

BUCHANAN RECORD. BUCHANAN, BERRIEN COUNTY, MICHIGAN, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1894. NUMBER 34.

NOTIONS, TOILET ARTICLES, Yankee Notions, &c., IN VARIETY. Serviceable Goods at Reasonable Prices.

Business Directory.

CHRISTIAN CHURCH—Preaching every Lord's day at 10:30 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. Also Sunday School at 12:30 noon. ... ADVENT CHRISTIAN CHURCH—Rev. A. F. Moore, Pastor. Preaching at 10:30 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. ... THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH—Services at 10:30 A. M. and 7:30 P. M. ...

Do You Use Salt? It will pay you in numerous ways to use the salt that's all salt. This is especially true in the butter market. You recognize a difference in butter. You can point out a difference in the salt used, and you'll find that the best salt is the best salt. ... DIAMOND CRYSTAL DAIRY SALT. DIAMOND CRYSTAL SALT CO., St. Clair, Mich.

Rose & Ellsworth's - OPENING - NEW FALL DRESS GOODS. We are now prepared to show by far the largest and finest assortment of Fall Dress Goods ever brought to this market. The latest imported and American Dress Fabrics are here and many of them exclusive, especially in High Novelties, such as French Cloths, New Fricols, Silks and Wool Tailor Suitings, Kersey Cloths, New Bonnets, Tailor Checks and many others. ...

FROM THE RANKS.

By CAPTAIN CHARLES KING. (Copyright, 1894, by the J. B. Lippincott Co.)

CHAPTER XIV.

Tuesday and the day of the long projected march had come, and if over a lot of garrison people were wishing themselves well out of a flurry it was the fact that the march was on. ...

turn at all. She heartily disapproved of Mr. Jerrold and was bitterly set against Nina's growing infatuation for him. ...

asked how he would be apt to do Mr. Jerrold. "He isn't well and has been dejected by himself to all callers today," said Rollins shortly. ...

"Not at all, sir. You gave me to understand that I was to remain here—to leave the post—until you had decided upon the points, to which I do not admit the justice of your course, and though you have put me to great inconvenience, I obeyed the order. ...

sons along the Union Pacific whose hearts have little room for thoughts of germs in the honor of this morning's tidings. ...

WOMAN'S RELIEF CORPS, Wm. Perrott Post No. 31. St. Clair, Mich. ... ROBERT HENDERSON, M. D., Physician and Surgeon. Office, Honch's Opera House Block, St. Clair, Mich. ...

DR. ELISE ANDERSON, Physician, &c. Office at his new residence, Front St., Buchanan. ...

Nina was accessible when visitors inquired at the fort. They had never known such mysterious army people in their lives. ...

And, as the city society, old Mamma idolized her beautiful daughter and could deny her no luxury or indulgence. ...

Smuggling liquor was one of Chester's horrors. He surrounded the post with a cordon of sentries who had no higher duty apparently than that of preventing the arrival of any liquor. ...

Tuesday still, and all manner of things had happened and were still to happen in the hurrying hours that followed Sunday night. ...

"That is all possible. But how about the man in her room? Nothing was stolen, though money and jewelry were lying around loose. ...

TRAINS EAST. LEAVE BUCHANAN. Detroit Night Express, No. 1228, at 8:15 P. M. ... TRAINS WEST. LEAVE BUCHANAN. Chicago Night Express, No. 418, at 8:15 P. M. ...

Our new stock of Carpets, Rugs and Curtains is in and ready for inspection. ...

She would have set her foot against the fort at that night's moment, but she could not resist it that the papers should announce on Sunday morning that "the event of the season at Fort Sibley was the german given last Tuesday night by the ladies of the garrison and led by the lovely Miss Beaubien." ...

Other words in the flats, that foot-steps made no noise in the building sand, and all was silence save for the clash of the waters along the shores. ...

It was the sole topic of talk for a full hour. Many ladies had intended going to town by the early train almost every day, but for some time past they had been unable to do so. ...

"What is it, Harris?" he demands of a light batteryman who is hurrying past. "Orders for Colorado, sir. The regiment goes by special train. Major Thornton's command's been massaged, and there's a big fight ahead." ...

"I believe I can prove he didn't. On the contrary, that he went around by the roof of the porch to the colonel's room and tried there, but found it risky on account of the blinds, and that finally he entered the hall window—what might be called a penthouse—if he did not come from there, do we not?" ...

