
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



1913

**THE MINNESOTA
LEGISLATURE
of 1913**

BY

C. J. BUELL

346.160
B86

THE LIBRARY



CLASS 328.768
BOOK B86

The Minnesota Legislature of 1913

—BY—



C. J. BUELL

Author of

“The Currency Question”

“Industrial Depressions, their Cause and Cure”

“Monopolies and Trusts”

“Our Indebtedness to the Arabs”

Copyright by C. J. BUELL

1540 Laurel Avenue

St. Paul, Minn.

1914

328.768

P86

COMMENDATORY FORE WORD.

The manuscript for this book has been prepared by C. J. Buell, who gave his entire time, during the legislative sessions of 1913, to a careful study of the record of each member of both House and Senate and a thorough analysis of all important measures.

Mr. Buell has wisely left the record of each member to speak for itself.

We know Mr. Buell to be honest, independent and fearless, and believe he has produced a History of the Legislature of 1913 that every citizen can read with profit.

(Signed) Hugh T. Halbert,
Louis Nash,
T. T. Hudson,
Elwood S. Corser.

930551

PREFACE BY THE AUTHOR.

This book is the third in the series of histories of "The Legislature of Minnesota."

The first volume, "The Legislature of 1909," was published under the auspices of the Minnesota Citizen League, an organization founded in November, 1908, by the late Sidney M. Owen and a number of other citizens of Minnesota, who firmly believed that if the people of the state could know the influences that elected the members of our legislatures, the forces and motives that determined their official acts, the methods employed in committee and on the floor of the House and Senate,—in short, if the people could know the inside workings of the legislature and just how each Senator and Representative voted on all vital measures, then it would be easy to weed out those who were corrupt, or stupid or inefficient, and send to represent the people men who are honest, intelligent and progressive—men who could neither be bought nor fooled.

Following these lines, the secretary of the League, Mr. Lynn Haines, prepared and published a history of the Legislature of 1909, giving a clear analysis of all important measures, showing the forces that were at work to prevent good and secure bad legislation, and adding to it an accurate record of each member of the House and Senate, setting forth just how he had voted at roll call.

This book created a sensation. It showed beyond a question that many professed representatives of the people were really representatives of the special interests that rob the people through forms of law.

The publicity thus secured resulted directly in the retirement or defeat of practically every member of the old special interest serving political gang that had controlled the legislature for many years. Some retired voluntarily through fear of defeat, some were dropped at primaries and others defeated at general election.

This publicity was very useful in another direction. It helped to clarify the ideas and strengthen the backbone of many good members who had worked faithfully, but at great disadvantage. It made it easier for the people to know who had been faithful and who had failed.

And so by the two processes of weeding out the bad and helping the faithful, the legislature of 1911 was a great improvement over its predecessor of 1909.

But much was yet to be done. The special interests were very active; and though they failed to get much

bad legislation, they were able to prevent many of the best and most progressive measures from passing.

Again in 1911 Mr. Haines published a fearless and vigorous analysis of the work of both houses, containing a full record of each member. The people were eager for the information. About twenty thousand were circulated. Many objectionable members fell by the wayside. The best and most progressive House of Representatives in the history of the state was elected in 1912. It was honestly and efficiently organized and accomplished much.

The Senate was the same in personnel, as in 1911, but some of the members had seen a light, and better results were reached.

But there is more work to be done. There are still left senators and representatives who ought to be defeated, and others who should be helped to return and strengthened for good work.

For these reasons this book is published.

C. J. Buell.

TABLE OF CONTENTS		Page
Commendatory Foreword		5
Author's Preface		6
Introductory		10
CHAPTER I.		
The Speakership		13
CHAPTER II.		
How Shall Committees Be Appointed.....		15
CHAPTER III.		
Peoples' Power Legislation		19
1. Equal Suffrage for Women		19
2. Initiative and Referendum		24
3. The Recall		29
CHAPTER IV.		
Election Laws		31
CHAPTER V.		
Reapportionment		36
CHAPTER VI.		
Local Self Government		41
1. Public Utilities		42
2. The State Utility Commission Bill.....		43
3. The Nolan Bill		46
4. The Veto		46
5. A Comparison—The Governor's Bill and the Nolan Bill		46
6. The Telephone Bill and Its Veto.....		49
7. The Experience of Wisconsin		50
CHAPTER VII.		
The Cashman Anti-Discrimination Bill.....		52
CHAPTER VIII.		
Our Mineral Resource and the Tonnage Tax.....		57
CHAPTER IX.		
Temperance and Moral Measures		61
1. County Option		62
Nelson's Part		63
2. The Road House Bill		64
3. Fourth Class City Bill.....		65
4. The Injunction and Abatement Bill.....		65
CHAPTER X.		
The Public Domain		68
Public Lands		69
CHAPTER XI.		
Some Attempts That Failed		70
1. The Southwick Marriage Bill		70
2. Making Artificial Criminals		72
The St. Car Transfer Bill.....		72
3. Sterilizing Criminals and Others.....		75
CHAPTER XII.		
Other Important Legislation		77
CHAPTER XIII.		
The Records of the Members.....		79
Representatives		80
Senators		96
APPENDIX		
I and II. The Grain Reports.....		103
III. Brewery Controlled Saloons		110

INTRODUCTORY.

There are always two opposing forces at work in every organized society. One is progressive the other standpat or reactionary. One force is constantly striving for improvement; the other is either resisting improvement and progress or moving backward. One of these forces is restless, dissatisfied with things as they are; the other sits with folded hands and wonders what all the fuss is about. One may be called radical, if we use the word radical in its true sense, meaning to go to the root of things; the other is conservative, in an objectionable sense. It would conserve all that is old, no matter how rotten. True radicalism is the best conservatism. It keeps all that is good, but cuts out the dead timber.

In society, in church, in school, in government, in all the varied forms of industry, in short, in all human affairs, these two forces must work through men. Hence we have men who are progressive—ever pushing onward—always striving for improvement—men with visions of better things, with hope in their hearts, with fire in their blood, determined, enthusiastic, resistless. These are the world makers. On the other hand we have men who resist all improvement; who are satisfied with things as they are; who are like breaks on the wheels of progress, if indeed they do not turn the wheels backward.

Perhaps this is natural,—perhaps both kinds of men are needed; but I don't think the reactionaries should be given any special or law-created advantages. And isn't it a good thing that men die? Think how impossible progress would be if all the old fossils kept right on living!

But the forces of nature always make for progress. Old wrongs become unbearable and are finally righted. Not that the fundamental principles of democracy change, but that men come to see new applications of those principles. The great fundamental doctrine that governments are instituted among men to secure "Equal opportunity to all," never changes; but our conception of what *is equal opportunity* does change; and it is the all important business of legislators to first discover the natural laws that govern the evolution of society and then make their man-made statutes conform thereto.

And this is the true criterion by which to judge of man-made statutes: Do they secure greater equality of opportunity among the men and women who make up

society? Do they secure the greatest personal liberty, bounded only by the equal liberty of all others? Do they establish and maintain the greatest possible degree of self government for each social unit—the greatest freedom to manage their local affairs in their own way? Do the statutes of the state meddle the least possible with the private affairs of men and women, and with the local affairs of village or city, township or county? Do these statutes furnish the people with the simplest and most efficient tools by which to govern themselves; by which to choose their public servants; by which to make or amend the laws and constitutions under which they must live and labor?

In the following chapters the author will be guided by this principle in attempting to judge of the merits of measures and the acts and motives of men.



SPEAKER HENRY RINES

Who organized the House committees for effective progressive legislation.

CHAPTER I.

THE SPEAKERSHIP.

Very soon after the election of Nov. 5, 1912, it became apparent that the people had chosen to the lower house of the legislature of Minnesota a substantial majority of men who believed more or less firmly in the fundamental principles of democracy. Most of these men came to the legislature labeled as Republicans. Others called themselves Democrats. There was one called a Socialist and one a Prohibitionist. Whether these men were truly democratic or not must be determined by their legislative acts; and the first test by which we can begin to form an opinion was the way they lined up on the speakership. There were six candidates for speaker who appealed to the progressive element among the Republicans: W. I. Nolan of Hennepin, Henry Rines of Kenabec, N. J. Holmberg of Renville, Thomas Frankson of Fillmore, J. T. Johnson of Otter Tail, and T. T. Ofsthun of Pope. All these men had been in the legislature before, and their work had commanded the respect and confidence of the people of the state. With a degree of unselfishness seldom witnessed among those who seek political preferment these six men consulted and entered into an agreement to unite in support of the one who should show the greatest strength in a meeting of progressive members. In that meeting Henry Rines, after several ballots, was plainly the choice of the majority of those present, and all the rest pledged themselves to do all they could to secure his election. Other pledges of support began to come in and by December 3rd, enough members had pledged themselves to Mr. Rines to make his election to the speakership certain.

Garfield W. Brown of McLeod, P. H. McGarry of Cass and Ernest Lundeen of Hennepin, who had been willing to receive the votes of those opposed to Mr. Rines, now withdrew from the contest, and acknowledged their defeat. In this contest the twenty members who were elected as Democrats took no part. Sixteen of them met in St. Paul Nov. 26, and decided to hold aloof and allow the Speakership to be determined by the Republican members. This action is worthy of commendation, for as long as *party* is recognized, at all in our legislature, parties should stand by themselves in the determination of all *party* matters. It is to be hoped that the time is near when men will be chosen for public positions in state and city, village and county, upon their honesty and fitness instead of how they line up on national issues that have no necessary relation to state and local affairs. Of course real democracy is fundamental, and he who is imbued with that spirit will always be allied on that side regardless of the party label he wears.

At the opening of the legislative session Mr. Rines was elected speaker by one hundred one (101) affirmative votes to nineteen (19) for Frank Minette of Stearns Co. One Democrat, Vasaly of Morrison County, voted for Rines, explaining that he regarded party of no consequence in this matter and was fully satisfied with Mr. Rines.



LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR BURNQUIST

**Who organized the Senate committees for the best possible
progressive results.**

CHAPTER II.

HOW SHALL COMMITTEES BE APPOINTED?

Shall legislative committees be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the presiding officer of the Senate, or by the members of each body themselves through a Committee on Committees, or by some other device which the house in question shall provide?

Your answer to this question will depend largely on your point of view.

What is the object of organizing a legislative body at all? Why do we have committees?

There can be but one honest purpose in the organization of any legislative body, and that is to so frame the committees as to best carry out the will of the people, and secure such statutes as the people demand.

The means by which this shall be done is not of vital importance, so only that all are treated fairly and the work done effectively.

The Merits of and Objections to a Committee on Committees.

The only merit ever claimed for organization through a committee on committees is that it would be more democratic,—more likely to represent the will of the people.

Let us see.

Most of the proposals for a committee on committees were coupled with the further proposal that such committee should be composed of nine members, one from each congressional district, to be chosen by the members elect from such congressional district.

Now, for legislative purposes, the state is a unit, not nine unites. It would be possible, and quite proable, that the state as a whole might be strongly committed to progressive legislation, and yet a majority of the nine districts be reactionary.

Concentration of responsibility is a fundamental principle of all government.

Any committee on committees would fix responsibility nowhere.

A Speaker elected by the whole house can be held responsible. If the Speaker is in full harmony with the wishes of the people, as was undoubtedly the case with Mr. Rines, he will be better fitted to do this work, because he will have given more careful thought to the questions at issue, and he will waste less time.

In the Senate.

In the case of the Senate there is a slight difference. The Constitution vests all legislative power in the House and Senate. The Lieutenant Governor is no part of the Legislative power.

It might therefore seem that there is no reason in the nature of things why the Lieutenant Governor should appoint the Senate committees. But, in the state of Minnesota, it has always been the custom, except in one case, for the Senate to concede to the Lieutenant Governor the

power of appointing committees; and the people elect him with this understanding. In the election of 1912 the people of Minnesota had voted overwhelmingly in favor of strong, constructive, progressive policies, and had elected to the office of Lieutenant Governor J. A. A. Burnquist, a man known to be fully in sympathy with those policies. It was therefore the general feeling that the old custom should not be disturbed.

However, Senator F. A. Duxbury of Houston County and Senator George H. Sullivan of Washington County, who had always heretofore been the champions of privilege and standpattism, now came forward as advanced progressives, and demanded that the committees be taken away from the Lieutenant Governor and appointed by the Senate itself. This matter had been fully exploited in the newspapers for more than a week before the opening of the session; and it had been loudly proclaimed that the Democratic members of the Senate would unite, almost solidly, with the reactionary Republicans to overthrow the time-honored custom and take the committees away from Burnquist. Sullivan and Duxbury made long and very profound arguments in favor of their plan. The progressive element of the Senate made no word of reply. When the vote was finally taken, the reactionaries were able to muster only sixteen votes, divided as follows:

Republicans—Anderson, Carpenter, Cooke, Dunn, Duxbury, Gunn, Murray, Stebbins, Geo. H. Sullivan, and Wilson (ten).

Democrats—Coller, Donaldson, Johnson, C. D., Poehler, Weis, and Works, (six).

General Wilson explained that if his vote had been necessary to defeat the proposition, he would have voted the other way. Anderson and Donaldson declared that they had advocated the principle so long and so fully before their people that they could not vote otherwise than as they did. Johnston of Todd was in his seat but did not vote. Schaller was not in the Senate at all that day.

Evidently the Senators did not regard this as an opportune time to make the change, especially as the same Senate two years before had followed the old established custom. And perhaps their feeling was fairly well voiced by one senator who remarked, "When the Devil goes to preaching religion, I am always suspicious."

The Contest in the House.

The situation in the House was interesting. Ernest Lundeen of Minneapolis made a most vigorous fight for a committee on committees, but failed to secure any considerable support. He declared that his plan was vital and that no member who stood for real progressive policies could oppose it; but about all the real progressives were of a different opinion. A Committee on Committees would probably have required more than a week to do their work, and then could hardly have made as good and effective working committees as were those made by the Speaker.

On roll call Mr. Lundeen's motion received only seven votes, as follows: Lydiard, Sawyer, Lundeen, Dwyer, Thielen of Hennepin, Barten of Scott, and P. A. Peterson of Freeborn.

We need not question the honesty of either side to this controversy. Each man sees the case from his own point of view. And the plan proposed by each must be judged by the results it brings. My own conviction is that any legislative body that really desires to serve the people will be able to do so effectively, no matter which method they employ, and that they will change their methods as their needs require.

The amount of good legislation secured and the small number of bad laws enacted is sufficient answer to those who would make a vital question of the plan of organization. The whole question must hinge upon the honesty and intelligence of the members and those to whom the appointment of committees is entrusted.

Both houses were honestly organized for effective work. The committees were framed to produce results, and good results were had.

A very good illustration of the difference between the house in 1913 and 1911 may be found in the following comparative table of expenses of the two sessions:

Mr. Conley from the committee on Legislative Expenses makes the following report, showing the total expenses for the session of 1913 and also a comparative statement of similar expenses for the session of 1911.

ARTICLES	1911	1913	DIFFERENCE
Knives	\$1,046.00	None	\$1,046.00
Fountain pens....	1,175.60	None	1,175.60
Scissors	257.50	None	257.50
Writing paper ...	4,699.00	\$993.32	3,705.68
Carbon paper....	1,108.10	135.86	984.24
Typewriter paper	1,315.95	177.16	1,038.79
Blank books and forms	954.00	217.00	737.00
Paper knives....	100.00	None	100.00
Law books.....	932.50	191.00	741.50
Pocket manuals..	1,840.00	428.34	1,411.66
Postage	243.50	100.00	143.50
Senate and House files	1,122.00	574.55	547.45
Other supplies, etc.	3,597.61	1,167.38	2,430.23
Sundry items....	2,198.37	1,323.65	874.72
Furniture	1,849.00	216.00	1,633.00
Fixtures	331.00	521.74	\$190.74
Drainage Invest. Com.	2,695.82	None	2,695.82
Grain Invest. Com.	292.74	2,628.90	2,336.16
Public Acts. and Expend.	240.00	1,079.26	839.26
Game and Fish Com. Trips	353.85	None	353.85
State Hospital Com.	346.52	62.39	284.13
Other Com. Trips.	753.56	907.20	153.64
Election Contests.	751.00	1,404.50	653.50
Employe's Salaries	43,008.00	34,588.50	8,419.50
Members' Salaries	120,000.00	120,000.00	
Mileage to members	3,846.85	3,864.25	17.40
	\$194,958.47	\$170,570.00	\$24,388.47 \$4,190.70

The so-called supply account shows a decrease of\$15,193.87 over the 1911 session.

Furniture and fixtures.....	1,442.26
Employee's salaries	8,419.50
Visiting committee	484.36
	\$25,539.99

The 1913 session expended more money on investigation than did the 1911 session, thus leaving the net saving of the 1913 session over that of 1911, \$24,388.47.

Respectfully submitted this 25th day of April, 1913.

Kerry Conley.

Changes in the Rules.

Another strong indication that the House was organized by Mr. Rines in the interest of the entire people is to be found in the following list of important changes in the rules, prepared by W. I. Nolan, Chairman of the Rules Committee:

1. Reduced by 20 days the time during which bills could be introduced.
2. Special order made by a majority vote upon one day notice.
3. Reduced the number of committees and employees, (employees reduced one-third).
4. Made the Committee on Legislative Expenses an effective committee with a complete check on every expenditure, thus reducing the expenses of the House by more than \$24,000.
5. Required a permanent record of the Committee on Claims.
6. Required a regular schedule of committee meetings, thus preventing dilatory tactics on the part of committee chairmen.
7. Required each committee to keep a record of its meetings and proceedings, with a record of the vote of committee members, this vote to be part of the report to the House. The purpose of this rule was to give publicity to committee actions.
8. Limited the time a committee could hold a bill to 15 days. At the end of the 15-day period any member could demand the return of the bill to the House.
9. No leave of absence could be granted any committee to visit state institutions unless a request was made to the House in writing, stating the institution to be visited. The number that could be excused for this purpose was limited to three members.

This rule did away with the old time junkets.

Many other changes were made making the work of the House more efficient and providing a more complete record of bills and the action taken thereon.

The purpose of the changes was to give publicity to every action of the House and make the old-time methods of preventing legislation impossible.

CHAPTER III.
PEOPLE'S POWER LEGISLATION.

Governments derive all just powers from the consent of the governed. This is conceded by all to be the first and most vital principle of democracy. It therefore follows that the machinery by which the people are to make and amend their constitutions and statutes, should be as simple and as easy to work as possible. This is the reason why such devices as the Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Direct Primaries, Preferential voting, Popular Election, etc., have come to be so insistently demanded by the people. And that these means of popular government are soon to be made a part of the fundamental law in all parts of our country, there can be no doubt. In some form they are now in force in more than one-third of the states, and everywhere the people are demanding them. The English system of responsible government, with an appeal to the country in every crisis, is a different method of asserting the same principle.

Equal Suffrage for Women.

Women are about one-half of the *governed*. That half has as much *right* to a voice in government as has the other half; and that *right* should no longer be denied. Any one who has not yet grasped this principle, has something yet to learn in the school of democracy.

Senator Sageng's bill for a constitutional amendment to remove the discrimination against women which now deprives them of their right to vote came up for discussion on special order at 11:30 A. M., Jan. 28, 1913. Senators Haycraft, Boyle, Sageng and Dwinell made strong pleas that the *men* of Minnesota be permitted to vote upon this question, for it is by the men that this question must be settled. Senators Hackney and Duxbury spoke against submitting the question to the men of the state. The roll was called with the following result.

