democratic Governor. Its constitutionality has been questioned by Republican party leaders and jurists, and it is said that it will be taken into the courts. General Alger said in this city yesterday that it was the intention of his party to test the validity of the law in the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Constitution says: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress." Republican and Democratic journals alike admit that this clause gives the State full power over the manner of appointing its quota of electors. And it is a historical fact that as late as 1824 Delaware, Georgia, Vermont and other States chose their electors by the Legislatures. Several States also had then the general ticket system, others the single district system, and still others a double and triple district system, that is, dividing the State into districts irrespective of the Congressional districting, and choosing two or three electors in a district.

It is contended by a number of constitutional jurists that the State Legislature has the power to authorize the Governor, the Supreme Court or any agent it pleases to choose presidential electors. But what gives the Democrats renewed interest in the Michigan plan is the fact that a similar scheme was outlined during the Forty-third Congress by Senator Morton, the great war governor of Indiana, Matt Carpenter, of Wisconsin, General Logan, of Illinois, and half a dozen others equally stalwart in Republican party principles.

The Republicans look upon the Michigan plan as a piece of party strategy on the part of Democrats. The latter would not, they say, adopt such a scheme in Kentucky, West Virginia or Tennessee, where the Republicans have a possibility of carrying the districts. In fact this question entered somewhat into the issues of the