VANDALIA LINE TIME TABLE. In effect June 25, 1894. Trains leave Gallien, Mich., as follows: FOR THE NORTH. No. 32, Ex. Sun., 1:30 P. M. ... FOR THE SOUTH. No. 31, Ex. Sun., 1:30 P. M. ...

Our new stock of Carpets, Rugs and Curtains is in and ready for inspection. ...

Another thing that added to the flame of speculation and rumor was the fact that the two gentlemen had spent over an hour up stairs in the colonel's and Miss Alice's room and "was fooling around the house till near 10 o'clock." ...

One or two men, urged by their wives, who thought it was really time something were done to let him understand he ought not to lead the garrison, shot out of sight, and the ladies found that it was useless to remain—there would be no further developments so long as they did—and so they came away, with many a lingering backward look. ...

Rollins seized the captain's sleeve and strove, sick at heart, to pull him back, but Chester stoutly stood his ground. ...

"You've been here a long time, haven't you?" he asked. "Yes, sir, I have. I've been here since the first of the month. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

W. L. DOUGLAS'S \$3 SHOE. THE BEST. NO SQUEAKING. \$5 CORDOVAN. \$3.50 FINEST CORDOVAN. ...

Rose & Ellsworth, South Bend, Ind. The Knee Pant Suits. G. W. NOBLE. Bought in New York, for \$2, \$3.50, \$5 and \$7. They are just the thing for your boys. ...

Rollins was always glad of an excuse to go out to the fort, but a coldness had sprung up between him and Jerrold. ...

It is not until they reach the broad portals of the great Stewart of the west that one of their number, half incredulous, buys a copy and reads aloud. ...

"You've been here a long time, haven't you?" he asked. "Yes, sir, I have. I've been here since the first of the month. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

W. L. DOUGLAS'S \$3 SHOE. THE BEST. NO SQUEAKING. \$5 CORDOVAN. \$3.50 FINEST CORDOVAN. ...

Rose & Ellsworth, South Bend, Ind. The Knee Pant Suits. G. W. NOBLE. Bought in New York, for \$2, \$3.50, \$5 and \$7. They are just the thing for your boys. ...

Rollins was always glad of an excuse to go out to the fort, but a coldness had sprung up between him and Jerrold. ...

It is not until they reach the broad portals of the great Stewart of the west that one of their number, half incredulous, buys a copy and reads aloud. ...

"You've been here a long time, haven't you?" he asked. "Yes, sir, I have. I've been here since the first of the month. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

W. L. DOUGLAS'S \$3 SHOE. THE BEST. NO SQUEAKING. \$5 CORDOVAN. \$3.50 FINEST CORDOVAN. ...

Rose & Ellsworth, South Bend, Ind. The Knee Pant Suits. G. W. NOBLE. Bought in New York, for \$2, \$3.50, \$5 and \$7. They are just the thing for your boys. ...

Rollins was always glad of an excuse to go out to the fort, but a coldness had sprung up between him and Jerrold. ...

It is not until they reach the broad portals of the great Stewart of the west that one of their number, half incredulous, buys a copy and reads aloud. ...

"You've been here a long time, haven't you?" he asked. "Yes, sir, I have. I've been here since the first of the month. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

MORTGAGE SALE. WHEREAS, default has been made in the payment of the money secured by a mortgage of certain real estate, to wit: ...

Teachers' Examinations. Notice is hereby given that examinations of teachers for the county of Berrien will be held at Buchanan, the last Friday in August, 1894. ...

Rollins was always glad of an excuse to go out to the fort, but a coldness had sprung up between him and Jerrold. ...

It is not until they reach the broad portals of the great Stewart of the west that one of their number, half incredulous, buys a copy and reads aloud. ...

"You've been here a long time, haven't you?" he asked. "Yes, sir, I have. I've been here since the first of the month. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

"You don't have any cyclones up here in the mountains, do you?" I asked in evident astonishment. "Well, no, mister, not particularly. ...

SUPPLEMENT TO THE RECORD.

TWAS NO ELECTION.

Decision of Judge Coolidge in the County Seat Case.

The Election Held Last Spring with Reference to the County Seat Removal Adjudged Null and Void.

Circuit Court for the County of Berrien.
Judson A. Peck et al.

The Board of Supervisors of Berrien Co.

The proceedings in this case were instituted by writ of certiorari for the purpose of reviewing the proceedings of the Board of Supervisors of this county, with reference to a proposal to remove the county seat to the city of St. Joseph, submitted to a vote of the electors of the county at the annual township election in April last.