To permit the men to vote:

Bedford	Elwell	Odell
— Benson	Fosseen	— Peterson
Boyle	Froshaug	— Putnam
Cashman	Gunderson	— Rustad
Clague	— Hanson	— Sageng
Cook, C. F.	Haycraft	Saugstad
Dale	Johnson, V. L.	Shaller
.. Denegre	— Lende	Sundberg
Duea	Moonan	Thoe
— Dwinell	Nelson	Wilson

Against permitting the men to vote:

Ahmann	Hackney	Poehler
Anderson	— Handlan	Pugh
Carpenter	Johnson, C. D.	— Rockne
Chadle	— Johnston	Stebbins
Coller	Klein	— Sullivan, G. H.
Cooke, L. O.	L'Herault	— Sullivan, J. D.
Donaldson	McGrath.	Swanson
— Dunn	Marden	— Van Hoven
.. Duxbury	Murray	— Wallace
— Glotzbach	Olson	— Weis
Gunn	— Pauly	Works

Two years ago Cheadle, Duxbury, Olson and C. D. Johnson voted to submit the question to the male voters of the state, but this time changed front.

This year the women gained four votes as follows:

Clague	Duea
Dwinnell	Fosseen

So the women's cause failed again by just *two* votes.

The following editorial from the St. Paul Daily News voiced the feeling of very many voters:

"HOW DO MINNESOTA MEN LIKE THEIR MUZZLE?"

This suffrage business isn't over yet.

The fight has only just begun. Tuesday's vote in the senate was only a skirmish.

It was only a skirmish because the bill for submission is still to come before the house and because it is not to be believed that the senate will persist in applying the muzzle to the men voters of Minnesota.

In effect the senate has said to the MEN voters:

'We know that you are interested in this great question of equal suffrage—

'BUT WE REFUSE TO LET YOU VOTE ON IT.'

Thirty-three members of the senate have thus attempted to apply the muzzle to the men voters of the state.

Do they believe they are wiser than all the present voters?

Or are they afraid to trust their political futures to a mixed ballot of ALL CITIZENS?

Neither of these reasons does them much credit.

No, it is only the first skirmish. Suffrage is too big a question to be laid away by one close vote in but one body of the legislature.

Sober second thought may yet save the senate from permanent commitment to a monstrous blunder.

Let the House show the way."

—The Editor, St. Paul Daily News.

In the house, the equal suffrage amendment came up on special order, Tuesday morning, February 11.

Representative Adolph Larson of Pine County, the author of the bill, made a brief, plain statement of the purpose of the bill: "All that we ask is that this question be referred to the voters of the state. Let them decide it. Surely you are not afraid to trust the men to vote on this question. Are we so much wiser than those who sent us here, that we must sit in judgment over them?"

Holmberg, Campbell, Southwick, Nolan, Teigen, Kneeland, Conley, Sawyer, Bendixen, and Harrison spoke briefly and forcibly in favor of the bill. Harrison declared that if only one woman in a thousand wanted the ballot we have no right to deny her. Westlake and Lennon wanted to protect the women from the contaminating influence of politics, and G. W. Brown felt so strongly on this subject that he was not even willing to let the men vote on it, because the women would mix with the men in the work of campaigning. Bendixen asked Brown if he thought women would be contaminated if they were to come among

the men on the floor of the house. Are they contaminated when they go with us to church or in the lecture room?

Hopkins spoke strongly in favor of the bill declaring that all great questions should be submitted to the people; but three days later he was not willing that the people should be permitted to vote on the question of allowing each county to decide for itself whether the open saloon should be licensed or not, claiming that the licensing of the sale of liquor is not a public question but a personal and moral one as to which the public has no right to interfere.

Here follows the analysis of the vote—80 to 37:

For Suffrage:

Anderson, Walther	Hogenson, Tobias	Prince, T. H.
Bendixen, C. M.	Holmberg, N. J.	Putnam, H. A.
Bjorge, H. P.	Hopkins, Frank	Peterson, P. A.
Bjornson, G. B.	Johnson, A. C.	Rines, Henry
Bouck, Chas. W.	Johnson, J. T.	Sanborn, J. B.
Braateli, G. T.	Klemer, F. L.	Sawyer, C. L.
Brown, W. W.	Kneeland, Thomas	Skartum, K. G.
Burchard, C. D.	Knapp, C. T.	Southwick, C. F.
Burrows, G. W.	Larson, Adolph	Spooner, L. C.
Campbell Wm. A.	Lee, J. F.	Stone, Dr. W. T.
Carlson, Carl P.	Lindberg, R. J.	Stoven, A. C.
Child, S. R.	Lundeen, Ernest	Sundberg, Victor
Clementson, John	McMartin, Finlay	Teigen, A. F.
Coates, J. H.	Marschalk, Paul	Thorson Jul.
Conley, Kerry	Moeller, Geo. H.	Thornton, J. M.
Crane, Ralph E.	Morken, T. T.	Vasaly, L. W.
Crawford, D.	Nolan, W. I.	Voxland, G. H.
Davis, Andrew	Norton, W. I.	Warner, C. H.
Dunn, R. C.	Nelson, Nels E.	Warner, Elias
Elmer, J. P.	Ofsthun, T. T.	Wefald, Knud
Finke, A. C.	Olien, Andrew	Weld, B. I.
Frankson, Thos.	Orr, Chas. N.	Westman, L. O.
Frye, P. H.	O'Neill, D. P.	Williams, M. W.
Hanson, Alec	Palmer, F. L.	Wilson, J. W.
Harrison, H. H.	Papke, John W.	Walker, Isaac F.
Healey, John A.	Peterson, A. J.	Warner, A. L.
Hillman, N. S.	Porter, Miles	

Against Suffrage:

Anderson, John	Knopp, S. M.
Barten, Jos.	Lennon, J. G.
Borgen, Anton	Lydiard, L. A.
Brown, G. W.	McGarry, P. H.
Carey, H.	Minnette, Frank E.
Dindorf, W. E.	Nimocks, F. E.
Dunn, H. H.	Peterson, A. B.
Dwyer, Jas.	Pfaender, A.
Ferrier, Jas.	Pless, H. C.
Flowers, H. H.	Preston, J. J.
Fuchs, E. J.	Reed, G. D.
Hafften, Aug.	Ribenack, E. R.
Henry, J. A.	Saggau, H. A.
Just, W. A.	Seebach, Frank
Kimpel, Geh.	Stageberg, N. A.

Steen, Henry	Vollmer, Henry B.
Swenson, Oscar A.	Westcott, W. H.
Thielen, Wm. H.	Westlake, E. J.
Virtue, Leonard	
Not Voting:	
Greene, T. G.	Schwartz, Martin
	Sullivan, M. J.

When the house bill which had passed by a full two-thirds majority reached the Senate Friday morning Feb. 14th, there followed one of the most remarkable and unheard of scenes ever witnessed in a legislative body. Several senators who favored equal suffrage were absent—some of them had been excused to go home on necessary business. One at least was more than a hundred miles away.

The enemies of votes for women took advantage of this fact to prevent any consideration of the question on its merits. Senator Geo. N. Sullivan, of Stillwater, a shrewd, keen, uncompromising opponent of all progressive measures, moved to reject the Bill. His motion was seconded and the fight was on. Senator Sageng demanded a call of the Senate in order to get the absent members back, but it was impossible to reach them. Senators Sageng, Moonan, Haycraft and Lende appealed to the sense of fairness and justice of the Senate, but their appeals fell on deaf ears and were answered by sarcastic grins and sneers from their opponents who were ready to resort to any and all technical tricks to prevent open and free consideration of the bill on its merits.

Kill Suffrage Bill.

The ballot resulted as follows:

Senators who favored woman's suffrage on 7 roll calls:

Bedford, S. B.	Froshaug, S. J.	Rustad, Edw.
Benson, H. N.	Hanson, A. L.	Sageng, O.
Boyle, J. P.	Haycraft, J. E.	Saugstad, John
Cashman, T. D.	Lende, O. A.	Schaller, Alb.
Dale, O. G.	Moonan, John	Sundberg, B. E.
Denegre, J. D.	Nelson, S. A.	Thoe, F. J.
Dwinnell, W. S.	Peterson, E. P.	Wilson, G. P.
Elwell, J. T.	Putnam, F. E.	

Senators who opposed woman's suffrage on 7 roll calls:

Ahmann, J. J.	Gunn, D. M.	Rockne, A. J.
Anderson, E. N.	Hackney, J. M.	Stebbins, A. T.
Carpenter, G. F.	Handlan, Jas.	Sullivan, G. H.
Cheadle, H. W.	Johnson, C. D.	Sullivan, J. D.
Coller, J. A.	Johnston, Jas.	Swanson, C. J.
Cooke, L. O.	McGrath, M. J.	Van Hoven, P.
Donaldson	Marden, C. S.	Wallace, C. L.
Dunn, W. W.	Olson, A. C.	Weis, H. F.
Duxbury, F. A.	Poehler, A. A.	Works, S. D.
Glotzbach, F. L.	Pugh, T. M.	

Absentees for the Bill:

Fosseen, M. L.	Gunderson, C. J.
Johnson, V. L.	Odell, C. W.

Absentees against the Bill:

Klein, C. H.	Pauly, J. W.
L'Herault, N. A.	

Not voting on one or more roll calls:

Dwinnell, W. S., Minneapolis—On Sen. O. Sageng's motion to refer the bill to the elections committee.

Duea, S. B., Ruthton—On Sen. G. P. Wilson's motion to adjourn.

Cook, C. F., Austin—On Sen. G. H. Sullivan's motion to reject bill.

Murray, Frank, Bird Island—On Sen. Lende's motion to lay the bill on the table.

DAILY NEWS EDITORIAL.

"SHALL SLYNESS RULE THE STATE?"

Men of Minnesota, how do you like the muzzle which YOUR senators seem determined to fix permanently upon you?

For a second time YOUR senate has refused you permission to say yes or no upon the big live issue of equal suffrage.

The senate's first refusal was bad enough, but it followed the semblance of a fair and open debate.

Now YOUR senate has a second time declared that YOU ARE INCOMPETENT to decide this matter.

It is a constitutional question: the senate cannot settle it. The law is that you, THE VOTER, SHALL DECIDE.

But the senate—YOUR senate—refuses to let you exercise the right which the law gives to you and to you alone.

This second refusal did not follow fair and open debate. Having passed the house since the senate's first refusal, the bill came back with a thousandfold more of official standing than it had before. In the ordinary course of business, it would have traveled a well-marked course, so that its friends could have been advised of every step in its progress.

This was not true. WHY?

Before there was any time for a realignment, the bill was brought up on a sneak play without warning and again defeated. WHAT WAS THE REASON? WHO was the reason?

The bill was defeated by a trick and the trickster was Sen. Geo. H. Sullivan, who has a long record for opposition to people's legislation. Sullivan has fought the direct election of senators, the recall, the initiative and referendum, the state-wide primary and county option. Each of these measures could only be opposed on the ground that the people cannot be trusted with power to govern themselves and to make wise decisions. If Sullivan cannot and will not trust the voters, why should he expect the people further to trust him?

IF SUCH SENATORIAL SERVICE IS STATESMANSHIP, THEN THE PETTY CRIME OF A STREET GAMIN FILCHING FRUIT FROM A BLIND APPLE WOMAN SHOULD RANK AS SKILLED DIPLOMACY.

IF THIS IS SQUARE AND ABOVE BOARD, THEN A WEASEL THROTTLING DUCKLINGS IN THE DARK OF THE MOON IS A PERFECT PICTURE AND PATTERN OF PROBITY.

Who are these adepts in senatorial slyness, these students of stealth, these public servants who mistake the gumshoe for fair, manly argument?"—Editor Daily News.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

In the House of Representatives the first real test came on the Initiative and Referendum bill. The elections Committee had reported the best bill that has ever been framed in any state in the union.

The enemies of the bill knew it would be useless to make the attack directly from the front, so they tried a shrewd flank movement, but it didn't work. G. W. Brown, of McLeod county, attempted to put through the following amendment:

"No petition herein mentioned, shall be circulated among the electors of this State for the purpose of securing signatures thereto, but such petitions may be left in the custody of any of the following officers, viz.: Clerks of the District Court, City Clerks, Village Recorders and Town Clerks, and such other officers as may be hereinafter designated by law."

The right of petition is sometimes abused. It is a nuisance to have petition peddlers boring us for signatures. Paid petition peddlers sometimes use fraudulent methods to get names. It is easy to get signers to any kind of a petition.

Therefore, says Brown, we will prohibit petitions, and many who think they are really democratic were fooled by the argument and fell into the trap.

Now the right of petition is fundamental, and is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. You have an undoubted natural right to draw up a petition and ask people to sign it. You have the same right to hire an agent to secure signatures. But, because there is sometimes annoyance and fraud connected with such work, Mr. Brown was willing to prohibit by Constitutional provision this right to circulate petitions. How some minds can magnify a mosquito bite! How easy it is to become so obsessed over a small evil that we are willing to overturn the very foundations of freedom in our attempt to get rid of the evil. If there are evils connected with the circulation of petitions to initiate legislation, the remedy is not to be found in prohibiting such circulation—not even in prohibiting the employment of people to circulate petitions, but in prosecuting for fraud these who are guilty of fraud.

To deposit petitions with town and village clerks and other public officials and compel all who wish to sign them to go to such places to sign, not only violates a fundamental principle of democracy—not only establishes an unwarranted espionage and tyranny over the personal rights of the citizen—but would be a most effective means of killing the efficiency of the Initiative and Referendum.

The question was argued long and powerfully, and most ingeniously by Brown, Hopkins, Lennon, H. H. Dunn and others, who tried to emasculate the bill where they did not dare oppose it openly, and they were able to get 52 votes from men who were either so undemocratic in their make up, or so easily fooled by specious argument, that they were ready to sacrifice the very arc of the covenant of our liberties to remove a flea bite.

Here is the way the vote stood.

Those voting for the Amendment and Against the Real Initiative and Referendum.

Anderson, John	Nimocks, Frank E.
Anderson, Walther	O'Neill, D. P.
Barten, Joseph	Papke, John W.
Bouck, Chas. W.	Peterson, A. B.
Brown, G. W.	Peterson, P. A.
Carey, Hubbard	Pfaender, Albert
Crawford, D.	Pless, Ernest C.
Dindorf, W. E.	Preston, J. J.
Dunn, H. H.	Reed, George D.
Dunn, R. C.	Ribenack, E. R.
Dwyer, James	Saggau, H. A.
Elmer, J. P.	Sanborn, J. B.
Flowers, H. H.	Schwartz, Martin
Greene, T. G.	Seebach, Frank
Hafften, August	Southwick, Claude E.
Hanson, Alec	Stageberg, N. A.
Harrison, H. H.	Stoven, A. C.
Healey, John A.	Sullivan, M. J.
Henry, J. A.	Swenson, Oscar A.
Hoggenson, Tobias	Thielen, Wm. H.
Hopkins, Frank	Thornton, J. M.
Kimpel, Gerhard	Vollmer, Henry B.
Lennon, John G.	Walker, Isaac F.
Lydiard, L. A.	Warner, A. L.
Minette, Frank E.	Wescott, W. H.
Nelson, Nels E.	Westlake, E. J.

Those voting against the Amendment and For a Real Initiative and Referendum.

Bjorge, H. P.	Frye, P. H.
Bjornson, G. B.	Fuchs, E. J.
Borgen, Anton	Hillman, N. S.
Braatelién, G. T.	Holmberg, N. J.
Brown, W. W.	Johnson, A. C.
Burchard, C. D.	Klemer, F. L.
Campbell, Wm. A.	Kneeland, Thomas
Carlson, Carl P.	Knopp, Samuel M.
Child, S. R.	Larson, Adolph S.
Clementson, John	Lee, J. F.
Coates, J. H.	Lindberg, R. J.
Conley, Kerry	Lundeén, Ernest
Crane, Ralph E.	McMartin, Finlay
Davis, Andrew	Marschalk, Paul
Ferrier, James	Moeller, Geo. H.
Finke, A. C.	Morken, T. T.
Frankson, Thomas	Nolan, W. I.

Norton, W. I.	Sundberg, Victor C.
Ofsthun, T. T.	Teigen, A. F.
Olien, Andrew	Thorson, Julius
Orr, Charles N.	Vasaly, Louis W.
Palmer, F. L.	Voxland, George H.
Peterson, A. J.	Warner, C. H.
Porter, Miles	Warner, Elias
Prince, T. H.	Wefald, Knud
Putnam, H. A.	Weld, Bert I.
Skartum, K. G.	Westman, L. O.
Spooner, L. C.	Williams, M. W.
Steen, Henry	Wilson, J. W.
Stone, Dr. W. T.	Rines, Henry, Speaker

Not voting:

Bendixen, C. M.	Knapp, C. T.
Burrows, G. W.	McGarry, P. H.
Just, W. A.	Sawyer, C. L.
Johnson, J. T.	Virtue, Leonard

Those who made strong speeches in opposition to the Brown Amendment were Nolan, Campbell and Child of Minneapolis, Finke of Rock Co., Frankson of Fillmore, and Teigen of Chippewa.

The following Editorial from the St. Paul "Daily News" describes the situation very clearly and forcibly.

"A Victory for the People—By a Narrow Margin.

The Minnesota house of representatives yesterday proved true to its trust. It passed a real, effective initiative and referendum bill—a measure sound and workable in its provisions.

BUT the final, almost unanimous vote of 110 to 7 did **NOT** represent the **TRUE ALIGNMENT** of the people's **FRIENDS** and **FOES** in the house.

The crucial test came **PREVIOUS** to the final vote, when the question was on the adoption or rejection of a proposed amendment which would have choked out the life of this measure. Then the vote was 60 to 52—**A SCANT MAJORITY OF EIGHT** for popular government.

The deadly amendment would have prohibited the **CIRCULATION** of initiative and referendum petitions and provided that all such petitions be left with certain city or county officers, where people **MIGHT** go to sign them.

It may be that here and there a **FEW** representatives voted for this amendment in the honest belief that it was a good thing.

But the great majority voting for it **KNEW** that it would, if adopted, effectively **KILL** the initiative and referendum by making it well-nigh impossible to get sufficient signatures to a petition.

Those few who voted for this amendment from honest conviction and who still in their hearts regard themselves as real **SERVANTS** of the people should take the next and **EVERY** following opportunity to **VOTE RIGHT** and set themselves right with their constituents.

And real friends of popular government must not be blinded to the actual closeness of their majority in the house.

And voters everywhere should note how THEIR representative voted on this amendment at the crisis of a great fight for popular government.

Of the eight who did not vote, Bendixen, Burrows, Knapp, Sawyer and J. T. Johnson would have been against the Brown amendment; Just, McGarry and Virtue for it.

Against the bill on final passage, Walther Anderson, R. C. Dunn, Elmer, McGarry, Knapp, Saggau, Walker.

In the Senate.

Senator Geo. H. Sullivan declares that he favors the Initiative and Referendum, but what kind of an Initiative and Referendum act would satisfy him? It looks very much as if the kind that would please him would be one that the people could not use.

The Senate committee made some amendments to the House bill, but none of them made it less workable; but when the bill came up on special order Tuesday, March 18, Sullivan made a fierce onslaught, and partly succeeded in destroying its workability.

He first offered an amendment to require a majority of all voting at an election to pass a constitutional amendment. This led to a long discussion with the following result:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Fosseen	Putnam
Anderson	Gunn	Pugh
Boyle	Hachney	Rockne
Cheadle	Johnson, C. D.	Schaller
Cooke, L. O.	Johnston	Sullivan, G. H.
Denegre	Klein	Swanson
Donaldson	L'Herault	Van Hoven
Duea	Murray	Wallace
Dunn	Olson	Weis
Dwinnell	Pauly	Wilson
Elwell	Poehler	Works

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bedford	Gunderson	Peterson
Benson	Hanson	Rustad
Cashman	Haycraft	Sageng
Clague	Johnson, V. L.	Saugstad
Cook, C. F.	Lende	Sundberg
Dale	McGrath	Thoe
Duxbury	Moonan	
Froschaug	Odell	

So the amendment was adopted, 33 to 22.

Having so far succeeded, Sullivan next tried to apply the same principle to the vote on statutes, and require a majority of all voting at the election to pass a law. But in the opinion of the senate a law is different from an amendment to the constitution. It should be easier for the people to pass a law than to amend the constitution,

so they voted Sullivan down and left it so that a majority of these voting on the question can make and amend statutes.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Cheadle	Pugh	Van Hoven
Dunn	Sullivan, G. H.	Weis
Gunn	Swanson	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Gunderson	Poehler
Bedford	Hanson	Putnam
Benson	Haycraft	Rustad
Boyle	Johnson, C. D.	Sageng
Cashman	Johnson, V. L.	Saugstad
Clague	Johnston	Schaller
Cook, C. F.	Klein	Thoe
Dale	Lende	Wallace
Donaldson	L'Herault	Wilson
Duea	Moonan	Denegree
Duxbury	Murray	Hackney
Dwinnell	Odell	McGrath
Elwell	Olson	Rockne
Fosseen	Pauly	
Froshaug	Peterson	

So the amendment was lost, 43 to 8.

Sullivan then offered an amendment to prohibit the circulation of petitions but failed. Yeas 17, and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Johnson, C. D.	Sullivan, G. H.
Anderson	Olson	VanHoven
Cooke, L. O.	Pauly	Wallace
Donaldson	Pugh	Weis
Duea	Rockne	Works
Gunn	Swanson	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bedford	Froshaug	Peterson
Benson	Gunderson	Poehler
Boyle	Hanson	Putnam
Cashman	Haycraft	Rustad
Cheadle	Johnson, V. L.	Sageng
Clague	Johnston	Saugstad
Dale	Klein	Sundberg
Dunn	Lende	Thoe
Duxbury	McGrath	Wilson
Dwinnell	Moonan	
Elwell	Murray	
Fosseen	Odell	

Senator Rockne then moved to amend so that the petitions must come from at least one third of the counties of the state instead of from ten counties, as in the original bill. This would make it very difficult to initiate labor legislation as the organized working men are mostly in a few large centers, also legislation that affected only certain sections of the state, no matter how important, would be very hard to secure; but the amendment passed by the following vote:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Johnson, C. D.	Putnam
Anderson	Johnson, V. L.	Rockne
Bedford	Johnston	Rustad
Benson	Klein	Saugstad
Clague	McGrath	Schaller
Cook, C. F.	Moonan	Sundberg
Dale	Murray	Swanson
Donaldson	Odell	Thoe
Duea	Olson	Weis
Duxbury	Peterson	Wilson
Elwell	Poehler	Works
Froshaug	Pugh	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boyle	Gunderson	Pauly
Cheadle	Gunn	Sageng
Cooke, L. O.	Hackney	Sullivan, G. H.
Denegre	Haycraft	VanHoven
Dunn	Hanson	Wallace
Dwinnell	Lende	
Fosseen	L'Herault	

So the amendment was adopted, 35 to 19.

The bill then passed the Senate unanimously.

But the House refused to concur in these Senate amendments, and the conference committee reached a unanimous agreement on the points in controversy. This agreement reduced the number of counties in which petitions must be circulated to one-fourth of all the counties instead of one-third, and made it much easier to adopt constitutional amendments. Both houses adopted the conference report; the Senate unanimously and the House with the following four dissenting votes: Anderson, J., McGarry, Peterson, A. B., and Saggau. And so, at last, after many years of struggle, the right to control legislation has been put up to the people of Minnesota for their discussion.

THE RECALL.

A very good recall bill was passed with only eight votes against it in the Senate, as follows: L. O. Cooke, Lake City; J. A. Collier, Shakopee; D. M. Gunn, Grand Rapids; C. J. Swanson, Fridley; J. D. Sullivan, St. Cloud; G. H. Sullivan, Stillwater; S. D. Works, Mankato; G. P. Wilson, Minneapolis.

Two Senators were absent, H. N. Benson of St. Peter and Peter Van Hoven of St. Paul. All the other Senators voted for the bill on final passage.

But the real test on the recall bill came on the attempt to amend so as to exempt judges. The conservatives made a strong effort to save the judges from recall, but could muster only the following 22 votes:

Carpenter, Collier, Denegre, Dunn, Duxbury, Dwinnell, Elwell, Gunn, Johnson, C. D., Klein, L'Herault, Murray, Pugh, Putnam, Rockne, Schaller, Sullivan, G. H., Sullivan, J. D., Swanson, Wallace, Wilson and Works.

Benson, Nelson and Van Hoven were absent, and all other senators voted against exempting judges from recall.

Some of the senators opposed the bill because it included judges, but Senator Works explained that he was opposed to any recall bill, as he believed it dangerous to give the people such power.

The following four senators even voted against the conference report on the recall: Dunn, Sullivan, G. H. Wilson and Works.

In the House on final passage there were only two votes against the recall bill, R. C. Dunn of Princeton and Lydiard of Minneapolis.

CHAPTER IV.

ELECTION LAWS.

I believe that we shall finally do away with primary elections entirely; but as long as we use the system, it should be made as perfect as possible.

There are many objections to the system of primary elections, and I want to state briefly some of the most important of them. They are a great expense to the state and a greater expense to the candidates, making it very difficult for a poor man to aspire to office, where he must meet the labor and cost of two contested elections—one to get the party nomination, and the other to secure the election. Again, the primary election usually compels us to recognize political parties—and when each voter at the primary must declare his political faith, then the principle of the secret ballot is to a great extent destroyed. But in spite of this required declaration of the political party that one belongs to, it is easy for the members of one party to vote the other party ticket, thus nominating weak men for whom they have no intention of voting at the polls.

Then it might justly be asked why should parties be recognized at all? Are not political parties voluntary organizations of citizens who come together to support certain ideas and ideals of government, and why should the public step in and interfere? In the long run, can any good come out of such interference?

The answer has been that since parties select the candidates from among whom the people are to choose their public servants, the machinery of parties must be subject to legal regulation. I have never agreed with this contention, but have always insisted that if the laws would provide the simple and easily workable machinery whereby the people could select their public servants, no primary laws would be needed. Indeed such laws are worse than useless.

The experiences of many countries bears out this contention. The preferential plan of voting at the regular election is now in operation in many parts of the world, and has recently been adopted in several cities of the United States. Grand Junction, Colorado, the home of that pioneer of progressive ideas in government, Senator James W. Bucklin, was the first in this country. It has been followed by several other cities of Colorado (including Denver), by Spokane, Wash., and recently by our own city of Duluth.

The preferential plan is simplicity itself. Let any candidate go on the ballot who can secure a certain number of endorsers to his petition. This leaves the field open for any party or other voluntary association of voters to put forward their candidate, and do all they can to elect him.

At the election each voter has a right to express his preference. Opposite the name of his first choice for any

office he puts the figure 1; opposite his second choice the figure 2; opposite his third choice the figure 3; and so on down the list of candidates for that office. He marks the candidates for each office in the same way all down the ballot. This plan frequently results in having many names on the ticket, and it takes much time to count the votes. But the ticket is not likely to be any longer than the ballot at the primaries, and the expense of counting is far less than the expense of the extra election made necessary by the primary system.

Another valuable feature of this plan is that no minority candidate is ever elected. No man can be elected until he secures a majority of votes, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th choice, and so on. It does require much counting, but the plan is simple, the voters easily grasp it, and the election clerks and judges readily understand the methods of counting. This has been the experience wherever tried, and much expense is saved, both to candidates and to the state. But until such a plan as this can be adopted, we should have the best primary election law possible with 2nd or even 3rd and 4th choice. The voters will soon learn. Practice is the only thing that makes perfect, and you can never teach people how to do a thing by denying them the chance to do it.

The elections committee of the Senate brought in a fairly good primary bill—I should have liked it better if it had provided for 3rd choice as well as 2nd, and a simpler method of marking and counting the ballots. The bill provided for several changes in the present law.

First—The Progressive party was recognized and permitted to have a place on the ballot. Regardless of what the effects might be on other parties, this is certainly only fair to a party that carried the state for president and polled over 33,000 votes for the head of the state ticket.

Second—The non-partisan principle was applied to all county and judicial offices and the second choice principle was retained.

Third—No filings by petition are permitted after the primary election.

Fourth—Where there is no contest for nomination the candidate is not put on the primary ballot.

The first attempt to spoil the bill was made by Senator Duxbury, who tried to put all county officers, except Superintendent of Schools back on to the partisan basis. But this attempt failed.

Yeas 20 and nays 34, as follows:

Anderson	Fosseen	Stebbins
Carpenter	Gunn	Sullivan, G. H.
Cooke, L. O.	Klein	Swanson
Duea	Marden	Thoe
Dunn	Nelson	Wallace
Duxbury	Olson	Rockne
Dwinnell	Pugh	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahmann	Handlan	Rustad
Bedford	Hanson	Sageng
Boyle	Haycraft	Saugstad
Cashman	Johnson, V. L.	Schaller
Cheadle	Lende	Sullivan, J. D.
Clague	L'Herault	Sundberg
Coller	McGrath	Van Hoven
Donaldson	Moonan	Weis
Elwell	Odell	Wilson
Froshaug	Pauly	Works
Gunderson	Peterson	
Hackney	Putnam	

So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Stebbins assisted by Senator Geo. H. Sullivan then made a desperate attempt to strike out the second choice provision, but that also failed to get more than 28 votes. Here is the line up. Those voting in the affirmative wanted to cut out the second choice.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Johnson, C. D.	Schaller
Anderson	Johnston	Stebbins
Carpenter	Glotzbach	Sullivan, G. H.
Clague	Gunn	Sullivan, J. D.
Coller	Klein	Swanson
Cooke, L. O.	L'Herault	Van Hoven
Denegre	Pauly	Wallace
Donaldson	Poehler	Wilson
Dunn	Pugh	
Duxbury	Rockne	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bedford	Froshaug	Odell
Benson	Hackney	Olson
Boyle	Hanson	Peterson
Cashmann	Haycraft	Putnam
Cheadle	Johnson, V. L.	Rustad
Cook, C. F.	Lende	Sageng
Dale	McGrath	Saugstad
Dwinnell	Marden	Thoe
Elwell	Moonan	Weis
Fosseen	Nelson	Works

So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Clague then proposed to amend the bill so as to make all legislative candidates non-partisan. This was seized upon by the enemies of the bill as a good means of defeating it. Duxbury urged all opponents of the bill to vote for the amendment as a means of killing the bill. Many friends of the bill did not regard the amendment as at all dangerous and so made no fight against it.

The amendment was adopted by the following vote:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Gunn	Rockne
Bedford	Haycraft	Stebbins
Carpenter	Johnson, C. D.	Sullivan, G. H.
Cheadle	Johnston	Sullivan, J. D.
Clague	L'Herault	Swanson
Cook, C. F.	McGrath	Thoe
Dale	Marden	Van Hoven
Dunn	Olson	Wallace
Duxbury	Pauly	Weis
Elwell	Peterson	Wilson
Fosseen	Poehler	Works
Glotzbach	Pugh	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Froshaug	Odell
Benson,	Hackney	Putnam
Boyle,	Hanson	Rustad
Cashman,	Johnson, V. L.	Sageng
Coller,	Klein	Saugstad
Denegre	Lende	Schaller
Donaldson	Moonan	
Dwinnell	Nelson	

So the amendment was adopted.

Mr. Sullivan J. D., offered the following amendment to S. F. No. 412 and moved its adoption:

Strike out all that part of section 6 of the bill after the word "office" in line 12 of said section.

This amendment was intended to permit names to go on the ballot by petition after the primaries.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Carpenter	Glotzbach	Rockne
Cheadle	Gunn	Rustad
Cooke, L. O	Johnson, C. D.	Sullivan, G. H.
Dale	L'Herault	Sullivan, J. D.
Dunn	McGrath	Swanson
Duxbury	Marden	Van Hoven
Dwinnell	Moonan	Wilson

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahmann	Fosseen	Peterson
Anderson	Froshaug	Poehler
Bedford	Hackney	Pugh
Benson	Hanson	Putnam
Boyle	Haycraft	Sageng
Cashman	Johnson, V. L.	Saugstad
Clague	Johnston	Schaller
Coller	Klein	Stebbins
Cook, C. F.	Lende	Thoe
Denegre	Odell	Works
Donaldson	Olson	Weis
Elwell	Pauly	Wallace

So the amendment was not adopted.

The bill was then put on its final passage with the following result.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Glotzbach	Pugh
Anderson	Hackney	Putnam
Bedford	Handlan	Rockne
Benson	Hanson	Rustad
Boyle	Haycraft	Sageng
Carpenter	Johnson, C. D.	Saugstad
Cashman	Johnson, V. L.	Schaller
Cheadle	Johnston	Sullivan, G. H.
Clague	Lende	Sullivan, J. D.
Coller	L'Herault	Sundberg
Cook, C. F.	McGrath	Swanson
Cooke, L. O.	Moonan	Thoe
Denegre	Murray	Van Hoven
Donaldson	Odell	Wallace
Dunn	Olson	Weis
Elwell	Pauly	Wilson
Fosseen	Peterson	Works
Froschaug	Poehler	

Those who voted in the negative were:

^ Dale	Gunn	^ Nelson
^ Duxbury	Klein	^ Stebbins
^ Dwinnell	^ Marden	

In the House there was very little opposition. As finally passed the bill is quite an improvement over the old primary law.

CHAPTER V.

REAPPORTIONMENT.

The last reapportionment of the state into senatorial and legislative districts was made by the legislature of 1897—sixteen years ago—and even that bill left to Southern Minnesota rather more than its fair share of members on the constitutional basis that each *section* of the state shall be represented as nearly as may be according to its population.

During the last sixteen years nearly every county to the south and west of the Twin Cities has lost population, while St. Paul, Minneapolis and all Northern Minnesota have gained very heavily. With these changes the old apportionment has become more and more unjust, especially in the senate.

The bill introduced by the joint committee of the house and senate does fairly apportion the members of both houses to the different *sections* of the state, tho there is great discrepancy in population among the districts in these sections. This is especially true of the northwestern part of the state where there are two very small districts hedged in by three very large ones, but this arrangement was almost inevitable and was entirely satisfactory to the members from that part of the state.

The fight of H. H. Dunn, of Freeborn, to deprive the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul of any increase in representation was the most bitter and dramatic in the whole contest; and from the constitutional point of view the most inexcusable.

Mr. Dunn was able to rally to his support only 45 votes, almost wholly from the southern part of the state where the members fought tenaciously to deprive the cities of their due proportion of members under the constitution, and to keep their own unfair excess of representation.

It is easy to understand why many of the country members feel hostile to the growing power of the cities. Heretofore the city members have been largely under the influence of the liquor and monopoly interests; and tho the present legislature is a great improvement over the past in this respect, there is still great chance for further improvement. And the city representation is bound to improve. The people of the cities are more and more coming to understand the great fundamental principles of real democracy, and more and more their representatives are sure to voice the sentiments of the growing intelligence of their constituents. The future has much to hope and little to fear from the cities. In the words of Frederick C. Howe, "The city is the hope of democracy," and yet the bill as reported and passed by the house left each of the large cities with one senator and two representatives less than they were entitled to under any fair interpretation of the constitution. If the constitution gives the cities too

much power the remedy lies in an amendment limiting the representation from the large centers, not in a violation of the constitution in a reapportionment bill.

The vote on the Dunn amendment was as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Barten	Hafften	Reed
Bendixen	Hanson	Saggau
Braatelian	Hogenson	Schwartz
Brown, W. W.	Johnson, A. C.	Seebach
Burchard	Just	Southwick
Carey	Kimpel	Stageberg
Conley	Klemer	Steen
Crane	Lindberg	Swenson
Crawford	McMartin	Teigen
Dunn, H. H.	Minette	Voxland
Ferrier	Papke	Walker
Finke	Peterson, A. J.	Weld
Flowers	Peterson, P. A.	Wescott
Frankson	Pless	Westman
Frye	Prince	Williams

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, J.	Hopkins	Porter
Anderson, W.	Johnson, J. T.	Preston
Bjorge	Knapp	Putnam
Bjornson	Kneeland	Ribenack
Borgen	Knopp	Sanborn
Bouck	Larson	Sawyer
Brown, G. W.	Lee	Skartum
Campbell	Lenon	Spooner
Carlson	Lundeen	Stone
Child	Lydiard	Stoven
Clementson	McGarry	Sullivan
Coates	Marschalk	Sundberg
Davis	Moeller	Thielen
Dindorf	Morken	Thornton
Dunn, R. C.	Nelson	Thorson
Dwyer	Nimocks	Vasaly
Elmer	Nolan	Virtue
Fuchs	Norton	Vollmer
Greene	Ofsthun	Warner, A. L.
Harrison	Olien	Warner, C. H.
Healy	O'Neill	Wefald
Henry	Orr	Westlake
Hillman	Palmer	Wilson
Holmberg	Peterson, A. B.	Mr. Speaker

So the amendment was lost, and then the bill was passed by a large majority, 84 to 33.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, J.	Borgen	Campbell
Anderson, W.	Bouck	Carlson
Bendixen	Braatelian	Child
Bjorge	Brown, G. W.	Clementson
Bjornson	Burrows	Coates

Conley	Lydiard	Sawyer
Davis	McGarry	Skartum
Dindorf	Marschalk	Southwick
Dunn, R. C.	Minette	Spooner
Elmer	Moeller	Steen
Fuchs	Morken	Steven
Greene	Nelson	Sullivan
Harrison	Nimocks	Sundberg
Healy	Nolan	Teigen
Henry	Norton	Thielen
Hillman	Ofsthun	Thornton
Holmberg	Olien	Thorson
Hopkins	O'Neill	Vasaly
Johnson, J. T.	Orr	Virtue
Kimpel	Palmer	Vollmer
Knapp	Peterson, A. B.	Walker
Kneeland	Peterson, A. J.	Warner, A. L.
Knopp	Pless	Warner, C. H.
Larson	Porter	Wefald
Lee	Preston	Weld
Lennon	Putnam	Westlake
Lindberg	Ribenack	Wilson
Lundeen	Sanborn	Mr. Speaker

Those who voted in the negative were:

Barten	Frankson	Prince
Brown, W. W.	Frye	Reed
Burchard	Hafften	Saggau
Carey	Hanson	Schwartz
Crane	Hogenson	Seebach
Crawford	Johnson, A. C.	Stageberg
Dunn, H. H.	Just	Swenson
Dwyer	Klemer	Voxland
Ferrier	McMartin	Wescott
Finke	Papke	Westman
Flowers	Peterson, P. A.	Williams

So the bill passed and its title was agreed to.

When the bill reached the senate the committee on reapportionment gave one more senator each to the first and third districts.

Then Senator Putnam offered an amendment that would have taken from the three large counties all the increase in the senate that their population entitled them to. Duxbury and Moonan made long and earnest appeals for the Putnam amendment, but could not carry it.

The vote was as follows: Yeas 20 and nays 38.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Glotzbach	Poehler
Bedford	Haycraft	Putnam
Benson	Lende	Rustad
Cashman	McGrath	Stebbins
Cook, C. F.	Moonan	Thoe
Cooke, L. O.	Nelson	Weis
Duxbury	Olson	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahmann	Hackney	Rockne
Boyle	Handlan	Sageng
Cheadle	Hanson	Saugstad
Clague	Johnson, C. D.	Schaller
Coller	Johnson, V. L.	Sullivan, G. H.
Denegre	Johnston	Sullivan, J. D.
Donaldson	Klein	Sundberg
Dunn	L'Herault	Swanson
Dwinnell	Marden	Van Hoven
Elwell	Odell	Wallace
Fosseen	Pauly	Wilson
Gunderson	Peterson	Works
Gunn	Pugh	

So the amendment was not adopted.

Then Duxbury offered an amendment that would take from Hennepin county all increased representation in the senate, with the following result: Yeas 21 and nays 36.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duxbury	Poehler
Bedford	Haycraft	Putnam
Benson	Johnston	Schaller
Cashman	Lende	Stebbins
Cook, C. F.	Moonan	Thoe
Dale	Nelson	Weis
Duea	Olson	Works

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahmann	Gunderson	Pugh
Boyle	Gunn	Rockne
Carpenter	Hackney	Rustad
Cheadle	Handlan	Sageng
Clague	Hanson	Saugstad
Coller	Johnson, C. D.	Sullivan, G. H.
Denegre	Johnson, V. L.	Sullivan, J. D.
Donaldson	Klein	Sundberg
Dunn	L'Herault	Swanson
Dwinnell	Odell	Van Hoven
Elwell	Pauly	Wallace
Fosseen	Peterson	Wilson

So the amendment was not adopted.