No controversy has arisen as to the material facts of the case, and the questions to be determined are purely legal, involving the construction of certain statutes and the validity of the proceedings under which the election was held. A brief statement of facts is necessary to an intelligent understanding of the legal questions in controversy.

On January 5th, 1894, the Board of Supervisors, by a vote of 18 yeas to 8 nays, adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this Board that the county seat of this county should be removed from its present location to the city of St. Joseph, and that this Board does hereby designate the city of St. Joseph as the proper place to which said county seat should be removed, and that the question of removal of said county seat to St. Joseph shall be and is hereby submitted to the electors of said county of Berrien, at the time of holding the next annual township election."

On January 6th, 1894, the Board adopted a resolution providing that the County Clerk should prepare and cause to be distributed ballots, one-half of which should be printed, "For the removal of the county seat," and one-half of which should be printed "Against the removal of the county seat."

On Feb. 1st, 1894, the Board by resolution instructed the Clerk to prepare the ballots for the election relating to the removal of the county seat, in accordance with Act No. 190 of the Laws of the State for the year 1891.

On or about Feb. 23rd, 1894, the Judge of Probate, County Clerk and County Treasurer, claiming to act as a Board of Election Commissioners for the county, caused to be prepared a form of ballot to be used by the electors of the county in voting upon the question of removal of the county seat.

The form was as follows:

For the removal of the County Seat to
St. Joseph.

YES.	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Printed instructions were placed at the top of the ballot, directing the elector that if he desired to vote in favor of the removal of the county seat to St. Joseph, he should make a cross in the square opposite the word "Yes," and if he desired to vote against such removal he should make a cross in the square opposite the word "No."

These ballots, thus prepared, were delivered by the Clerk to the Board of Election Inspectors of each of the 32 voting precincts of the county, and at the annual township election which occurred April 2nd, 1894, these ballots were used and voted for by the electors and no other form of ballot was voted. A special ballot box was used in each of the voting precincts for the deposit of the ballots so prepared.

At the election of April 2nd, 1894, no State or county officers were voted for, nor was any constitutional amendment or other question to be voted upon by the electors of the State, submitted to the electors. In each township and city of the county, a ballot containing the names of township or municipal candidates for local offices was used and voted. This ballot was printed separately from the ballot relating to the county seat removal question and deposited in a separate ballot box.

On April 10th, 1894, the Board of Supervisors convened for the purpose of canvassing the returns of the election inspectors, in relation to the removal of the county seat, and did so canvass them; charges were made alleging fraudulent and illegal votes in certain voting precincts, and a resolution to investigate and examine into such charges was offered, but was defeated. Upon the canvass of the returns the Board of Supervisors declared as the result of such election that 10,990 votes had been cast, of which 5,395 were in favor of the removal of the county seat to St. Joseph, and 5,595 against the same.

The poll lists returned by the inspectors of elections disclosed the fact that in a large number of voting precincts only one poll list was kept, showing only the names of the voters voting at such election, but not showing the names or numbers of those who voted on the question of removal of the county seat, and not showing the names or numbers of those who voted the township or municipal ticket. The number of voters voting in any such precinct upon the question of the removal of the county seat could not be determined from the poll lists, as the poll lists contained the names of all voters voting at such election, some of whom may not have voted more than one ballot. In other words, it could not be determined from such poll lists whether a voter whose name appeared thereon, voted both the ballot for local candidates and the ballot on the question of removal of the county seat, or voted only one of such ballots, in which latter case it would not appear which ballot he voted. If the poll lists which do not designate in any way the names and numbers of voters voting upon such question were rejected, the vote upon the return would stand as follows: Total vote, 5,205, of which 1893 voted "Yes" and 3312 voted "No."

It also appears from the records of the

proceedings of the Board of Supervisors that certain lots in the city of St. Joseph had been designated as the county site for the county buildings by the Supervisors, in case of removal of the county seat, before the election, and subsequent to the passage of the resolution for submission to the electors of the county of the question of the removal of the county seat.

It further appears that among the 18 supervisors who voted for the original resolution of submission of removal of the county seat to St. Joseph, were two supervisors who had not been elected by the township boards of New Buffalo and Chikaming townships to fill vacancies. The Board of Supervisors consisted of 26 members.

Upon this state of facts it is contended by the petitioners:

I. That the supervisors of New Buffalo and Chikaming had no right to vote upon the original resolution of submission, because the law required that such resolution can be submitted only by the vote of two-thirds of the "members elect," that the phrase "members elect" means members elected by the people, and that as the statute evidently requires a vote of two-thirds of the supervisors of all the townships and supervisors districts in the county, being 26 in number, if the votes of the New Buffalo and Chikaming township supervisors are rejected, the vote for submission would stand 16 for removal or less than the requisite two-thirds of the entire number of supervisors. In my opinion, this objection is untenable. It may be suggested that if we reject the vote of the supervisors of New Buffalo and Chikaming on the ground that they were not members elect, the vote would have stood 16 for submission and 8 against. All the members elect, being 24 in number, having voted, and two-thirds of these having voted in favor of removal, it is difficult to understand how the resolution was defeated, even if the contention of the petitioners as to the construction of the phrase "members elect" shall be correct.

But however this may be, I am of the opinion that the phrase "members elect" does not exclude supervisors appointed, and is not restricted in its meaning simply to those elected by the people. The word "elect" is often used in statutes and constitutions as meaning "chosen" or "selected." The manner of choice or selection, whether by popular vote or by appointment, is not material. This definition is given by the standard dictionaries and dictionaries of law, interchangeably with that of "elected." I can see no reason why supervisors appointed by regular authority should not have equal powers with those elected; otherwise the township represented by such appointees would have no voice in the action of the Board of Supervisors in a matter where it is important that every township should have an opportunity to be heard. If the intention of the law were otherwise, it should have been expressed in language so clear and unambiguous that no room would have been left for doubt.

II. It is contended by the relators that the returns from all voting precincts, where the poll lists do not show the names and number of the electors voting upon the question of removal, should be rejected, and that if these be rejected the remaining returns would show a majority against the proposition for removal.

This manner of keeping poll lists where there are two distinct kinds of ballots to be voted and where two separate ballot boxes are kept for the deposit of ballots, may be open to criticism. In such cases a simple list of names cannot show how many voters voted any particular kind of ballot. Persons who voted the ticket for local officers might not have voted upon the question of county seat removal, and yet by double voting or by collusion with dishonest inspectors of elections, the number of ballots in the ballot box might equal the number of names on the poll list.

My opinion, however, is that the court has no power, under the state of facts presented, to consider this question.

No provision is made that the poll lists shall be returned to the county canvassers or be inspected by them. The county canvassers, in canvassing and declaring the result of the election, act solely upon the returns of the inspectors. In this case the Board of Supervisors were not bound to examine or inspect the poll lists. They play no part in the process of canvassing the returns of an election, or of declaring the result of such election. The poll list is kept for the sole use of the town inspectors of election, in order to enable them to compare the number of ballots found in the ballot box with the number of electors voting, to reject and throw out, in a manner prescribed by law, such number of ballots as shall be in excess of the number of votes appearing on the poll list.

The use and province of the poll lists end practically with the canvass of the votes by the local inspectors. The supervisors, therefore, acted entirely within their jurisdiction in simply canvassing the returns of the inspectors, without reference to the poll lists, and the courts, in a case of this kind, have no authority to review the proceedings of the Board of Supervisors, simply because the poll lists may have been defective.

33 Mich., 370.
91 Mich., 440.

III.

It is contended that the action of the Board of Supervisors subsequent to the passage of the resolution of submission on Jan. 5th, 1894, in accepting and designating a certain piece of land in the city of St. Joseph as a site for the county buildings, or as a site for the county seat, in case the popular vote was in favor of removal, rendered all the proceedings nugatory; that this action modified the previous resolution of submission and that in order to constitute a valid submission the designation of the particular site selected by the Board should have been submitted to the popular vote.

It is true that the Board of Supervisors may designate a certain piece of land or territory less than that embraced in the whole of any town or city, as the place to which the county seat shall be removed.

Double v. McQueen, 96 Mich., 42.
In the last mentioned case the place to which the removal of the county seat was proposed was described as the northwest quarter of section 12, town 30 north, range 2 east.
See also Atty Gen'l v. Canvassers of Iron Co., 64 Mich., 611.
It is also true that if the Board of Supervisors by any act, tantamount to a vote of submission to the people, designate a particular tract of land as the place to which the removal of the county seat is to be made, and the removal is made dependent on the acquisition or selection of that particular piece of land, then the ballot voted for at the election must designate, not the city or the township in which the land is situated, but the particular tract of

land. If in such case, the particular tract of land is not designated in the proposal voted for, the election and subsequent proceedings thereunder are rendered void.

Peck v. Supervisors of Presque Isle Co., 36 Mich., 371.

People v. Supervisors St. Clair Co., 15 Mich., 85.