The bill was then put on its final passage, when only ten senators voted against it.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Denegre	Hackney
Bedford	Donaldson	Hanson
Benson	Duea	Johnson, C. D.
Boyle	Dunn	Johnson, V. L.
Carpenter	Dwinnell	Johnston
Cheadle	Elwell	Lende
Clague	Fosseen	L'Herault
Coller	Glotzbach	Marden
Cooke, L. O.	Gunderson	Murray
Dale	Gunn	Odell

Pauly	Saugstad	Swanson
Peterson	Schaller	Van Hoven
Pugh	Stebbins	Wallace
Rockne	Sullivan, G. H.	Wels
Rustad	Sullivan, J. D.	Wilson
Sageng	Sundberg	Works

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Haycraft	Poehler
Cashman	Klein	Thoe
Duxbury	Moonan	
Handlan	Olson	

So the bill passed and its title was agreed to.

The house promptly accepted the senate amendment, and so, after sixteen years of struggle, the northern part of the state has secured a fair representation in the legislature, and the cities a part of the increase their population would entitle them to under the constitution.

CHAPTER VI.

Local Self Government.

Local self government for each social and political unit is the very corner stone of democracy; and so it has been thru all the ages of human evolution. The self governing village community has been the home of political freedom, and here liberty has been cradled and nourished and helped to grow great and strong, intelligent and far reaching.

Away back among the hills and valleys and forests of Central Asia, long before our Aryan ancestors migrated eastward into India or westward into Europe, the people of each little community had its own system for the management of its local affairs; and here we shall find the germs of all our democratic institutions, even to those latest and newest instruments of democracy the Initiative, Referendum and Recall.

All thru the ages, interference with such local right of self government has been the essence of tyranny; and this is as true to day as in any past age. Neither does it matter how this interference with local freedom has been brought about, whether by conquest, as so often in the past, when a village or city has been overthrown by force of arms and subjected to a foreign foe to be ruled and plundered for the benefit of its oppressors, or by the more insidious, but just as effective, modern method of permitting state legislatures and congress to pass laws that regulate and tyrannize over the people of the smaller communities. The result is just the same. Liberty is lost.

"No people," said Lincoln, "are good enough to govern another people;" and no legislature is good enough or intelligent enough to frame the regulations by which the purely local affairs of our towns and counties, villages and cities are to be governed. And yet a large part of the time of every session of our legislature is wasted on just such worse than worthless work as this.

Of course many of our cities now have home rule charters by which they manage most of their local affairs; but why shouldn't all things of a local nature be turned over to each town or city? Why should the state have any voice whatever in the purely local affairs of Minneapolis or St. Paul, Winona or Mankato, or any other village or city in the state? No legislature can possibly know the needs of a town or city so well as the people themselves.

The result is that local matters are put through the legislature, by the members from each locality, and the rest of the members simply vote for whatever the local representatives bring forward. In this way much legislation is put through that the people of the locality affected know little or nothing about, and which they would have none of if they did know.

We need not think that the members from any locality are dishonest or lacking in ability. The mere fact that they are human is enough. They can't know the local needs well enough, and if they did know they could not

devote the time necessary to intelligently frame the needed laws.

This principle was forcibly brought out on March 3rd, when nineteen new bills were rushed through the senate under suspension of the rules. About two or three minutes were given to each bill. They were all Minneapolis measures; had never been printed; no senator knew anything about any of the bills, except as the matter was explained in the most general way. Of course, no one really knew anything about what he was voting on. Even the senator who had charge of the bills had never read them. But they all went through without a vote against any one of them. Even if every one of these bills was just what was needed, by the people of Minneapolis, what can be said in support of such methods of securing needed laws? But at least one of these bills was as bad as can well be imagined. The bill professed to amend the laws relating to the board of health of that city. What it really did was to create a purely irresponsible board, appointed by the mayor, and over which the people had no control whatever.

Then it proceeded to vest that board with arbitrary, tyrannical and practically unlimited powers.

Of course the bill aroused intense opposition. Its tyrannical and iniquitous features were promptly laid bare, and it was killed very dead by the Hennepin County house members; but what shall we say of a system that makes such things possible, and subjects patriotic citizens to the necessity of constantly defending their rights and liberties.

But the most far-reaching and dangerous interference of the legislature with local affairs relates to their attempts to regulate local

Public Utilities.

In most parts of the civilized world all public utilities are owned and controlled by the people directly; and everywhere there is a strong tendency to make this ownership and control more complete and effective. All public utilities, whether of city, state, or nation are essential parts of our public highways. The common path—the public highway—has always been regarded as a public affair and never as a private affair. In the very nature of things no private person nor corporation can possibly build and equip any railway, canal, pipe line, telegraph or telephone system, gas or electric system, street railway, or water works, without first securing a grant of governmental power,—without first getting the government of nation, state or city to turn over a part of its natural and necessary functions to such private person or corporation. Following this line of reasoning, the courts have always held, that, whenever such corporations are created and endowed with these powers, and duties, they must always be subject to any and all reasonable regulations which the people may impose.

Where shall this power to regulate rest? Your answer to this question will depend largely on whether you really believe in democracy or not. Democracy says that the social unit that is served by the public utility corporation shall be the power to regulate it. The federal government shall regulate corporations engaged in inter-state commerce; but must keep its hands off those whose operations lie wholly within a state. The state government must regulate state corporations; the city government must control city corporations. If a city is big enough to have a street railway, a gas, or an electric company, or any other city utility, it is certainly big enough to control such utility. If it makes mistakes it must learn from them. No outside power can do this for any city. State or federal control of city corporations is a violation of the principle of home rule and local self government, that should not be tolerated.

Of late years the cities have been rapidly learning how to control their public service corporations. The corporations do not like this, so they are now making a concerted movement for the establishment of state commissions that are to have complete control over all public utilities within the state; thus depriving every city of any and all control over their city corporations, and even over their own publicly owned utilities.

The State Utility Commission Bill.

Several bills having this object in view were introduced into the legislature of 1913. Senators Wallace and Murray each brought in a bill of this character early in the session. Later on Senator Wallace was taken very sick. It looked as if he would not be able to do anything for his measure. About this time there was suddenly, and almost without warning, reported out of the house committee on general legislation, a bill which proved to be identical in all essentials with the Wallace bill. This bill immediately aroused great opposition, and very justly so, as will be seen by a very brief analysis of some of its provisions.

First, it created a State Commission of three men, appointed by the Governor for a term of six years, over whom the people had no check whatever; and into the hands of these men was to be placed the complete control of every public utility in every city and village of the state, leaving the people of these cities and villages with no voice whatever in the management of their local public-service corporations, except as they might be able to influence the state commission by indirect means.

No city could, in any way, regulate or control the price of gas, electricity, or street car service. No city could make any kind of agreement with any of its public service corporations in any way whatever, except as it was done through this State Commission.

Can we imagine a more complete overthrow of the principle of home rule and local self government?

But this is not all, nor the worst of the evil.

This bill, in sections 30 and 31, prohibits lower rates than those in force Jan. 1st, 1913. In St. Paul, both gas and electric rates had already been lowered. They would have to be restored to the old excessive rates in force prior to Jan. 1st. In many places rates are much too high, but under this bill they could not be reduced.

More than this, if any town or city wanted to take over any public utility, to be owned and operated by the people, the conditions were made very hard, and it would be almost impossible to comply with them. Three-fifths of all those voting at an election must vote favorably, before a city could come into the ownership of a public utility at all, and even then, it is probable that the law would deprive them of all control over their own local concern.

The bill contained the feature known as "The Indeterminate Permit." This is innocent looking, but most vicious in operation. It practically amounts to a perpetual franchise, tho the bill claimed to do away with all franchises; but what difference does it make whether it is called a franchise or a permit? In either case it is the same thing.

And if a city should determine to buy out the property of a public utility corporation, what then? The bill contained a very carefully drawn provision,—carefully drawn to protect the interests of the corporations. Section 65 provided that "the Commission shall take into account and include the amount of money actually and wisely expended in acquiring, constructing, creating and bringing the property to its then state of efficiency, and every other just and reasonable element of value, including the value of such property as a going concern. And the only condition was that it must have been a "going concern" for five years.

How would it be possible, under this section, for the people ever to get relief from excessive charges? All the old junk that had ever been thrown on the scrap heap must be included; for the money was undoubtedly spent "wisely," when the stuff was bought. And the people had probably paid for it already, perhaps many times over in the cost of service; but now they must pay for it again.

"A Going Concern"—what does this mean? and what would the people be forced to pay for? Doesn't this force the people to pay for all "watered stock?" If the going concern is charging rates for service that will pay dividends on millions of dollars of watered stock, as is the case with our street car company, our gas and electric companies, how are we to escape paying tribute for all time to come on all that water?

Sections 30, 45 and 59 are also very interesting. Nearly all public service corporations have paid for much of their extensions out of current profits, due to the privilege of charging excessive prices for the service rendered. This bill provides that all such investments are to be considered and taken into account, if the people decide to take over a public utility; thus fastening upon the people

the necessity of paying dividends on what had been legally stolen from them in excessive charges.

These are the worst features of the bill; but it was full of other bad features, like the provision enabling the Commission to withhold facts from the public for a period of ninety days. A good deal of harm could be done in ninety days—done beyond repair. The information would come to the public too late.

Bad as this bill was—backed by the public service corporations, not only in Minnesota, but of the whole country as well—much as it violated every principle of home rule and local self government, yet it received 30 affirmative votes, when it came up in the house on special order April 11.

Knapp, G. W. Brown, and Lydiard did all they could to put the bill through; but their efforts failed. Child, Pfaender and Minette riddled the bill so completely—showed up its iniquities so plainly—that most honest men could not fail to see what it really was, though it was masquerading as a great step in the direction of progress and reform. But we all know how the livery of Heaven is stolen to serve the Devil in.

Here is the way the members voted:

Those in the affirmative were:

Brown, G. W.	Hopkins	O'Niel
Dunn, R. C.	Kimpel	Pless
Dwyer	Knapp	Preston
Elmer	Knopp	Saggau
Ferrier	Lennon	Steen
Finke	Lydiard	Virtue
Haften	McGarry	Volmer
Harrison	Nelson	Walker
Healy	Nimocks	Warner, C. H.
Hogenson	Ofsthun	Westcott

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, J.	Davis	Marschalk
Anderson, W.	Dindorf	Minette
Barten	Dunn, H. H.	Morken
Bendixen	Flowers	Norton
Bjorge	Frankson	Olien
Bjornson	Frye	Orr
Borgen	Fuchs	Palmer
Bouck	Green	Papke
Brown, W. W.	Hanson	Peterson, A. B.
Braatelian	Henry	Peterson, A. J.
Burchard	Holmberg	Peterson, P. A.
Burrows	Johnson, A. C.	Pfaender
Campbell	Johnson, J. T.	Prince
Carlson	Just	Putnam
Child	Klemer	Ribenack
Clementson	Kneeland	Sanborn
Coates	Larson	Schwartz
Conley	Lee	Seebach
Crane	Lindberg	Skartum
Crawford	McMartin	Southwick

Stageberg	Thielen	Wefald
Stone	Thornton	Weld
Stoven	Thorson	Westlake
Sullivan	Vasaly	Westman
Sundberg	Voxland	Williams
Swenson	Warner, E.	Wilson
Teigen	Warner, A. L.	Mr. Speaker

The following were absent or not voting:

Carey, Hillman, Lundeen, Moeller, Nolan, Porter, Reed, Sawyer, Spooner. Of these nine members, Porter, Hillman, Carey and Nolan had been excused, but the others had all answered to roll call during the morning.

The Nolan Bill.

Early in the session Rep. W. I. Nolan of Minneapolis introduced into the house a very short and simple bill granting to the governing body of every city or village in the state "the right and power to prescribe and limit the charges which any (public utility) corporation may demand or receive for the commodities or services furnished by it."

This bill passed the house without a dissenting vote. Then the corporations got very busy—especially the Minneapolis General Electric Company, which is operating without any franchise, and which this bill would bring under the control of the city council.

On Tuesday, April 8th, this bill passed the senate with only five votes against it,—Dunn, Murray, G. H. Sullivan, J. D. Sullivan and Thoe. Thoe's vote against the bill was a great surprise, as he had a consistent record in favor of all progressive measures. Later he voted in favor of passing the bill over the Governor's veto, and thus set himself right again.

G. H. Sullivan made a very hard fight against the bill, but did not seem to make much impression on the senate.

The Veto.

The next act in the drama took place a few days later, when Governor Eberhart vetoed the bill, in a message that threatened the legislature, that if they did not pass a bill for a general public utility commission, to control all public utilities throughout the state, he would call the legislature in special session to pass such a bill.

In view of the fact that all members must lose their time and serve without pay in a special session, the Governor's threat was a pretty big club to hold over their heads to compel them to do the bidding of the corporations.

A Comparison.

THE GOVERNOR'S BILL AND THE NOLAN BILL.

The governor's bill took the control of all the local public utilities out of the hands of the people to be served, and placed it under the control of three men to be appointed by himself and in no way responsible to the people. The Nolan bill left the control in the hands of the people to be served and increased their powers.

The Governor's bill violates every principle of home rule and local self government. The Nolan bill preserves these principles and extends their application.

The Governor's bill is autocratic, the Nolan bill democratic.

The Governor's bill is reactionary, the Nolan bill progressive.

The Governor's bill deprives the people of every city and village in the state of rights and liberties they now enjoy; the Nolan bill extends and enlarges those rights and liberties.

The Governor's bill opens wide the door to the worst kind of political corruption; the Nolan bill reduces the possibilities of corruption to a minimum.

The Governor's bill is advocated by the public service corporations; the Nolan bill is urged and supported by the plain people.

In the legislature, the Governor's bill was supported by the reactionaries and the servants of the special interests, aided by a few progressive men who did not understand the influences behind it, nor appreciate its inevitable results; the Nolan bill was urged by men whose record is free from taint of corporation influence.

The Governor's bill was defeated in the House 78 to 30. The Nolan bill first passed the House unanimously, and the senate with only five votes against it; and it was passed over the Governor's veto by a vote of 83 to 27, and at least five of these 27 confessed that they voted to uphold the veto, because of political patronage the Governor had promised them, and had threatened to withhold if they voted to over-ride his veto.

The following house members voted to over-ride the veto of the Nolan bill, who had at first voted for the Governor's bill, some of them, at least, not knowing its real nature: Dunn, R. C., Dwyer, Ferrier, Finke, Harrison, Hopkins, Knapp (the supposed author of the bill), Lennon, Nelson, Ofsthun, Preston, Warner, C. H.

In short, on the side of the Governor's bill were all the forces of special interest, reaction, political corruption, tyranny and oppression. On the side of the Nolan bill were the plain people, with their determination to retain self government, to extend home rule, and to keep for themselves and their children the right to manage their own local affairs, to protect themselves from corporate robbery, and preserve their liberty and independence.

Here is the way the vote stood on the motion to pass the Nolan bill over the Governor's veto. His support would have been considerably less, had he not used the pressure of patronage.

Those voting to sustain the Governor were:

Bendixen	Johnson, J. T.	Pless
Borgen	Kimpel	Putnam
Bouck	Knopp	Reed
Brown, G. W.	Lindberg	Saggau
Elmer	Lydiard	Southwick
Hafften	McGarry	Virtue
Hanson	O'Niel	Walker
Healy	Papke	Westman
Hogenson	Peterson, P. A.	

Those voting to over-ride the Governor's veto were:

Anderson, J.	Henry	Prince
Anderson, W.	Hillman	Ribenack
Barten	Holmberg	Sanborn
Bjorge	Hopkins	Sawyer
Bjornson	Johnson, A. C.	Schwartz
Braatelian	Just	Seebach
Brown, W. W.	Klemer	Skartum
Burchard	Knapp	Spooner
Burrows	Kneeland	Stageberg
Campbell	Larson	Stone
Carlson	Lennon	Stoven
Child	Lundeen	Sullivan
Clementson	McMartin	Sundberg
Coates	Marschalk	Swenson
Conley	Minette	Teigen
Crane	Moeller	Thielen
Crawford	Morken	Thornton
Davis	Nelson	Thorson
Dindorf	Nolan	Vasaly
Dunn, R. C.	Norton	Voxlund
Dwyer	Ofsthun	Warner, A. L.
Ferrier	Olien	Warner, C. H.
Finke	Orr	Wefald
Frankson	Palmer	Weld
Frye	Peterson, A. B.	Williams
Fuchs	Peterson, A. J.	Wilson
Green	Pfaender	Mr. Speaker
Harrison	Preston	

But the Governor and his machine, the corporations and their friends, now got more busy than ever. They brought every possible pressure to bear to sustain the veto; and when it came up in the Senate, the Governor was sustained by the following vote:

Those who voted to sustain the Governor were:

Ahmann	Dunn	Moonan
Anderson	Duxbury	Murray
Benson	Glotzbach	Olson
Carpenter	Gunn	Odell
Clague	Handlan	Peterson
Cooke, L. O.	Johnson, C. D.	Poehler
Denegre	Johnston	Pugh
Donaldson	Klein	Putnam
Duea	Marden	Schaller

Stebbins	Swanson	Works
Sullivan, G. H.	Van Hoven	
Sullivan, J. D.	Weiss	

Those who voted to over-ride the veto were:

Bedford	Froshaug	Pauly
Boyle	Gunderson	Rockne
Cashman	Hackney	Rustad
Cheadle	Hanson	Sageng
Coller	Haycraft	Saugstad
Cook, C. F.	Johnson, V. L.	Sundberg
Dale	Lende	Thoe
Dwinnell	L'Herault	Wilson
Elwell	McGrath	
Fosseen	Nelson	

THE VETO OF THE TELEPHONE BILL.

And the Minnette-Holmberg Bill, which the Governor also vetoed a few days later,—what was there in this bill, so dangerous to the rights of the people as to warrant a veto?

The only vital thing in this bill was that it compelled the telephone companies to make physical connection, one with another, thus permitting subscribers on one system to talk with subscribers of another system, by paying a reasonable charge. The bill also put all the telephone companies in the state under the control of the Railway and Warehouse Commission.

The N. W. Telephone Co. did not like this. They lobbied against the bill before its passage, and used every means to prevent its repassage over the Governor's veto.

But the House did repass the bill over the veto by a vote of 95 to 13.

Those voting to sustain the Governor were:

Bouck	Lennon	Saggau
Brown, G. W.	Lydiard	Virtue
Dwyer	McGarry	Walker
Healey	Moeller	
Knopp	Nimocks	

But in the Senate the Governor and the corporations won out again.

Those who voted to sustain the Governor were:

Ahmann	Handlan	Poehler
Anderson	Johnson, C. D.	Pugh
Carpenter	Johnston	Schaller
Coller	Klein	Stebbins
Cooke, L. O.	L'Herault	Sullivan, G. H.
Donaldson	Marden	Sullivan, J. D.
Duea	Moonan	Swanson
Dunn	Murray	Van Hoven
Glotzbach	Odell	Weiss
Gunn	Peterson	Works

Those who voted to over-ride the Governor's veto were:

Bedford	Elwell	Olson
Benson	Fosseen	Pauley
Boyle	Froschaug	Putnam
Cashman	Gunderson	Rockne
Cheadle	Hackney	Rustad
Clague	Hanson	Sageng
Cook, C. F.	Haycraft	Saugstad
Dale	Johnson, V. L.	Sundberg
Denegre	Lende	Thoe
Duxbury	McGrath	Wilson
Dwinnell	Nelson	

These two vetoes furnish the most crucial test to which the Senators were put during the entire session.

Those who had the honesty, intelligence and determination to with-stand the Governor's threats and pleadings are worthy of all praise; for the pressure was very great. Those who needed no persuasion or threats and those who yielded should be given plenty of time for meditation and change of heart, before being further trusted with public responsibility.

The Experience of Wisconsin.

Since the legislature adjourned the Minnesota Home Rule League has made a thoro investigation of the workings of the system of state regulation of local public utilities and local public service corporations in Wisconsin and bring the following indictment in 17 counts:

1. The Commission has not given relief to the public in the way of lower rates and better service in any such measure as has been secured by the municipalities of Minnesota under home rule, and in notable cases in other states not under state regulation.

2. It has shown a strong leaning towards the interest of the utilities as against public interest, as revealed in its findings of high rates for service, more than reasonable profits and excessive valuations. Originally created as an agency for the protection of the public from the exploitation of utility companies, it has become rather an agency for the protection of the companies and the means of increasing the value of their investments.

3. It has moved with exasperating slowness in rate and service cases involving great public concern, with the companies profiting enormously in the interim by its inaction.

4. It has put a big financial burden upon the state at large for the alleged benefit of the cities.

5. It has been an obstacle in the way of the cities securing for themselves relief from oppressive conditions of rates and service through municipal ownership, by inviting competition, or by other methods.

6. It has compelled the cities in many cases to go to large expense to defend their interests, both before the

Commission and the courts, when the theory of the law is that the Commission is created to do exact justice toward all parties concerned.

7. It has used the indeterminate permit to protect inefficient private electric utilities in their local monopoly, in continuing poor service and excessive charges and in avoiding their legal contract obligations with municipalities.

8. It has busied itself with inconsequential details which common sense alone would leave to the discretion of local authorities and utility officials, thus inconveniencing the public and delaying consideration of vitally important matters.

9. It has determined for municipalities matters of broad fundamental public policy, which by natural right belong to the municipalities to determine for themselves.

10. It has interfered unwarrantably with the operations of municipal plants.

11. It has discouraged the cause of conservation of natural resources advocated so strongly by other departments of the Wisconsin government.

12. It has failed signally to eliminate the public utilities from local politics. On the contrary, it has compelled them to be more active than ever.

13. It has worked to suppress community initiative and to retard the development of citizenship and growth of the citizens in capacity for self-government.

14. In rate making for water and gas, both municipal and private plants, it has discriminated heavily against the general public and in favor of the privileged few.

15. It has shown a brutal disregard of local public sentiment in matters affecting vitally the political, social and material welfare of communities.

16. It has gained such influence over the legislative body of the state that, in effect, it writes its own legislation, with the result of dangerously enlarged powers in this department of government.

17. It has not facilitated the settlement of controversies between municipalities and public utility companies, but rather often operates to still further complicate the situation and delay the day of final adjustment.

CHAPTER VII.

The Cashman Anti-Discrimination Bill.

Shall a railway be permitted to charge more to one person than to another for the same service?

Shall it be allowed to charge to one town or city a larger sum than to another for the same class of freight, carried the same distance, and under practically the same conditions?

This is the kernel of the so-called distance tariff bill. Perhaps it would have been nearer the truth, if it had been named "An act to prevent common carriers from discriminating for or against persons and places in the matter of freight charges."

For twenty years the state of Iowa has denied the railways the right to discriminate between places in their charges for carrying freight. As a result every town in the state has exactly the same opportunity so far as freight charges are concerned.

For many years the people of the smaller centers in Minnesota have demanded as low rates as are given St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth. During all this time the railways have fought against this just demand, and all the big business interests of the large cities have come valiantly to their rescue.

Why?

Partly because such bodies in our large cities are more or less under the domination of the great railways, and partly because they are enjoying especially low rates, which they are afraid they will lose, if the roads are forced to treat all parts of the state alike in the matter of rates.

Here are some of the rates voluntarily given by the railroads to certain favored classes of freight from certain favored centers.

On brick from Chaska to the twin cities there is a rate of three cents per hundred pounds, while for the same distance to other towns the rates are higher. If the Iowa rate were applied strictly, it would cost 3.3 cents per hundred, but all other places the same distance from Chaska would get equally low rates.

From Mankato to the twin cities the rate on crushed stone is 3 cents and on dressed stone 3½ cents; while to Tracy to the west and to Rochester to the east, practically the same distance, the rate is 6 cents.

From International Falls to the twin city, 332 miles, the rate on paper is 10 cents, while to Fergus Falls, 42 miles less, the rate is 33 cents, or more than three times as much. One railroad man claimed that the rate to Fergus Falls was only 26 cents, but even then it is more than two and one half times as much as to the twin cities, a greater distance.

The lumber rate from Park Rapids to the twin cities, 210 miles, is 8½ cents, while from Park Rapids to More-

head it is 13 cents and to Kenedy 15½ cents, practically the same distance. The Iowa rate would be 8.8 cents.

Lumber from Cloquet to the cities is 5½ cents for 175 miles, but to Morehead, only 60 miles farther, it is 15½ cents. The Iowa rate to Morehead would be 9.2 cents, and to the twin cities about the same as the present rate.

Soft coal from Duluth to the twin cities, 150 miles, costs 90 cents a ton, but to Owatonna 68 miles farther it costs \$1.40 per ton. At the same time the N. P. brings coal from Duluth to the twin cities for the Milwaukee road at a charge of 40 to 52 cents a ton—less than half what they charge the ordinary shipper.

The flour rates from Pipestone to Heron Lake, 55 miles, is 10½ cents while from Mpls. to Heron Lake, 157 miles, it is the same price. From Pipestone to Hanley Falls, 61 miles, the flour rate is 9½ cents; from Mpls. to Hanley Falls, about 2½ times as far, the rate is only 9 cents.

Such discrimination as this in favor of the big mills of Mpls., will help to account for the number of dead flour mills to be found all over the state, killed by unfair discrimination on the part of the railways.

Structural iron from Duluth to the twin cities, 150 miles, costs 7½ cents; while to Austin, 100 miles farther, it cost 17.1 cents. How can manufacturing be done in small places, in the face of such unjust discrimination in the charges for carrying coal, iron, and lumber, the raw materials of industry?

Many small manufacturing concerns would like to locate in the smaller towns. Their means will not permit them to pay the high price for land in the cities. But they can't go to the smaller towns because of the high freight rates, and hence are kept out of the state.

Are any of these rates too low? Are the railways really carrying at a loss when they charge 3 cents per hundred for brick from Chaska, or 3 to 3½ for stone from Mankato, or 10 cents for paper from International Falls, or any of the other low rates which have been recorded above?

If these rates are too low, then these industries are in the pauper class, and are securing these favors at the expense of other industries which must be overcharged to make up for these favors to certain men and certain towns.

But are they too low? Are the roads carrying these particular classes of goods from these particular towns at a loss?

This question was put squarely to each of the railway attorneys who appeared before the committee to argue against the Cashman bill, and in every case they admitted that such freight was not carried at a loss, but they insisted that such low rates did not give the railways a "normal profit." What is a "normal profit?" Is it a profit that will enable the railways to pay 7% on all the water they have ever poured into their stock? It would seem so.

If the roads can carry brick from Chaska to the cities for three cents a hundred pounds, why can't they carry for the same price the same distance to any other center? And why shouldn't they be required to do so?

Of course we should not lose sight of the fact that the roads can carry cheaper where they can have a full load both ways, than where they have to go one way empty, but is there any more likelihood of being obliged to go back empty from any other town than from the twin cities.

Many people regard great cities as very desirable things, and we may freely admit that if a city grows great without favors of any kind, no complaint can be made. But there are certain classes of people in all large cities that are not satisfied with equal opportunity—not satisfied with a fair field and no favor, but are always seeking favors.

Who are benefited by the unnatural booming of cities? Is it the great mass of the people—75% to 95% of the people—who work each day for what they get and never live too well? Or is it rather those who own the lots and lands upon which the cities are built, and who are always seeking to draw more people to the centers so as to boom their lands? This is a positive damage to the ordinary man. If he is a renter his rents are increased with every addition to the population while his wages are not raised. If he is a home owner, booming the city does not increase his wages, but it does increase the taxes on his home.

So even from the most selfish point of view, the great mass of the city people have nothing to gain but much to lose by any system that gives unfair advantages to the cities. But the common people are not often heard in these matters—they are too busy earning a living to think much about them; and if they did think, they couldn't afford to spend the time to come to the capitol to make their voices heard. The result is that the big interests that fatten on favors are the only ones in evidence, and Senators from the cities are like other men; they are impressed by what they hear. The interest of the unrepresented silent mass seldom influences them.

The Cashman Bill to prohibit discrimination between places by the railroads of Minnesota came up in the senate Wednesday afternoon March 5th and was debated at great length.

The principle speeches in favor of the bill were made by Senator Cashman of Steele Co., author of the bill, who made a very clear and impressive presentation of his case, and by Senator Collier of Scott.

The opposition came chiefly from Senators Pauly and Dwinnell of Minneapolis, assisted by Senators Rockne of Goodhue and Clague of Redwood.

The Cashman bill allowed the long line to compete with the short line from junction points, thus doing away with one objection to a strict distance tariff.

Below is given a letter from the Iowa Railway Commission giving their view of the case.

"State of Iowa. The Board of Railway Commission.
Des Moines, Feb. 25, 1913.

Hon. T. E. Cashman,

Senate Chamber, St. Paul, Minn.

My Dear Mr Cashman:

Referring to your letter of the 16th inst. regarding the bill you are urging for passage before the Senate of your state, would say that you are right as to your understanding of my views in this matter. The mileage basis is, in my judgment, *the only true and equitable plan to handle matters of this kind*, and the only clause that we now desire in our law is that the long lines be permitted to meet the short line rates at junction points without it being made the basis of rates at intermediate points. That is the only change that I would suggest in the Iowa law, and I hope soon to see this change made in our state.

Trusting this explanation is satisfactory to you, I am

Very truly yours,

N. S. KETCHUM,

Commissioner."

After a very full discussion the question came to a vote with the following results:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahmann	Froschaug	Olson
Anderson	Glotzbach	Peterson
Bedford	Gunderson	Poehler
Benson	Hanson	Putman
Carpenter	Haycraft	Rustad
Cashman	Johnston	Sageng
Coller	Lende	Saugstad
Cook, C. F.	Marden	Schaller
Cooke, L. O.	Moonan	Stebbins
Donaldson	Murray	Thoe
Duea	Nelson	Wilson
Duxbury	Odell	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boyle	Johnson, C. D.	Sullivan, J. D.
Cheadle	Johnson, V. L.	Sundberg
Clague	Klein	Swanson
Denegre	L'Herault	Van Hoven
Dunn	McGrath	Wallace
Dwinnell	Pauly	Weis
Elwell	Pugh	Works
Fosseen	Rockne	
Gunn	Sullivan, G. H.	

In the House the bill was fully discussed by H. H. Dunn and Ralph Crane in the affirmative and by Orr in the negative and was passed by the following vote, yeas 71 and nays 42:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, J.	Frye	Pfaender
Anderson, W.	Hafften	Pless
Barten	Hanson	Putnam
Bendixen	Henry	Reed
Bjorge	Holmberg	Saggau
Bjornson	Hopkins	Schwartz
Braatlien	Johnson, A. C.	Southwick
Brown, G. W.	Johnson, J. T.	Spooner
Brown, W. W.	Just	Stageberg
Burchard	Kimpel	Stone
Burrows	Klemer	Swenson
Carey	Larson	Teigen
Carlson	Lee	Thorson
Child	Lindberg	Vasaly
Clementson	McMartin	Virtue
Coates	Minette	Voxland
Conley	Morken	Warner, C. H.
Crane	Nelson	Warner, E.
Crawford	Olien	Welfald
Dunn, H. H.	O'Neill	Wescott
Dunn, R. C.	Papke	Westman
Finke	Peterson, A. B.	Williams
Flowers	Peterson, A. J.	Mr. Speaker
Frankson	Peterson, P. A.	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Borgen	Lundeen	Sawyer
Bouck	Lydiard	Seebach
Campbell	McGarry	Steen
Dwyer	Marschalk	Stoven
Elmer	Moeller	Sullivan
Ferrier	Nimocks	Sundberg
Fuchs	Nolan	Thielen
Greene	Norton	Thornton
Harrison	Ofsthun	Vollmer
Healy	Orr	Walker
Knapp	Palmer	Warner, A. L.
Kneeland	Prince	Weld
Knopp	Ribenack	Westlake
Lennon	Sanborn	Wilson

And then on April 9th there was finally passed a bill which would permit a shipper to choose his own route of shipment even tho his goods had to be carried over two or more railways. This enabled shippers to choose the shorter route and thus save expenses.

The only opponents of this bill in the senate were Denegre, Dunn, Handlan, Klein and Swanson.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE TONNAGE TAX BILL.

Our Mineral Resources.

The richest iron mines in the world are in northern Minnesota. More than one third of all the iron taken out of the earth now comes from those mines. Once all this belonged to the people, a heritage of vast value, placed there by Nature for the common use of all.

Through ignorance and shortsightedness, if nothing worse, the title to most of this has passed out of the hands of the people, and become the property of the gigantic steel trust, and nothing now remains to the people of the state, save only the power of taxation. That power we still have, and some day we may learn how to use it, so as to restore to the people a part at least of their lost inheritance.

Back in the early days before 1895, the only way the state had to get any revenue from these iron mines, was through a small tonnage tax that was paid into the state treasury. This tax was in lieu of all other taxes both for state and local purposes. This left the people on the iron ranges practically destitute of revenue—no money for county roads nor for village streets—no money for schools, nor police nor fire protection—no money for water works nor gas nor electric lights—for nearly all the values were in the mines, and these were wholly exempt from taxation, except the one cent per ton that was paid to the state when the mines were opened and worked, and even this tax ceased when, for any reason, it became more profitable to close the mines and let the people starve for want of employment, for the mines were about the only source of employment on the iron ranges; but this condition could not arise under the Bjorge-Frankson bill because the mines under that bill would be taxed the same as they are taxed now for all local purposes.

In 1894 and 1895 the writer saw mines shut down, villages deserted, homes and stores empty, the people driven away, the country barren and desolate as a desert, almost no roads, nor schools; not a foot of pavement nor hardly any sidewalk in any town or city on the ranges; and all because of a stupid and vicious act of the legislature, passed many years before by misrepresentation and subterfuge, if by nothing worse—an act of the legislature that pretended to be in the interest of developing the mining industry, when in reality it encouraged and established mining monopoly;—an act of the legislature that was never constitutional, but which disgraced the statute books for many years, while the monopolizers of the people's resources steadily and surely fastened their clutches on the richest iron mines in all the world. But in 1900 an amendment to the constitution was adopted by the people which permits a tax on the output of mines.

Partly through the work of the present writer, in publishing a report of the situation on the ranges, and largely

through the untiring labor of S. A. Stockwell, who was a member of the legislature of 1895, the old, unconstitutional tonnage tax law was repealed and the mines were placed on the assessment roll and taxed on their value (whether used or not) for schools and roads, for sidewalks and pavements, for water and gas and electricity, for all township and village, city, county and state purposes. The desert began to blossom and the wilderness to bear fruit for the benefit of man and of civilization. The impassible paths through the swamps and forest have become the finest county roads in all the state, bordered with good plank walks and lighted with electric lamps for many miles, connecting the towns and cities of the range; and the towns and cities themselves now have good paved streets, cement walks, water and sewer, gas and electric systems that make them the equal of many places of far more people and greater pretensions. The school buildings are among the best in the world and are equipped with every modern appliance for manual training, cooking, sewing, and all the mechanical and domestic arts, while the great assembly rooms are high and light and well ventilated, and in some at least beautifully decorated with paintings and statuary.

And yet this is not enough. Those mine owners are still reaping princely fortunes out of these resources of nature—the common gift to all—whose value is socially produced and in justice ought to belong to all. They are exhausting the mineral wealth of the people of Minnesota to build palaces in distant lands, while they leave us the desert and desolation that follow in the wake of their exploitation; because by the estimate of competent authority all available iron ore in this state will be exhausted in forty years leaving substantially nothing but holes in the ground having no taxable value.

The people understand all this, but the problem is a difficult one. Many times bills have been drawn, more or less crude and ill-considered, but honestly aimed at securing more of this vast common wealth for the benefit of the people of the state. So far all these efforts have been unsuccessful. A vivid recollection of the old days of want and desolation still remains in the memory of many residents of the ranges and any suggestion of a tonnage tax falls upon them like a sentence of banishment or death. This fear has been carefully cultivated by agents of the mine owners and by unscrupulous politicians until it is about all a man's life is worth in that part of the state to propose any measure that can be called a tonnage tax.

Partly because of this fear and partly because the problem is such a difficult one—because the economical and legal riddles involved are so hard to unravel,—all proposed bills have failed to pass or have been vetoed by the Governor.

In the legislature of 1913, the simplest bill yet proposed was brought forward by H. O. Bjorge of Becker County and Thomas Frankson of Fillmore. This bill did

not touch in any way the present taxes for local and county purposes, but in place of the present state tax of about $3\frac{1}{2}$ mills on the dollar of valuation, it proposed to classify all mines as producing and non-producing mines. A mine that actually produced 2,000 tons per year or more was to be called a producing mine and taxed at from 2c to 5c per ton according to the iron in the ore. All mines producing less than 2,000 tons per year and all unused mines were to be classed as non-producing mines and taxed as they are now for all purposes.

This of course is an arbitrary classification, and the question was raised at once whether it would not conflict with the constitution of the state which provides that all property of the same class must be taxed alike for all purposes.

One would suppose that there must be some natural differences in order that property might be placed in different classes; but what natural difference is there between a mine producing 2,000 tons a year and another producing 1999 tons a year?

And furthermore, it would be possible for a mining company to take from a very rich mine 2,000 tons in a year, pay the state the 5c per ton equaling \$100, and escape all the many thousands of dollars of tax it is now paying to the state on the full value of the mine. And even if such a tax could stand the test of the courts, it would fall on the operators and not on the fee owners; and the fee owners are the ones who ought to be reached.

After the bill had been thoroughly discussed for several hours, and after the question of its constitutionality had been fully gone into, after the danger of long and expensive litigation had been pointed out, and the question raised whether such litigation would not tie up all local revenue, the vote was finally taken and resulted as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, W.	Flowers	Peterson, A. J.
Barten	Frankson	Peterson, P. A.
Bendixen	Frye	Porter
Bjorge	Hafften	Putnam
Bjornson	Hogenson	Reed
Braatelian	Holmberg	Schwartz
Brown, W. W.	Johnson, A. C.	Skartum
Burchard	Johnson, J. T.	Stageberg
Burrows	Just	Swenson
Campbell	Kimpel	Teigen
Carey	Lee	Voxland
Carlson	Lindberg	Warner, E.
Clementson	McMartin	Wefald
Conley	Minette	Weld
Crane	Morken	Westcott
Crawford	Ofsthun	Westman
Dunn, H. H.	Ollen	Williams
Ferrier	Papke	
Finke	Peterson, A. B.	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, J.	Knopp	Seebach
Borgen	Larson	Southwick
Bouck	Lennon	Spooner
Brown, G. W.	Lundeen	Stone
Child	Lydiard	Stoven
Coates	McGarry	Sullivan
Davis	Marschalk	Sundberg
Dindorf	Moeller	Thielen
Dwyer	Nelson	Thornton
Dunn, R. C.	Nimocks	Thorson
Elmer	Nolan	Vasaly
Fuchs	Norton	Virtue
Greene	O'Neill	Vollmer
Harrison	Orr	Walker
Healy	Palmer	Warner, A. L.
Henry	Preston	Warner, C. H.
Hillman	Prince	Westlake
Hopkins	Ribenack	Wilson
Klemer	Saggau	Mr. Speaker
Kneeland	Sanborn	
Knapp	Sawyer	

I do not think we can justly question the honesty or intelligence of any man who voted either way on this bill. Yet it does seem that some way ought to be possible by which the people of the state can save for themselves more of the enormous values which now go to the mine owners, but which justly belong to all of us. Possibly some tax on the fee owners' interest in the land could be devised which would reach the ones who really get the money when the mines are opened and the ore taken out. This ought to be imposed in addition to all present taxes, state and local, on all producing mines.