In this case, I find nothing in the records of the Board of Supervisors which makes the removal of the county seat to St. Joseph dependent upon the selection or designation of the lands. It is true that negotiations were had with the city of St. Joseph by which said city, in case of removal of the county seat, was to secure a particular piece of land as a site for the county buildings, but the acquisition of such land was made dependent upon the removal of the county seat, and the removal of the county seat was not made dependent on the acquisition of such land. The evident object of the Board was simply to secure in advance, free of expense to the county, a site for the county buildings, in case the county seat should be removed.

The act of submission to the people was unconditional. It is immaterial that negotiations may have occurred, relative to a particular site for the buildings. The electors voted upon a proposition which was entirely unconditional, and not dependent upon anything else, and therefore the submission, so far as the question raised here is concerned, was valid.

Atty Gen'l v. Supervisors, 33 Mich., 192.
The opinion in this case is apparently decisive of the point in controversy. The court says: "There is nothing improper in a Board of Supervisors, who are considering the question of removing a county seat, taking into account any local provisions that may be made to relieve the county from expenses incident to the removal. If they finally pass an unconditional resolution for removal, and the people vote upon and approve the unconditional proposition, that is sufficient. No inquiry can be gone into to determine what is was that influenced the minds of either supervisors or people."

IV.

The main contention in this case is whether there was prepared and voted at the election, a legal, official ballot on the question of the removal of the county seat. Three questions arise in this connection.

1st. Should not the question of removal of the county seat have been placed at the foot of the township or municipal ticket?

Second: Does the law contemplate more than one ballot or more than one ballot box at a township election, where no state or county officer is to be elected, and no constitutional amendment or other question to be voted upon by the electors of the state is submitted to the popular vote?

Third: Had the county board of election commissioners any authority to prepare and distribute the ballots concerning the removal of the county seat, or should such ballots have been prepared and distributed by the township or municipal board of election commissioners?

In order to make the issue clear and intelligible it becomes necessary for me to refer to the various provisions of our statutes, which govern elections of this kind.

Previous to the year 1851, the question of removal of county seats in this state was left entirely to the control and direction of the legislature. In that year an act was passed vesting the board of Supervisors of each county with the power of submitting the question to the electors of the county, under certain conditions and restrictions. That act still remains in force except so far as it is modified and repealed by acts numbered 190 and 194 of the public acts of 1891.

That act also provided the form of the ballot to be used. Those voting in favor of the proposed removal should have printed or written on their ballots the words: "For the removal of the county seat." Those voting against such removal shall have printed or written on their ballots the words: "Against the removal of the county seat."

In 1891, a resolution was made in the method of voting, and by act 190 of the session laws of that year the so-called Australian method of voting was introduced into our elective system. That act, however, was only partial in its operation. It applied, according to section one of the act only to elections at which a presidential elector, member of congress, member of the legislature, state or county officer or circuit judge was to be elected, or an amendment to the state constitution was to be submitted to the popular vote.

Section 13 of this act somewhat broadens the first section by providing that when a constitutional amendment or other question is to be submitted to the "electors of the state" the secretary of state shall duly certify the same to the clerk of each county in the state, etc.

The act provides that in each county at such election, the judge of probate, county clerk and county treasurer shall constitute a county board of election commissioners, who shall prepare and distribute ballots and stamps for all officers for whom the electors are entitled to vote and for all constitutional amendments and other questions to be submitted to "the electors of the state for popular vote."

These provisions seem to contemplate that no purely local or county question, such as that of the removal of a county seat, can be submitted to popular vote under this act. Only such questions as are to be voted upon by the entire body of the electors of the state are provided for.

It is true that section 13 provides that where a constitutional amendment or other question is to be voted, the ballot shall be prepared in a certain method, but this provision must be construed in accordance with sections one, thirteen and fourteen of the act, to make the section intelligible or consistent with the frame-work of the act itself.

It is provided also by section 14 that the board of election commissioners shall cause any constitutional amendments or other questions, submitted to the electors of the state, to be printed at the foot of the ballot containing the names of the candidates voted for at such election.

The legislature of 1891, however, subsequently passed another act, entitled "an act to prescribe the manner of conducting municipal and township elections and to prevent fraud and deception thereat" being act No. 194. This act provided that at such elections the provisions of act 190 should govern, so far as consistent, and thus introduced the Australian system into our township and municipal elections. The act further provides that at such elections there shall be a board of election commissioners for each township and city, who shall perform the same duties relative to the preparation and printing of ballots as are required by law of the county boards of election commissioners. This board in the township, is constituted of the town board, and in cities and villages by such persons as shall be elected by the common council of such villages and cities.