CHAPTER IX.

Temperance and Moral Measures.

"You can't make men good by passing laws."

Maybe not; but you can help to keep them bad by standing in the way of the repeal of bad laws.

Perhaps there are few laws on our statute books that have done more to make and keep men bad than the laws licensing and legalizing the saloon.

If a thing is right it needs no license; if it is wrong it should have none.

Under the common law anything that was a nuisance or a menace to the neighborhood could be stopped as soon as public opinion demanded its removal. The courts would enjoin the nuisance and order it ended.

But when the saloon, or anything else, is licensed, it is made legal and respectable, and the people are then powerless to proceed against any particular saloon as a nuisance.

The license system has forced the saloonkeepers to specialize in the business of making drunkards of their fellowmen. It has also forced them to become politicians, and made the saloon a political center.

The high license system has made it so expensive to own and operate a saloon that it has resulted in forcing the wealthy brewer into the saloon business, so that a very large part of the saloons in every American city are thus owned and operated, and so, to protect themselves, the liquor interests have been forced to control the city governments. Out of this has grown the union of all the vicious elements with the big public service corporations and rich tax dodgers.

These interests have bound our cities hand and foot and are always united to prevent any measures, like Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Equal Suffrage, or any reform of the election laws even, that would give the people more control of their own public affairs.

More than this, the excessive taxes on liquors, the high license fees, and the enormous expense of fitting up the gilded palaces where liquors are sold, are directly responsible for the injurious adulterations that are now almost universal.

And to put the finishing touches on this monument of iniquity, whose base is the license system, the dealers in liquors have been driven to organize a system for creating appetite in the young; so that we have the various devices for leading boys and girls—even very young children—into the drink habit.

To get rid of these evils is not a case of trying to make men good by passing laws; but rather of repealing laws that make men bad, and thus leaving them free to follow their natural inclination to be good.

For men and women are by nature good. If this were not so, the human race would have run its course and disappeared from the face of the earth ages ago.

In spite of meddlesome statutes and evil customs that have been forced by police and public opinion, the race has been constantly rising to greater heights of intelligence, decency and morality.

What is now needed is greater freedom for normal development.

We must repeal bad laws and give human nature a chance to be good.

The legalized saloon must be driven out.

The inherent right of the people of any village, city or county to repeal the license system within its own limits must be restored to them.

County Option.

Many members of the legislature of 1913 had been elected largely on this issue; and a bill to grant the people of each county the right to vote on the question of the licensed saloon was introduced early in the session.

The people of the villages of the state have for many years enjoyed the right to decide for themselves this question of the licensed saloon.

But the right of the people of the counties to vote out the saloon has been denied.

As the county is the unit for purposes of taxation—as the county has to stand the expense for the trial of criminals and the support of paupers created by the licensed saloons—it would seem reasonable that the people of a county should not be denied the right to shut out licensed saloons from their territory.

This is not a question of prohibition at all. Nor is it a question of depriving people of liquor, who are accustomed to its use. In no way does it prevent men from choosing for themselves what they shall eat and drink. It simply puts into the hands of the people of the county the power to vote out the licensed drinking place, just as the villages and smaller cities now have that power.

Nor is there any merit in the contention that when a county refused to vote out all saloons then every city and village in the county must license the sale of liquor. This would be a flat violation of the principle of home rule and local self government.

The common law would suppress any drinking place anywhere whenever the people of the neighborhood demanded it. That is the correct principle.

County option is no violation of the principle of local self government, but rather an extension of that principle to the county that must stand the extra expense of this institution.

On Friday morning, Feb. 14, the County Option Bill came up in the house; and, after a thorough discussion, was killed by a vote of 59 to 59, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, W.	Johnson, J. T.	Sanborn
Bjorge	Klemer	Sawyer
Bjornson	Kneeland	Skartum
Braatlien	Larson	Southwick
Brown, W. W.	Lee	Spooner
Burchard	Lindberg	Stone
Campbell	McMartin	Sundberg
Carlson	Marschalk	Teigen
Child	Morken	Vasaly
Clementson	Nolan	Voxland
Conley	Norton	Warner, A. L.
Crane	Ofsthun	Warner, C. H.
Davis	Olien	Warner, E.
Dunn, R. C.	O'Neill	Wefald
Finke	Orr	Weld
Frankson	Palmer	Westman
Frye	Peterson, A. B.	Williams
Hillman	Peterson, A. J.	Wilson
Holmberg	Porter	Mr. Speaker
Johnson, A. C.	Putnam	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, J.	Healy	Prince
Barten	Henry	Reed
Bendixen	Hogenson	Ribenack
Borgen	Hopkins	Saggau
Bouck	Just	Schwartz
Brown, G. W.	Kimpel	Seebach
Burrows	Knapp	Stageberg
Carey	Knopp	Steen
Coates	Lennon	Stoven
Dwyer	Lundeen	Sullivan
Dunn, H. H.	Lydiard	Swenson
Dindorf	McGarry	Thielen
Crawford	Minette	Thornton
Ferrier	Moeller	Thorson
Flowers	Nelson	Virtue
Fuchs	Nimocks	Vollmer
Greene	Papke	Walker
Hafften	Peterson, P. A.	Westlake
Hanson	Pless	
Harrison	Preston	

So the bill was lost.

Responsibility for the defeat of County Option in the House may justly be charged to Representative Nelson of Douglas County.

Nelson's Part.

HIS PLEDGE: "If elected I will live up to the platform adopted in last May's convention *in every respect*."

THE PLATFORM: "Resolved that we are in favor of a State, County Option law and recommend that any Republican candidate for the Legislature stand solidly for this principle."

HE VOTED AGAINST THE BILL. HIS VOTE BEAT IT. IF HE HAD VOTED FOR IT ONE OTHER REPRESENTATIVE WHO HAD VOTED AGAINST IT WOULD HAVE VOTED FOR IT.

And so, through the treachery of one of its pledged supporters, the liquor interests were temporarily victorious.

The Road House Bill.

Worse than the licensed saloons of the towns and cities are the road side saloons—the Road Houses—that are met with along the main traveled country roads. In the country districts there is no police protection; no way of maintaining order; no way to restrain those who frequent these road houses. Since the incoming of the automobile, it is very easy for parties of toughs from the cities to ride out to these road houses and “make a night of it.” Prostitutes and their followers here mingle with and corrupt innocent girls who have been brought to these places, not knowing their true character. Perhaps there are no worse breeders of vice and crime than are these licensed road houses. For many years attempts have been made to pass a law forbidding the granting of licenses to sell liquor outside of the towns and cities in places where police protection is impossible.

The temperance committee reported favorably the O'Neill bill—introduced by Rep. D. P. O'Neill of Pennington Co.—and on Feb. 25 the question came up on special order. Rep. Minette made a strong attempt to amend it so as to allow township boards to grant licenses. This would save several German saloons in his district. Also it would practically nullify the bill, for the town boards would be quite as likely to grant these road houses licenses as would the county boards which now grant them. And this was the very object of the bill—to prevent the county boards from legalizing the sale of liquor at these roadside places, where drunkenness and debauchery are now so common, where so many crimes are committed, and where so many innocent girls are ruined. The opposition was so strong that Minette withdrew his amendment, and the Journal of the House does not record him as voting at all.

Only 26 votes could be mustered against the bill as follows:

Barten	Fuchs	Saggau
Borgen	Ferrier	Seebach
Bouck	Healy	Steen
Brown, G. W.	Henry	Stoven
Carey	Kimpel	Sullivan
Crawford	Knopp	Thielen
Dindorf	Papke	Virtue
Elmer	Pless	Vollmer
Dwyer	Preston	

Here are the 85 who are recorded for it:

Anderson, J.	Johnson, A. C.	Reed
Anderson, W.	Johnson, J. T.	Sanborn
Bendixen	Just	Sawyer
Bjorge	Klemer	Schwartz
Bjornson	Kneeland	Skartum
Braatlien	Larson	Southwick
Brown, W. W.	Lee	Spooner
Burchard	Lennon	Stone
Campbell	Lindberg	Sundberg
Carlson	Lundeen	Swenson
Child	Lydiard	Teigen
Clementson	McMartin	Thornton
Coates	Marschalk	Thorson
Conley	Moeller	Vasaly
Crane	Morken	Voxland
Davis	Nelson	Walker
Dunn, H. H.	Nolan	Warner, A. L.
Dunn, R. C.	Norton	Warner, C. H.
Finke	Ofsthun	Warner, E.
Flowers	Olien	Wefald
Frankson	O'Neill	Weld
Frye	Orr	Wescott
Greene	Palmer	Westlake
Haften	Peterson, A. B.	Westman
Hanson	Peterson, A. J.	Williams
Harrison	Peterson, P. A.	Wilson
Hillman	Porter	Mr. Speaker
Hopkins	Prince	
Holmberg	Putnam	

This bill was so amended in the Senate as to allow the county commissioners together with the Sheriff and the County Attorney to grant road house licenses where the town board should request that license be granted. The House refused to concur in the Senate amendment, and the bill died between the two Houses, the conference committee being unable to agree.

Fourth Class City Bill.

Another good bill in the interest of temperance and morality was the act that passed both houses almost unanimously allowing the people of fourth class cities to vote upon the question of license or no license, and including both wholesale and retail dealers. It will now be possible for the people of any fourth class city to put an end to all liquor selling within the city limits.

The Injunction and Abatement Bill.

Senate File 68—to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, came up in the house on special order April 22, next to the last day of the session and furnished one of the most interesting and instructive contests of the entire session.

The bill had passed the senate with little opposition, but the interested parties were not willing to let it pass the house so easily.

Several amendments were offered, all of which were intended to make it easier for the owners of the property or the occupants, but these were all voted down. The vote on G. B. Brown's amendment requiring that all owners, lessees, occupants, etc., should be notified and allowed 30 days to abate the nuisance, is a fair example of the way the house lined up.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, J.	Harrison	Pless
Bendixen	Healy	Preston
Borgen	Henry	Prince
Bouck	Hogenson	Reed
Brown, G. W.	Just	Ribenack
Coates	Kimpel	Saggau
Crane	Knopp	Seebach
Crawford	Lennon	Steen
Dindorf	Lydiard	Stoven
Dunn, H. H.	McGarry	Sullivan
Dunn, R. C.	Minette	Thielen
Dwyer	Moeller	Thornton
Elmer	Nelson	Virtue
Ferrier	Nimocks	Vollmer
Flowers	Ofsthun	Walker
Fuchs	O'Neill	Wescott
Greene	Papke	Westlake
Hafften	Peterson, P. A.	
Hanson	Pfaender	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, W.	Johnson, J. T.	Schwartz
Bjorge	Klemer	Skartum
Bjornson	Knapp	Southwick
Braatellen	Larson	Stageberg
Brown, W. W.	Lee	Stone
Burchard	Lindberg	Swenson
Campbell	McMartin	Teigen
Carlson	Marschalk	Vasaly
Child	Morken	Voxland
Clementson	Nolan	Warner, A. L.
Conley	Norton	Warner, C. H.
Davis	Olien	Warner, E.
Finke	Orr	Wefald
Frankson	Palmer	Weld
Frye	Peterson, A. B.	Williams
Hillman	Peterson, A. J.	Wilson
Holmberg	Putnam	Mr. Speaker
Hopkins	Sanborn	
Johnson, A. C.	Sawyer	

So the amendment was lost.

Four other amendments of similar intent were offered and all voted down and then the bill passed by the following vote: Yeas 88, nays 11:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, J.	Holmberg	Putnam
Anderson, W.	Hopkins	Reed
Bendixen	Johnson, A. C.	Ribenack
Bjorge	Johnson, J. T.	Sanborn
Bjornson	Just	Sawyer
Braatellen	Klemer	Schwartz
Brown, W. W.	Knapp	Seebach
Burchard	Kneeland	Skartum
Burrows	Larson	Southwick
Campbell	Lee	Stageberg
Carlson	Lennon	Stone
Child	Lindberg	Teigen
Clementson	Lundeen	Thornton
Conley	Lydiard	Thorson
Crane	McMartin	Vasaly
Crawford	Marschalk	Vollmer
Davis	Minette	Voxland
Dunn, H. H.	Morken	Walker
Elmer	Nelson	Warner, A. L.
Ferrier	Nimocks	Warner, C. H.
Finke	Nolan	Warner, E.
Flowers	Norton	Wefald
Frankson	Ofsthun	Weld
Frye	Olien	Westlake
Fuchs	O'Neill	Westman
Greene	Orr	Williams
Hanson	Palmer	Wilson
Harrison	Peterson, A. B.	Mr. Speaker
Henry	Peterson, A. J.	
Hillman	Peterson, P. A.	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bouck	Moeller	Saggau
Coates	Pfaender	Steen
Dindorf	Pless	Thielen
Dunn, R. C.	Prince	

Leaving 21 members not voting.

It is probable that any public house of prostitution can be abated at any time, whenever any injured party sees fit to go into court and ask for a permanent restraining order.

CHAPTER X.

THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Minnesota is a state of boundless natural resources. Her mines and forests, her quarries and clay beds, her prairies and hardwood timber lands, all taken together, make a most wonderful heritage; and, if this heritage had been properly conserved for the benefit of all the people, it is hard to place a limit to the number of men and women who might find here the raw materials of nature upon which to employ their labor, to build their homes, and to erect a civilization better and grander than any the world has ever known.

But most of this wonderful heritage—the free gift of an all-beneficent nature—has fallen into private hands, and all that the people have left is the power of taxation. To be sure, this power can be used to restore to the people much of the value that inheres in these great natural resources; but many and great are the changes in our system of taxation necessary to bring about this result; and much time will be required to educate the people to see the need for such changes.

And worst of all, those who have secured the private titles to the mines and the forests and the water powers, are in a position to use unlimited means to befuddle the issues, to prejudice the voters, and prevent the changes that must be made, so that our tax system shall encourage industry and thrift, instead of, as now, encouraging land grabbing and speculation.

But small beginnings have already been made toward saving what is left of our great heritage, and the work is bound to go on.

Four years ago Representative L. C. Spooner secured the passage of a bill to save to the state the beds of all navigable streams; and Representative H. H. Dunn, under suspension of the rules, put thru a bill to reserve to the state all minerals under lands hereafter to be patented to railways.

During the session of 1913, Representative Spooner was untiring in his efforts to secure the passage of a bill to make surveys and determine the feasibility of a system of canals to utilize the waters of the state for power and navigation, which, if found practicable, would result in many millions of benefit to the people.

It has been found that the Lake of the Woods is 87 feet higher than the foot of Lake Traverse, and that a canal 240 miles long can be built along the eastern shore of the old Lake Agassiz without a single lock, the fall being only about 4 inches to the mile.

This canal would cut off the streams that flow into the Red river, and divert their surplus waters into the Minnesota, giving it many hundreds of miles of navigation, and making available more than 250,000 horse power to be used for the generation of electricity for light, heat and power purposes.

This is a matter that should be very carefully worked out. The best engineering skill should be employed to find out as nearly as may be what our resources are and the best method for their development. Then the people will know what action to take.

Public Lands.

It is not enough to conserve and utilize our vast water power.

We still have mineral lands, timber lands and farming lands of vast value that should be so administered as to benefit all the people, and not simply a few speculators.

Lands should be cleared and drained and roads built, and then compact settlement should be encouraged.

The policy should be, not how fast we can sell off and get rid of our remaining natural resources, but how intelligently and judiciously those resources can be administered, not only for the benefit of the whole people who own them but also for the benefit of real settlers who desire to possess and use them.

CHAPTER XI.

SOME ATTEMPTS THAT FAILED.

Every session of the legislature is confronted with a vast flood of unwise and meddlesome legislation.

Worse than this, a great deal of legislation is usually attempted of a positively dishonest and swindling character,—laws granting special privileges to favored classes and depriving the common man of his inherent rights.

The legislature of 1913 was probably the least guilty in this respect of any in the history of the state, but not entirely so.

It is one thing to pass a law and a very different thing to make it work; and it often works just as you don't want it to.

It is one thing to see an evil, but a far more difficult thing to correct it by statute.

It is fine to have good intentions, but we are told that they are used as pavement for a very disreputable place.

Because a man is honest and sincere is no sure sign that he is either wise or clear-headed.

Because a law is framed for the purpose of ending an evil, is no guaranty that the evil will promptly take its departure as soon as the law is signed by the governor.

Every session of the legislature sees many laws of this kind passed, at considerable expense to the people in the time of members, and in waste of good paper and ink; and then the laws become dead letters or worse. If not worse, the people may be thankful.

Several bills of this kind were up in one or both houses during the session of 1913, and some of them became laws.

The Southwick Marriage Bill..

A very good example of ill advised attempts to remedy evils by law may be seen in the bill put thru the house by Representative Claude E. Southwick of Wells.

Many people enter into hasty and ill-considered marriages.

"We will remedy that evil," says Southwick, and so he provides, in his bill, that there must be a waiting of five days, after the license is issued, before the ceremony can be performed.

Perhaps this might stop some hasty marriages, and perhaps not, but it certainly would open the door to any evil-minded man who wanted to take advantage of an ignorant girl, to first get the license and persuade the girl that all legal requirements had been met; live with the girl five days, as his wife, and then leave her to the tender mercies of society, perhaps with a child to rear, and the scorn of good people to endure. This is very difficult under the present law, as the ceremony is nearly always performed very soon after the license is issued.

Here is another evil that would surely follow:

The records of licenses issued are always open to the public. An enemy might want to make trouble. The opportunities for blackmail and other vicious meddling would be greater than now, and would be sure to be employed more than is now possible.

Again some men with venereal diseases marry pure girls and infect them, thus injuring their health and probably bringing diseased and defective children into the world. But is the remedy to be found in compelling all applicants for a license to marry to submit to a physical examination by a doctor, as this bill attempted to do? And doesn't every one know how easy it is for a doctor to be mistaken? Don't we all know how often venereal diseases are merely suppressed—not cured—to break out again whenever conditions are favorable? And doctors certificates are not hard to get if one has the necessary means.

But the worse and most dangerous feature of the bill was the provision abolishing the common law marriage.

The common law marriage is the natural marriage. Every civilized and uncivilized people have recognized it from time immemorial; and it is everywhere a great safeguard to innocent women and children, where the marriage has taken place in fact, but without acknowledgment before a legally constituted authority.

The courts have always held such marriages legal, and the wife and children can inherit the property of the husband and father. The court records are full of cases where the common law marriage has saved a pure and honest wife from destitution and innocent children from pauperism.

And in states where the common law marriage has been abolished by statute, the court records give us case after case where pure and innocent wives have been denied the right to any of the property their toil and self-denial had helped to earn and save,—left with little children to support, and to face their remaining years in poverty and destitution.

But sometimes "bad women" try to use the common law marriage to get a part of the property of some old rounder who had died and left more money than character.

"Well," says the Southwick Bill, "we will abolish the common law marriage, and then the "bad women" can no longer come into court and try to get a part of the property of the rich rounder, under the plea of being his common law wife."

This is the very reason given by one sincere but misguided member, in explaining to friends why he voted for the Southwick Bill. Other members admitted that they voted for it because Southwick was a good fellow and they did not want to hold him up to ridicule. And then, of course, the senate would kill the bill anyway.

The law should protect those who have innocently entered into this most sacred relation. It should recognize the fact of marriage—as the common law always has—rather than lay stress on the form or ceremony by which the fact is announced to the world. It should presume that children are “legitimate,” not assume the contrary, and require them to show the marriage license of the father and mother. Perhaps the license has been lost, and all evidence of its existence with it.