Neither the act 190 nor the act 194 in terms provide for the submission of the question of removal of a county seat, but our supreme court, in the cases of Double v. McQueen and Pinkerton v. Staninger, seem to indicate that the Australian system of voting must be applied to elections upon the question of removal of county seats.

Double v. McQueen, 96 Mich., 39.
Pinkerton v. Staninger, 59 N. W. Rep. 611.

It may also be said that attorneys for both parties in this case concede that the Australian method of voting must have been used at the election in controversy. I shall therefore take it for granted, without expressing an opinion of my own, that this is the present status of the law.

It must be conceded that the questions raised are new and novel, and somewhat difficult of solution. The board of supervisors, although acting under the advice of able attorneys, and soliciting the opinion of the attorney general as to the form of the ballot and method of submission, were evidently perplexed, and uncertain how to proceed.

The board first resolved that the question of removal should be submitted under the laws of 1851, providing for two forms of ballot, one reading for removal and one against removal. Subsequently the board passed a resolution that the election should be carried on pursuant to act 190 of the laws of 1891, but did not by such resolution provide the form or language of the ballot. No reference was made to act 194 of the laws of 1891.

Under the circumstances it would be strange indeed if my own opinion were entirely free from doubt. I can only be governed by what seems to me the most reasonable interpretation and construction of statutes which are not only new and novel in their character, but ambiguous in their language and expression.

Under act 190 referred to, only one ballot is provided for. Candidates and questions for electors to vote for, are all placed on one Australian ballot.

Act 194 however, provides for another Australian ballot, a township or municipal ballot. This brings two Australian ballots into the field, whenever both state and county officers are to be voted for at the same spring election, which would occur the odd years. In even numbered years, where no state or county officers or state questions are to be voted for, there can be but one ballot, unless the submission of a question to the electors of the county rendered a second ballot necessary. Is such ballot contemplated by the law?

Now the law as expressed in acts 190 and 194, referred to as I have already said, nowhere mention or refer to questions regarding the removal of county seats nor to any purely local questions whatsoever. Seemingly there is an omission of this question. Whether intentional or not, it is not my purpose to decide. No difficulty could have arisen if the election last spring on the question of removal could have been held under the law of 1851. All the difficulties attending this controversy, have arisen from the attempt to apply the so-called Australian system to an election upon a county seat question.

But as it seems to be conceded that that election must have been held under the Australian method, we are obliged to raise inferences and suggest analogies from the various provisions of the act of 1891, to enable us to form any theory of what was the legislative intent as to the method of procedure.

The only provisions found in the acts referred to, relative to the form of the ballot, or the name of the ballot, upon the question to be submitted to the voters under the Australian system, are found under the provisions of the act 190, relative to constitutional amendments or other questions to be submitted to the electors of the state. Section 14 provides that the question shall be printed at the foot of the ballot containing the names of the candidates to be voted for. Section 13 provides for stating the substance of the question and using the words "No" and "Yes" and instructs the elector how to stamp the respective squares opposite the words "Yes" and "No."

Nowhere else is the least allusion to the form of the question, or as to where it is to be placed on the ballot.

Section 194 is silent upon this question but it does provide that act No. 190 shall govern so far as applicable, elections held under it.

If the election was to be held under the Australian system, then act No. 190 was applicable. It stepped in and governed the election in question, because act No. 194 nowhere pretends to prescribe any regulations for voting upon a question to be submitted to the voters. If we have anything to guide us, if there be anything by way of analogy which we can use as a precedent, we must resort to section 13 of act 190, to ascertain just where this question of removal shall be placed on the ballot, and cannot resort anywhere else. This section tells us to place the question at the foot of the ballot containing the names of the officers; if we attempt to resort to any other section, we are entirely at sea.

It may be asked with some pertinency, it seems to me, by what reasoning or by what authority, was it determined that the question of removal should be voted for on a separate ballot and why was it not placed at the foot of the local ticket? If the question must be placed on one ballot, with the names of candidates at a general election and at the foot thereof, as is conceded, why should it not be placed on the same ballot with the names of candidates at a township election; and at the foot thereof?

The law makes no distinction. If it applies to a state or county election, it applies to a township election. It either applies to both or neither.

One object of the Australian system is to prevent multiplicity of ballots. The fewer the ballots, the greater will be the opportunity for secrecy, the less for publicity and the greater the safeguards against fraud. The genuine Australian system, as established on its native heath and preserved in its original purity, allows but one ballot, however many and diverse be the candidates or questions voted upon. This method has already been adopted in California and some other states, and it is highly probable that within a few years, its adoption will become universal. The tendency is in this direction.

The case of Union V. Ussery, 147 Ill., 204, is directly in line with this case. In that case, the question of animals running at large was submitted to the electors of the county. A statute had been in existence providing the form of ballot; that there should be a separate ballot and a separate ballot box. Subsequently the Australian law was enacted which, however, did not, in express terms, repeal the prior statute in reference to the question in controversy. An election was held when the question was submitted by a separate ballot with a separate ballot box. The court held that the Australian law repealed the former statute and that there was no authority for a separate ballot and a separate ballot box, and held the election void.

With this tendency of legislation and public sentiment towards the one ballot system, it may be reasonably urged that the courts, with good reason in contriving ambiguous provisions of an Australian law, should bend their weight against encouragement of a multiplicity of ballots.

In direct connection with this question as to whether the question of the removal of the county seat could be voted for on a ballot separate from that containing the list of candidates, and necessarily involved in the same discussion, is the question by what board of election commissioners was the ballot upon the question of the removal of the county seat to be prepared and distributed?

Was it to be prepared by the county board of election commissioners, or by the township board of election commissioners? At the election in question, it was prepared by the county election commissioners and a separate ballot was provided for. The board of election commissioners for the county is provided for by act 190. That law states when such board is to act, and when it is to be called into being. It provides and fixes the time when they are to act by providing for their action when a presidential elector, member of congress, member of the legislature, state or county officer or circuit judge is to be elected, or any amendments to the constitution or other questions to be voted for by the electors of the state are submitted.

Sections 1, 10, 14 and 18 of Act 190 of 1891.

The elections provided for in Act 190 are referred to and designated by Act 194 as general elections. It determines what, within the meaning of the Australian law, is a general election and what is a township election, and determines that elections in the spring, when State or county officers are elected, are general elections, and that elections in the spring, when no such officers are elected, are not general elections. The election of last spring was therefore only an annual township election, because no State or county officers were to be elected and no State question was submitted to the voters. It follows that Act 194 providing for township or municipal elections, and for township or municipal election commissioners, governs that election. That act nowhere provides for the action of a board of county election commissioners; it provides only for a township board of election commissioners.

The county election commissioners can therefore only be called into existence at a general election, as already defined. The act which creates this Board does not apply or refer to any township or municipal election.

The act creating the Board, having determined when it can act, it must follow that they cannot act at any other time. It cannot be reasonably contended that a Board, clothed with extraordinary powers, can possess more authority than that expressed by the act which creates it and defines its jurisdiction.

It is here necessarily any ambiguity about the law in this respect. Whenever the county board cannot act, the law provides for another Board which steps in and sets the machinery of election in motion. One board is to act with reference to preparing ballots for a general election, and the other board with reference to a township or municipal election. When no general election occurs, then nothing exists which calls the county commissioners into existence, and the township or municipal commissioners act.

It may be said that the question of the removal of the county seat was a county question and that therefore by implication, county election commissioners should prepare the ballots. But it has been held by the Attorney General that the ballots to be prepared under the Local Option Law, when the question of the prohibition of the sale of liquor is to be submitted to the vote of the electors of the county, must be prepared by the township or municipal commissioners of election and not by the county commissioners. This practice has prevailed throughout the State.

The same reasoning which will apply to the method of preparing the ballots under the Local Option Law, will apply to that which arises under the law in regard to the removal of county seats. If the township board of election commissioners have power to prepare one they have the power to prepare the other.

The Attorney General has also held that where, by a special election, a Circuit Judge is to be elected on the same day of the regular township meeting, that it is the duty of the township election commissioners to print the ballots for Judge.

My construction of the laws applicable to the case, leads to the conclusion that there should have been but one ballot and one ballot box on the question of the removal of the county seat; that this question should have been printed at the foot of the ballot containing the list of local candidates voted for in each township and city, and that the township or municipal board of election commissioners was the proper board to prepare the ballot.

In attempting to carry out and enforce the adoption of the Australian system of voting, as provided for by recent statutes in many states, courts have been inclined to give a strict construction to the statutory provisions and regulations.

not be obtained unless the preparation of the ballot is put in the hands of some specified person or persons."