There are thousands of people today living together in common law marriage—people just as honest, faithful and pure as are any people in the world. All these would be compelled by Southwick's bill to go before a priest, minister or magistrate and have a ceremony performed, in order that their marriage should hold in law and their children inherit their property. Isn't this perilously near to being retroactive? Such a law would also open wide the door to the scorn and gossip of evil-minded people, who delight to make a scandal and create trouble whenever they can.

And isn't it true that the more requirements we make before people can become legally married, the greater number of people will ignore all such requirements; and then, if we declare that natural, or common law marriage, shall have no standing in the courts, have we not multiplied many fold the very evils we were trying to abate?

Marriage—the real true love union of a man and a woman—is the purest and most sacred relation in all the world; and what we really need—what young men and women most need—is to be educated to look upon that relation in its true light, as the one most cherished hope and grandest consummation of life.

And then, if we can so readjust our social and economic system that all can have a fair chance in the world,—that the masses shall not be legally robbed for the support of a privileged class—then how easy it will be for men and women to respond to the strongest and purest call of their nature, free from the fear of poverty that now, more than anything else, prevents true marriage, and results in the prostitution of the tenderloin on the one hand, and the equally destructive prostitution on the other that has grown up inside of legal marriage, namely: marriage merely to secure a home and support, the love, the only reason for true marriage, may be wholly wanting.

Making Artificial Criminals.

Is it a crime to give away a street car transfer or to ride on one received from the original owner? Should a newsboy or a boot black or any other person be sent to the workhouse because he sold a transfer or gave it away instead of using it? And should the person who got a transfer in that way and then rode on it be branded as a criminal? Shall the police force of our cities be set to watching such transactions, and arresting people caught red-handed?

Evidently Senator Denegre thinks so, or he would not have introduced and put thru the Senate a bill making it a misdemeanor to give away, or to receive and use, a transfer from any one except the "duly accredited agent of the Street Railway Co."

Denegre also fathered Senate file 736, which made it a misdemeanor "to be upon, go upon, or ride upon any railway train, car or engine, or any part thereof," unless you are a passenger or an employee. Nor could you walk along, or over, or upon any railway right of way without subjecting yourself to the same penalty.

On the afternoon of the last day of the session, Representative Geo. H. Moeller, of St. Paul, attempted to put this street car transfer bill thru the house under suspension of the rules. Lydiard of Minneapolis and Elmer of St. Paul tried to help it thru; but they were overwhelmingly defeated, largely thru the efforts of Bjornson of Lyon county and Lennon of Minneapolis.

Bjornson declared that, when you have paid your nickel and received your transfer, that transfer is yours to do with as you please. You have a right to use it, to sell it, or to give it away, as you see fit. Such laws only play into the hands of a corporation that is getting a double price for every ride it gives.

Lennon swore he would never support a bill that would set the police of the three great cities of the state to the task of arresting newsboys for selling transfers.

Well, the bill did not pass, but the people ought to know the facts. Both Mayor Keller of St. Paul and Mayor Nye of Minneapolis were about the capitol a large part of the afternoon and evening, and Mayor Keller, at least, was openly lobbying for the bill. Bjornson was called out and urged to let up and allow the bill to pass. Also both Chiefs of Police, and several ordinary policemen were on hand to impress the members. Even threats were used that important legislation would be held up if this bill were defeated. But the members refused to be impressed, and the threats did not go far.

The following is taken from the St. Paul Daily News:

KELLER LOBBIES FOR STREET CAR CO.

Mayor H. P. Keller appeared in a new role—at least in the open—when he ventured at the final business session of the legislature Wednesday night as a lobbyist for the street railway company.

He met a stinging rebuke from Rep. Andrew Davis, Elk River, whom he sought to interest in favor of the company, in the bill seeking to prohibit the use of transfers by anyone other than the person to whom transfers are issued by conductors.

Rebuffed by Davis.

"Who do you represent, the people or the street railway company?" Rep. Davis asked Mayor Keller, when the latter called him out of the house chamber, Rep. Davis

being opposed to the passage of the transfer bill. "It appears to me that this bill favors nobody but the company."

Mayor Keller turned without a word at this "slam" and walked away.

Admits Making Deal.

To Rep. G. B. Bjornson, Minnesota, Mayor Keller admitted having made a deal with the street car company, six months ago, binding himself to support the transfer bill under the agreement that the company would agree to a law allowing policemen and firemen to make yearly contracts with the company for rides at lower than the regular 5-cent fare.

"Is it possible that you have to make such a deal with the street railway company in order to get your rights in this matter?" asked Rep. Bjornson.

"It is a fact," replied the mayor, "and I have promised my support in favor of the transfer bill in the interests of the policemen of St. Paul."

"Well, all I've got to say is that I will not vote for such a measure," replied Rep. Bjornson.

Bill Not Passed.

The bill was not taken up and died on the calendar.

Get Concession Anyhow.

The bill permitting policemen and firemen to make annual transportation contracts passed the senate just before adjournment. It passed the house several weeks ago and will now go to the governor.

An Attempt to Restore the Death Penalty.

Two years ago Representative McKenzie of Sibley county secured the passage of a bill doing away with the death penalty. There appeared to be some reaction from this position, and Representative Pless, who had defeated McKenzie for the Republican nomination in Sibley county in the fall elections, brought in a bill to allow the jury to decide whether death or imprisonment for life should be the penalty for murder in the first degree. In case of a confessed murderer the court was given the same power. The bill created considerable debate in the house, but was killed by the following vote: Yeas 49 and nays 51, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Borgen	Ferrier	Lydiard
Bouck	Finke	McGarry
Brown, G. W.	Fuchs	Nimocks
Brown, W. W.	Greene	Ofsthun
Campbell	Hanson	O'Neill
Carey	Healy	Papke
Carlson	Johnson, A. C.	Pfaender
Crane	Just	Pless
Dindorf	Kimpel	Porter
Dwyer	Klemer	Preston
Elmer	Lundeen	Prince

Reed	Stageberg	Virtue
Ribenack	Stoven	Vollmer
Sanborn	Sullivan	Westlake
Sawyer	Swenson	Wilson
Seebach	Thielen	
Skartum	Thornton	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, W.	Hopkins	Peterson, A. J.
Bendixen	Johnson, J. T.	Putnam
Bjorge	Knapp	Schwartz
Bjornson	Kneeland	Southwick
Braatellen	Knopp	Steen
Burchard	Larson	Stone
Burrows	Lee	Sundberg
Child	Lennon	Teigen
Clementson	Lindberg	Vasaly
Coates	McMartin	Voxland
Davis	Morken	Walker
Dunn, H. H.	Nelson	Warner, A. L.
Dunn, R. C.	Nolan	Wefald
Frankson	Norton	Weld
Frye	Olien	Wescott
Henry	Orr	Westman
Hillman	Palmer	Williams

So the motion was lost.

Sterilizing Criminals and Others.

The bill of G. W. Brown to permit the sterilization of certain inmates of our state institutions passed the house by a bare 61 votes and it was hard to get the required number. This includes the inmates of state prison, state reformatory, training school for boys, industrial school for girls, institutions for feeble minded, epileptics and insane.

Section 1. Whenever the superintendent of any state prison, state reformatory, state training school for boys, state industrial school for girls, state school for feeble minded and colony of epileptics, or of any state hospital or state asylum for insane, shall certify in writing that he believes that the mental or physical condition of any inmate would be improved thereby, or that procreation by such inmate would be likely to result in defective or feeble minded children or children with criminal tendencies, and that the condition of such inmate is not likely to improve, so as to make procreation by such person desirable or beneficial to the community, it shall be lawful to perform a surgical operation for the sterilization of such inmate as hereinafter provided."

Isn't this conferring a very dangerous degree of arbitrary power? By what right may some men presume to decree the emasculation of their fellow human beings? But worst of all, is it fair or just to subject the boys and girls in the training schools of Red Wing and Sauk Center to the whim of a stupid or meddlesome superintendent? Every one knows that sterilization is destructive of manly vigor and womanly charm; and what shall we think of a

system of training that would make it possible to violate the persons of men and women, boys and girls, simply because they had been found guilty of some offense that had resulted in their being shut up for a time in a state institution. What right have we to so increase the penalty for their wrong doing?

In any case most criminals and defectives are the direct or indirect result of bad laws. At bottom society itself is to blame and not the individual criminal or defective, and now many legislators propose to wreak the vengeance of society on the innocent victims of their own stupidity.

CHAPTER XII.

OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION.

In this history I have dealt mostly with measures of a vital nature,—measures that are present day issues,—measures that are to furnish the foundation upon which to build the better civilization of the future.

But the legislature of 1913 did much important work of a different character,—much in the way of correcting faults in our statutes and improving the administration of the affairs of the state.

Space will not permit a full discussion of all these measures, but we may refer to a few of them.

Workman's Compensation.

Mothers' Pensions.

Minimum Wage for Women.

Classification of property for purposes of taxation and the taxation of personal property at only 25% of its true value.

Conferring on cities a greater degree of self-government.

Extension of Civil Service.

The five-sixths jury law in civil cases.

Making it easier to bring actions against public service corporations.

Prohibiting fraudulent statements in advertising matter.

Pure Seed law.

Blue Sky law.

Uniform Negotiable Instruments.

Uniform Warehouse Receipts.

Requiring true and correct branding of products and prohibiting imitation.

Laws relating to dependent and delinquent children.

The Dunn Good Roads law.

County Tuberculosis Sanitaria.

Regulating Dance Halls.

Improving the Department of Labor.

Forest Protection.

Improving Drainage laws.

The Garbo Election System.

Interchangeable Family Mileage Books.

Reserving minerals to the state in lands granted to railways.

Establishing Minnesota Brand for butter, cheese, canned fruit and vegetables.

Prohibiting misbranding of products.

Regulating manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

Prohibiting use of food preservatives by canners and dairies.

Presidential Preference Primary law.

Many acts more strictly regulating railways.

Increasing safety of machinery.

Improving public education.

Extending the principle of special assessment for betterments.

State insurance of public buildings.

Improving standard weights and measures.

Permitting voters who are away from home to send ballot by mail.

These are perhaps the most important, but they are far from all.

On the whole the legislature of 1913 was a conscientious, hard-working body of men, who did more for the real betterment of the public affairs of the state than can be said of any other legislature in its history.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE RECORDS OF THE MEMBERS.

How shall the value of a legislator's work be estimated?

What shall be the test?

Is it enough when we can say that a man is honest and sincere?

No; he must also be intelligent, broad-minded, far-seeing.

Many an honest man has done much to promote bad legislation; much to help along injustice; much to establish graft and greed and tyranny; much to enslave his fellow men—just because he was short-sighted, or because his sympathies had been played upon, or his judgment obscured.

Shall a man always represent his constituents?

This is often a dangerous position to take. It is frequently impossible to know the wishes of his constituents. They may be misinformed. They may have heard but one side of the question. That side may have been represented by interested parties. I do not think a representative should ever vote against his own highest convictions on any question. If his people demand this of him, he can resign and leave them free to choose one who can vote in harmony with their views. Or he can go to his people and explain his position to them and abide by the verdict.

There are certain fundamental principles that are fully established. The greatest possible liberty for each individual man and woman, the largest possible degree of home rule and local self government for each and every social unit, the confining of the activities of the state to matters of state wide interest only—these are matters regarding which there can be no honest difference of opinion among those who profess to favor democracy in government.

We all profess to believe in the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence that "Governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed." That the people have the inherent right to make the laws by which they are to be governed, to amend them, to repeal them,—these, too, are truths to which all must assent or deny the fundamentals upon which our governments, national, state, local, profess to be founded. Men may honestly deny these principles, but if they do, they have no right to seek to be elected to help make or administer the laws in a democratic republic.

But in the confusion of practical legislation, many honest men lose sight of these principles. Many men honestly vote wrong. But because they are honest, is no sign that they should be supported by the people whom they have honestly misrepresented.

Certain measures that came before the legislature of 1913 furnish the best test of a man's qualifications to represent the people in a democratic republic like the

state of Minnesota, and the way the members voted on these measures is the best criterion by which to estimate their work.

There were several bills restoring to the people greater control over their public affairs. On all these measures I shall take the truly democratic side and shall allow the records of the members to speak for themselves. I shall impugn no man's motives nor his honesty, but shall simply report how he took sides and how he cast his ballot.

I regard the following as the vital measures:

I. The Initiative and Referendum.

II. The Recall.

III. Equal suffrage for women.

IV. Amendments to the election laws making it easier for the people to nominate and elect their public servants.

All these relate to the fundamental right of the people to make and amend their own laws.

V. County Option in the matter of permitting the sale of liquor.

VI. The Nolan Bill securing to each city and village the right to control their own public utilities.

VII. The Wallace Bill in the Senate and the Governor's bill in the House that deprived cities and villages of this power and vested it all in the state to be administered through an irresponsible commission appointed by the Governor, and entirely removed from control by the people.

VIII. The Cashman Bill to prohibit railway discrimination.

IX. The most vital test was the vote on the two vetoes.

There were many other bills that would furnish valuable hints as to the real democracy of members, but these here mentioned I regard as the most vital.

So now you may read how the members have written their records in their votes on these bills.

Representatives.

JOHN ANDERSON, Sebeka, Wadena Co.—Merchant. Against equal suffrage; voted to spoil the Initiative and Referendum by prohibiting the circulation of petitions; against county option but supported other temperance measures; was for the Cashman bill and against the reactionary public utility commission bill; one of four to vote against the conference report on the Initiative and Referendum; voted to override both vetoes.

WALTHER ANDERSON, Badger, Roseau Co.—Banker and Merchant interested in co-operative enterprises; wealthy and naturally conservative. In the early part of the session he voted against the Initiative and Referendum, but later on his views changed and he heartily supported it on final passage; favored equal suffrage, county option and other temperance measures;

Cashman bill; against the state control of local public utilities; voted to override both vetoes.

JOSEPH BARTEN, Belle Plaine, Scott Co.—Farmer. Was against equal suffrage; against effective Initiative and Referendum; against County option and all temperance legislation; voted for the Cashman bill and opposed all puritanical and meddling legislation; voted to override both vetoes.

C. M. BENDIXEN, Morgan, Redwood Co.—Farmer. Chairman of the grain investigating committee. Favored all fundamental legislation as equal suffrage, initiative, referendum, recall, Cashman bill, local self government for cities, personally favored County option but voted against it for local reasons, favored other temperance laws; voted to override the telephone veto but for reasons of patronage voted to sustain the veto of the Nolan bill.

HENRY O. BJORGÉ, Lake Park, Becker Co.—Lawyer and Farmer. Author of the tonnage tax bill for which he worked untiringly; earnestly favored all progressive legislation as equal suffrage, initiative, referendum, recall, Cashman bill, county option and all temperance measures; favored home rule and local self government for cities and opposed the state control of local utilities. In general able, honest and fundamentally democratic on practically every question; voted to override both vetoes.

GUNNAR B. BJORNSON, Minneota, Lyon Co.—Editor "Minneota Mascot." A clear thinker and able speaker, he strongly favored all progressive measures as equal suffrage, County option and all temperance laws, initiative, referendum and recall; for the Cashman bill, and opposed to the state control of the city public utilities; for the Nolan bill; voted to override both vetoes; was the first to puncture the swindle of the street railway transfer bill.

ANTON BORGÉN, Duluth.—Retired property owner, against equal suffrage, county option and all temperance measures, initiative and referendum; did not vote on Cashman bill; against the reactionary public utilities bill and for Nolan Bill; voted to override the Governor's veto of the telephone bill but was with the interests to sustain the veto of the Nolan bill.

G. T. BRAATELIEN, Rothsay, Otter Tail Co.—Strong for all progressive measures, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, county option and temperance laws, equal suffrage, Cashman bill, Nolan bill and against the reactionary Public Utility bill; a fearless member who often voted his convictions regardless of policy or popularity; voted to override both vetoes.

CHARLES W. BOUCK, Royalton, Morrison Co.—Merchant and large land owner; voted against equal suffrage, county option and all temperance laws; opposed effective Initiative and Referendum; against Cashman bill; against reactionary Public Utility bill voted with the interests to sustain both vetoes.

G. W. BROWN, Glencoe, McLeod Co.—Lawyer; strong

opponent of all progressive laws, author of the Brown amendment to emasculate the Initiative and Referendum, against equal suffrage, county option and all temperance laws, for the reactionary Utility bill, favored the Cashman bill; was candidate for Speaker against the progressive elements in the house, and a leader of the extreme conservatives all through the session: supported both the vetoes of the Governor.

W. W. BROWN, St. James, Watonwan Co.—School teacher; was for equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, county option and all temperance measures, Cashman bill, Nolan bill, and against the reactionary public utility bill, voted to override both vetoes.

C. D. BURCHARD, Plainview, Wabasha County; favored equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, county option and all temperance measures, Cashman bill, Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill, voted to override both vetoes.

G. W. BURROWS, Breckenridge, Wilkin Co.—Real estate and farm loan business, bank director, etc; favored equal suffrage, is recorded as not voting on the Brown amendment to destroy the Initiative and Referendum, was against county option, did not vote on the Road House bill, for the Cashman bill, did not vote on the reactionary utility bill, voted to override both vetoes.

W. A. CAMPBELL, Minneapolis—Represents the Minnehaha Falls district, traveling salesman; strong supporter of labor legislation, author of the Mothers' Pension bill, was for equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, for the Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill, only city member to vote for the tonnage tax, against Cashman bill, voted to override both vetoes.

HUBBARD CAREY, Adams, Mower Co.—General merchant; against equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, for the Brown amendment to spoil the Initiative and Referendum, did not vote on the reactionary utility bill, for the Cashman bill and tonnage tax, general record strongly conservative, did not vote on either veto.

CARL P. CARLSON, Morris, Stevens Co.—Farmer; voted for all fundamentally democratic measures, equal suffrage, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, county option and all temperance laws, Cashman bill, and against depriving the cities of control of their own public utilities, also against both the reactionary vetoes.

S. R. CHILD, Fourth Ward, Minneapolis—One of the clearest thinkers and hardest workers in the House; voted for every fundamentally democratic measure, only city member who had the courage to vote for the Cashman bill prohibiting railway discrimination, chairman of the Efficiency Committee which investigated the state departments and made recommendations in the direction of efficiency and economy, was strongly against the reactionary public utility commission urged by the Governor and also voted to override both the reactionary vetoes.

JOHN CLEMENTSON, Erskine, Polk Co.—Farmer; voted for every fundamentally democratic measure, equal suffrage, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, county option and all temperance laws, Cashman bill prohibiting railway discrimination, for the Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill, and against both the reactionary vetoes.

JOSEPH H. COATES, Sauk Rapids, Benton Co.—Farmer, real estate dealer, lawyer; against county option, but favored other temperance measures, for equal suffrage, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, for the Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill, and against both the reactionary vetoes.

KERRY CONLEY, Rochester, Olmstead Co.—Manufacturer of cameras and photographic supplies; earnestly supported equal suffrage, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, county option and all temperance measures, for home rule and local self-government for cities and against the reactionary utility bill and both the reactionary vetoes, as chairman of the committee on legislative expenses, did much to economize the cost of the session and prevent petty graft in the furnishing of supplies.

RALPH E. CRANE, Grand Meadow, Mower Co.—Farmer; heartily supported all fundamentally democratic measures, as equal suffrage, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, county option and temperance laws, was for the Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, opposed both the reactionary vetoes.

D. CRAWFORD, Lakefield, Jackson Co.—Banker and public official; against county option and temperance measures, favored the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but voted for the bill on final passage, for equal suffrage, for the Cashman bill, for the Nolan bill and against the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and was against both the reactionary vetoes.

ANDREW DAVIS, Elk River, Sherburne Co.—Merchant; voted for all fundamental democratic measures, as equal suffrage, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, county option and temperance laws, for the Nolan bill and against the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and was against both the reactionary vetoes.

WM. E. DINDORF, St. Paul.—Advertising man; against equal suffrage, county option and all temperance laws, voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but was for the bill on final passage, for Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill, also against both the reactionary vetoes.