It is contended by the respondents that though the form of the ballot and the method of election pursued may not have been in accordance with law, the action of the board of Supervisors in canvassing the returns and declaring the result of the election, was final and cannot be reviewed by the courts. It is urged that the board of supervisors is a political body, in the nature of a county legislature, clothed with certain inherent powers which are beyond the reach of judicial review, and that among such powers, is the determination of the result of an election of this kind. The following cases are referred to:

Hipp v. Charlevoix Sup., 62 Mich., 456.

Atty Gen'l v. Lake Sup., 33 Mich., 299.

Mee v. Benzie Co. Sup., 41 Mich., 6.

Atty Gen'l v. Benzie Co. Sup., 34 Mich., 211.

But the cases presented, nowhere decide that the action of the board of supervisors is conclusive and cannot be reviewed by the courts, where the election was illegal or not authorized by the law. They decide simply that where the board has acted within its jurisdiction, its action cannot be called in question for any evil or wrong committed, on questions of receiving or rejecting alleged illegal or fraudulent votes or in canvassing the returns after a legal election.

The supreme court has frequently decided that where the election was illegal or the submission unauthorized by law, the action of the board on the question of removal of county seats was liable to review by the courts.

Atty Gen'l v. St. Clair Co. Sup., 11 Mich., 63.

People v. St. Clair Co. Sup., 15 Mich., 91.

Peck v. Supervisors of Presque Isle Co., 36 Mich., 378.

Atty Gen'l v. Sup. of Benzie Co., 34 Mich., 212.

It is clearly indicated by these decisions that the power of the board of supervisors is not an arbitrary or unlimited one; that the question of removal must have been legally submitted to the voters, and that a legal election must have been held in order to make valid the proceedings for removal.

If my view as to the method of voting contemplated by the law be correct, not a single legal ballot was cast upon the question of removal at the spring election. The question was not submitted properly by the board of supervisors; the ballots were not prepared by the only persons who were authorized by law to prepare them; the ballot was a separate and independent ballot and therefore void; a separate ballot box was used in violation of the requisites of the law, and the question of removal was illegally submitted in not being placed at the foot of the township or municipal ticket.

It would be difficult to conceive of a wider departure both in substance and in form, from the requirements of the Australian law, if the construction which I have given be the true one. Such departure, if actually made, was tantamount to an illegal election.

I am aware that it will be urged that the will of the people has been expressed and that the courts should not set it aside, even though expressed by a small majority, on account of some irregularities in the mode of election. But in my opinion this is not a case of irregularity. It is a case where the error is vital, and where it is sought to set aside the most fundamental regulations of the law. There can be no safety against corruption and fraud, nor can there be any certainty in ascertaining what the will of the people actually is at an election, unless the material forms and methods prescribed by the law have been substantially followed and the voters cast their ballots in accordance therewith. Every intelligent observer of our election methods appreciates and understands the importance and necessity of such a rule, and courts have uniformly been guided in the construction of statutes regarding elections, by this fundamental principle.

The election held on the 2d day of April, 1894, with reference to the question of the removal of the county seat is hereby adjudged to be null and void, together with all proceedings of the board of supervisors of this county thereunder, and appropriate judgment will be entered accordingly.

O. W. COOLIDGE,
Circuit Judge.

They Both Had It.

"The man that always has a joke to be printed came in with a ha-ha in his voice.

"Oh, I say," he exclaimed, "I've got a corker."

"What is it?" inquired the helpless victim.

"Did you celebrate the twenty-fifth of the alphabet?"

"The what?"

"The twenty-fifth of the alphabet—the Fourth of July?"

"Come off. What's the twenty-fifth of the alphabet got to do with the Fourth of July?"

"That's what it is."

"I don't see it."

"I'll show you," and the joker ha-ha'd some more.

"You see, the twenty-fifth of the alphabet is one letter; that one letter is y; y is the fourth of July, and there you have it."

"And there you have it too," added the helpless victim as he fired a pastepost into the joker's neck.—Detroit Free Press.

Protect the Eye From Foreign Bodies.

Never needlessly expose the eye to foreign particles, but when necessary wear plain glasses or goggles. When experimenting with chemicals, always turn the mouth of the tube or bottle away from the face and eyes. Whenever an eye is injured severely, says the hygienic doctor, place the patient immediately in a dark room and under the care of a skilled physician, whose directions must be implicitly followed.

The foreign bodies may be solids, as sand, cinders, hair, dirt, etc., lime, acids or alkalis.—Washington Star.

Peace and War.

It is an interesting, perhaps a significant fact that 1,000 people went to see the military parade in the World's fair where one attended the sessions of the international peace congress.—Baltimore