H. H. DUNN, Albert Lea, Freeborn Co.—Lawyer; voted for the Brown amendment to spoil the Initiative and Referendum, opposed equal suffrage, against county option, but for other temperance measures, took strong ground in favor of the Cashman bill, opposed the reactionary utility bill to deprive cities of the power to control

their own public utilities, and opposed both of the vetoes, was author of the bill to save to the state the minerals in the unpatented railway land grant lands.

R. C. DUNN, Princeton, Mille Lacs Co.—Editor Princeton Union; for equal suffrage, county option and temperance measures, and for the Cashman bill, voted for the Brown amendment to spoil the Initiative and Referendum and was one of seven to vote against the bill after the failure to spoil it, voted for the Governor's bill to deprive the towns and cities of the control of their public utilities, author of the Dunn Good Roads bill, the merits of which are yet to be tested, opposed both the reactionary vetoes.

JAMES DWYER, Minneapolis.—Ice business, member of the City Council for 12 years; against equal suffrage, against county option and all temperance measures, voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but supported the bill on final passage, voted with Lennon, Lydiard and Nimmo in favor of the reactionary bill to deprive the cities of all control over their public utility corporations, sustained the Governor's veto of the telephone bill but opposed the veto of the Nolan bill

J. P. ELMER, St. Paul, Seventh Ward—Life insurance, from 1897 to 1909 in the employ of the Great Western Railway as city and general passenger agent; for equal suffrage, against county option and all temperance measures, for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum and against the bill on final passage, voted for the Governor's bill to deprive cities of all control over their public utility corporations, he and Preston being the only Ramsey county men to vote for this bill, and even supported the veto of the Nolan bill, but voted against the veto of the telephone bill.

JAMES FERRIER, St. Charles, Winona Co.—Farmer and blooded stock raiser; against equal suffrage, county option, and all temperance laws, for the Initiative and Referendum on every ballot, against the Cashman bill, and for the reactionary utility bill, but opposed both the vetoes.

A. C. FINKE, Hills, Rock Co.—Banker and insurance; strong supporter of equal suffrage, county option and all temperance measures, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, for the Cashman bill, but supported the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, however, he opposed both the reactionary vetoes.

H. H. FLOWERS, Cleveland, LeSueur Co.—Banker and postmaster; against equal suffrage and county option, but favored other temperance laws voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but supported the bill on final passage, for the Cashman bill and against the reactionary utility bill and both the vetoes.

THOMAS FRANKSON, Spring Valley, Fillmore Co.—Lawyer and real estate dealer; strong supporter of all fundamental democratic measures, as equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan bill and opponent of the re-

actionary utility bill, joint author with Henry O. Bjorge of the Tonnage Tax bill, opposed both the vetoes.

P. H. FRYE, Kandiyohi Co.—Lawyer, farmer, member of co-operative elevator company and store; voted for all fundamental democratic measures, as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan bill, and against the reactionary utility bill depriving cities of home rule as to their public utilities and was against both the reactionary vetoes.

E. J. FUCHS, Second Ward, St. Paul—Druggist; opposed equal suffrage, county option and all temperance laws, voted against the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, and against the reactionary utility bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and against both the vetoes.

T. J. Greene, St. Paul—Served four years as deputy clerk of court, two years as deputy sheriff, three terms in the legislature; did not vote on equal suffrage, against county option, but for the road-house bill, for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, but voted for the bill on final passage, for Nolan bill and against the reactionary utility bill and both the reactionary vetoes.

AUGUST HAFFTEN, Buffalo, Wright Co.—Officeholder for many years; against equal suffrage and county option, but for the road-house bill, voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but was for the bill on final passage, for Cashman bill, but voted for the reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule in controlling their public utilities, supported the veto of the Nolan bill, but was against the veto of the telephone bill.

ALEC HANSON, Lake Crystal, Blue Earth Co.—Farmer; against equal suffrage and county option, but favored the road-house bill, voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, for the Cashman bill and against the reactionary utility bill, and was against both the reactionary vetoes.

H. H. Harrison, Stillwater, Washington Co.—Civil engineer; strong supporter of equal suffrage, against county option but for other temperance laws, voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but was for the bill on final passage, against the Cashman bill and for the reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, but was against both the reactionary vetoes.

JOHN A. HEALY, Hibbing, St. Louis Co.—Hotel-keeper; voted for equal suffrage, but was against all other progressive measures, even to favoring the reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities and supported both of the reactionary vetoes.

J. A. HENRY, Albany, Stearns Co.—Druggist; was against equal suffrage, county option and all temperance laws, voted for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, but was for the bill on final passage, was for the Cashman bill and Nolan bill and against the reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, was against both reactionary vetoes.

N. S. HILLMAN, Two Harbors, Lake Co.—Railway engineer, only Socialist in the legislature; voted for all fundamental democratic measures, as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, is not recorded on the Cashman bill, nor on the reactionary public utility bill, was against both reactionary vetoes.

TOBIAS HOGANSON, Stewartville, Olmstead Co.—Banker; was for equal suffrage, against county option, for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, but for the bill on final passage, voted for the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to public utilities, is not recorded on the Cashman bill, voted to sustain the Governor's veto of the Nolan bill, but was against the veto of the Minnette-Holmberg telephone bill.

N. J. HOLMBERG, Renville, Renville Co.—Farmer; strong advocate of all fundamental democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan bill and against the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to public utilities. As chairman of the elections committee was active and influential in favor of all progressive election laws, was against both reactionary vetoes.

FRANK HOPKINS, Fairfax, Renville Co.—Lawyer; took strong ground in favor of the Brown amendment to prohibit the circulation of petitions and kill the Initiative and Referendum, but supported the bill on final passage; favored equal suffrage, opposed county option, but favored other temperance laws; was author and champion of a bill to reduce licenses to a nominal fee, and thus remove the temptation to vote for license for the sake of the money it brought in; supported the Cashman bill; voted for the Governor's public utility commission bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, but also voted to pass the Nolan bill and the Minnette-Holmberg bill over the Governor's veto.

A. C. JOHNSON, Houston, Houston Co.—Farmer and stock raiser; supported every fundamental democratic and progressive measure, as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan bill, Minnette-Holmberg bill, etc., and opposed the reactionary Governor's bill, and voted to overturn the Governor's veto on both bills.

J. T. JOHNSON, Fergus Falls, Otter Tail Co.—Druggist; voted for all fundamental democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan bill, Minnette-Holmberg bill; against the Governor's public utility commission bill to deprive cities of home rule as to public utilities; voted to override the Governor's veto of the Minnette-Holmberg bill, but, for some reason, supported the veto of the Nolan bill, supposedly because of patronage obligation to the Governor.

N. A. JUST, Rapidan, Blue Earth Co.—Farmer and real estate dealer; against equal suffrage; against county option, but favored anti-roadhouse bill, did not vote on the

Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, but voted for the bill on final passage; for the Cashman bill, against the Governor and for the principle of home rule on all the public utility bills.

GERHARD KIMPEL, Young America, Carver Co.—Retired farmer; opposed all fundamental democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum, Recall; voted for the Governor's public utility commission, and to sustain the veto of the Nolan bill. The only exceptions to this course were his support of the Cashman bill and his vote to override the veto of the Minnette-Holmberg bill.

F. L. KLEMER, Faribault, Rice Co.—President Faribault Woolen Mill Co.; supported all fundamental democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan bill, Minnette-Holmberg bill and opposed the reactionary Governor's bill and vetoes.

C. T. KNAPP, Chisholm, St. Louis Co.—Lawyer; for equal suffrage; against county option but for anti-road-house bill and other temperance measures; for Initiative, Referendum and Recall; as chairman of the committee on general legislation, he fathered the public utility commission bill to deprive cities of local self-government as to their public utilities, but voted to override the Governor's veto on both the Nolan bill and the Minnette-Holmberg bill.

THOMAS KNEELAND, Fifth and Sixth Wards, Mpls.—Lawyer; favored equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, Nolan and Minnette-Holmberg bills, and voted to pass them both over the Governor's veto; opposed the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities. Mr. Kneeland took a deep interest in the conservation and efficient management of the public domain of the state and did faithful work in committee and on the floor of the house.

SAMUEL KNOPP, Winona, Winona Co.—Farmer; against equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws; against the Cashman bill, favored the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and upheld the Governor's veto of both the Nolan and Minnette-Holmberg bills.

ADOLPH S. LARSON, Sandstone, Pine Co.—Merchant; supported all fundamental democratic and progressive measures. As author of the equal suffrage bill, Mr. Larson made a strong plea for the rights of women; voted for the Cashman bill; was against the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and voted to pass both the Nolan and Minnette-Holmberg bills over the veto.

J. F. LEE, Annandale, Wright Co.—Farmer; supported all fundamental democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill; opposed the Gov-

ernor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and voted to pass both the Nolan and the Minnette-Holmberg bills over the veto.

JOHN LENNON, Fifth and Sixth Wards, Minneapolis—Traveling salesman; strongly opposed to most fundamental, democratic and progressive measures, but did vote to override the Governor's veto on the Nolan bill; opposed equal suffrage and county option, but voted for the anti-roadhouse bill; voted for the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, and supported the veto of the Minnette-Holmberg bill, also voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum.

R. J. LINDBERG, Henning, Otter Tail Co.—Druggist and banker; supported all fundamental democratic and progressive measures,—equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Cashman bill, Nolan Bill and Minnette-Holmberg bill, but voted to sustain the Governor's veto of the Nolan bill, supposedly because of political obligation to the Governor.

EARNEST LUNDEEN, Minneapolis—Lawyer; received considerable support as a candidate for speaker against Henry Rines, and made a hard fight for a committee on committees; supported all progressive measures except county option, and opposed the reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local utilities; voted to override both reactionary vetoes; was author of the Presidential preference primary bill, state insurance bill; was co-author of the Lundeen-Sunberg bill regulating dance halls and prohibiting sale of liquor in, around, or in connection with public dance halls; author of the bill that permits a whole family to ride on one mileage book; worked hard for a good workman's compensation bill, and tried to substitute the Wisconsin law for the bill that passed.

L. A. LYDIARD, Minneapolis, Eighth and Thirteenth Wards and some county towns—Opposed every democratic and progressive measure even to sustaining the Governor's veto of both the Nolan bill and the Minnette-Holmberg bill; was one of only two in the House to vote against the Recall on final passage; opposed county option but voted for anti-roadhouse bill; favored the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities.

PATRICK H. MCGARRY, Walker, Cass Co.—According to his biographical sketch furnished for the Blue Book, "he resides at Walker where he has business interests;" opposed every fundamental democratic and progressive measure even to supporting the Governor's veto of the Nolan bill and the Minnette-Holmberg bill, and favored the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities.

FINLAY McMARTIN, Claremont, Dodge Co.—Farmer and stock breeder; favored every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure, and opposed all reactionary bills.

PAUL MARSCHALK, Warroad, Roseau Co.—Engaged in commercial fishing on Lake of the Woods; was in favor of all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures except the Cashman bill; for equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Initiative, Referendum, Recall; was against the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum; against the Governor's bill to deprive the cities of local self-government as to their public utilities, and voted to pass both the Nolan bill and Minnette-Holmberg bills over the veto.

FRANK E. MINNETTE, Sauk Center, Stearns Co.—Interested in farming and general business; represents a very conservative constituency; opposed equal suffrage, county option and all temperance measures; voted for the Brown amendment to prohibit the circulation of petitions and thus kill the Initiative and Referendum, but favored the bill on final passage, also favored the Recall; was for the Cashman bill and the tonnage tax; made a hard fight for the telephone bill and against the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities; voted to override both vetoes.

GEO. H. MOELLER, Fifth Ward, St. Paul—With the Corning Advertising Agency; for equal suffrage; against county option, but favored other temperance laws; was against the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum; did not vote on the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities; sustained the Governor's veto of the telephone bill, but voted to pass the Nolan bill over the veto.

T. T. MORKEN, Crookston, Polk Co.—Lawyer and Judge of Probate; voted for all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option, anti-roadhouse bill, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Nolan bill, telephone bill, etc., and against all reactionary and meddlesome laws, voted to pass both the Nolan bill and the telephone bill over the Governor's veto and opposed the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities.

NELS E. NELSON, Alexandria, Douglas Co.—Farmer and holder of County offices; for equal suffrage, but voted against county option after being committed to it both by his party and his personal pledge; voted for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; for Cashman bill, but against the tonnage tax; voted for the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public utilities, but voted to pass both the Nolan bill and the telephone bill over the Governor's veto.

FRANK E. NIMMOCKS, Fourth Ward, Minneapolis—No occupation given; strong against equal suffrage and county option; voted for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; for the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to public utilities; voted to sustain the veto of the telephone bill, but is not recorded on the veto of the Nolan bill.

W. I. NOLAN, Thirteenth Ward, Minneapolis—Humor-

ous lecturer; as chairman of the rules committee, and recognized floor leader of the progressive democratic forces of the House Mr. Nolan gave very able and effective support to all the progressive legislation of the session, and opposed with equal force everything reactionary. As author and champion of the Nolan bill to give cities control over their own public utilities he made an able fight to pass his bill over the Governor's veto, and to defeat the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to all their local public utilities.

W. I. NORTON, Second and Ninth Wards, Minneapolis—Lawyer and attorney for Anti-Saloon League; active leader of temperance forces in the house, favored all fundamentally, democratic and progressive measures, and opposed all reactionary bills like the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to local utilities; voted to override both the reactionary vetoes.

T. T. OFSTHUN, Glenwood, Polk Co.—Lawyer; chairman of the committee on Taxes and Tax Laws; favored equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, tonnage tax; was against Cashman bill for local reasons; voted first for the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to local public utilities, but afterward voted to pass both the Nolan bill and the telephone bill over the Governor's reactionary veto.

ANDREW OLIEN, Clarksfield, Yellow Medicine Co.—Farmer and merchant; favored all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures and opposed everything of a reactionary character, as the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local public utilities; voted to pass both the Nolan bill and the telephone bill over the veto.

D. P. O'NEILL, Thief River Falls, Pennington Co.—Farmer; was for equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws and most progressive measures, but voted for the Brown amendment to prohibit the circulation of petitions and supported the Governor in his reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to local utilities and even supported the veto of the Nolan bill.

CHAS. N. ORR, Midway District, St. Paul—Lawyer; was strong in his support of all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures, and vigorously opposed everything reactionary like the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to local public utilities, and his vetoes of the telephone bill and the Nolan bill. As chairman of the Ramsey county delegation and the Judiciary Committee of the House Mr. Orr was a very influential member.

F. L. PALMER, Second and Ninth Ward, Minneapolis—Real estate, loans and insurance; favored all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures, as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum, Recall, Nolan bill, Minnette-Holmberg bill, and opposed the Governor's reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local public utilities and both the vetoes.

JOHN PAPKE, Waseca, Waseca Co.—Farmer; op-

posed equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws; was for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, and supported the Governor's reactionary veto of the Nolan bill, but voted against the Governor's bill to deprive cities of home rule as to local public utilities, and against the veto of the telephone bill.

A. B. PETERSON, Twin Valley, Norman Co.—Farmer; favored county option and temperance laws, but opposed equal suffrage and the Initiative and Referendum, being one of four to vote against the bill on final passage by voting against the report of the conference committee; voted against the Governor's reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local public utilities, and was against both reactionary vetoes; was for the Cashman bill and tonnage tax.

A. J. PETERSON, DAWSON, Lac qui Parle Co.—Banker; supported all fundamental democratic measures as equal suffrage, county option, Initiative, Referendum and Recall, Nolan bill, telephone bill, and was against the Governor's reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local public utilities and against both reactionary vetoes; was for the Cashman bill and the tonnage tax.

P. A. PETERSON, Emmons, Freeborn Co.—Farmer; voted for equal suffrage, against county option but for other temperance laws; favored the Brown amendment to prohibit the circulation of petition and thus kill the Initiative and Referendum; was for the Cashman bill and the tonnage tax; was against the Governor's reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local public utilities and against the veto of the telephone bill; but supported the veto of the Nolan bill; was strongly opposed to all sumptuary and meddlesome legislation.

ALBERT PFAENDER, New Ulm, Brown Co.—Lawyer; against equal suffrage and county option; voted for the Brown amendment to prohibit the circulation of petitions and thus destroy the value of the Initiative and Referendum; was for the Cashman bill; made a good fight against the Governor's reactionary bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local public utilities, and was against both the reactionary vetoes, and against all sumptuary and meddlesome legislation.

ERNEST C. PLESS, Gibbon, Sibley Co.—Miller; was elected against MacKenzie, who had been a leader of the anti-temperance forces two years before; was against equal suffrage, county option, and all temperance laws, was for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, for Cashman bill, the reactionary public utility bill and the veto of the Nolan bill, but voted against the veto of the telephone bill.

MILES PORTER, Mankato, Blue Earth Co.—Lawyer; strong supporter of all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures, and against everything reactionary; was sick during the last part of the session and unable to be in his seat.

J. J. PRESTON, Ninth Ward, St. Paul—Stone mason;

against equal suffrage, county option and other temperance measures; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; for the reactionary public utility bill, but against both reactionary vetoes.

T. H. PRINCE, So. St. Paul, Dakota Co.—General contractor and officeholder; was for equal suffrage, against county option, but favored other temperance laws; against Cashman bill and against the reactionary public utility bill, and opposed both reactionary vetoes.

H. A. PUTNAM, Battle Lake, Otter Tail Co.—Farmer; favored every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure, and opposed everything reactionary except the veto of the Nolan bill, which he voted to sustain under great pressure from the Governor the same as two other members from the same county; chairman temperance committee and did excellent work.

GEO. D. REED, Faribault, Rice Co.—Fuel business and officeholder; against equal suffrage and county option; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; for Cashman bill, did not vote on the reactionary public utility bill, opposed the veto of the telephone bill, but supported the veto of the Nolan bill.

E. R. RIBENACK, Duluth—Hotel-keeper; against equal suffrage and county option; for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum, but was against the reactionary public utility bill and against both vetoes.

H. A. SAGGAU, Ceylon, Martin Co.—Implement dealer and stock buyer; against equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, and then voted twice against the bill, one of seven on final passage in the House and one of four against the conference report; was for the reactionary public utility bill and for both vetoes but voted for the Cashman bill.

JOHN B. SANBORN, Midway District, St. Paul—Lawyer; for equal suffrage, county option and all other progressive measures, except that he voted for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum; was against the reactionary public utility bill and both vetoes.

C. L. SAWYER, Fifth and Sixth Ward, Minneapolis—Real estate dealer; favored every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and opposed everything reactionary, especially the Governor's public utility bill to deprive cities of self-government as to their local public utilities, and opposed the two reactionary vetoes.

MARTIN SCHWARTZ, Ottawa, LeSueur Co.—Farmer; opposed county option, but favored other temperance laws; did not vote on equal suffrage; was for the Cashman bill and the tonnage tax; against both reactionary vetoes, but is not recorded on the Governor's reactionary public utility bill.

FRED SEEBACH, Red Wing, Goodhue Co.—Held various public offices for many years; against equal suffrage,

county option and temperance laws, Cashman bill and tonnage tax; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; against the reactionary public utility bill and both vetoes.

K. G. SKARTUM, Lake Benton, Lincoln Co.—Drugs, books, etc.; voted for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and opposed everything reactionary, especially the Governor's utility bill and the two vetoes.

CLAUDE E. SOUTHWICK, Wells, Faribault Co.—Lawyer and large owner of farm lands; for equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws; voted for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, for Cashman bill, against the reactionary utility bill, and the veto of the telephone bill, but supported the veto of the Nolan bill; author of a drastic bill regulating marriage and abolishing common law marriages.

L. C. SPOONER, Morris, Stevens Co.—Lawyer and large land owner; voted for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure, and opposed everything reactionary; took special interest in the conservation of our natural resources and in saving to the people our water power, forests, mineral lands, etc.; author of the bill to classify property for purposes of taxation, and to tax homes and industries at a lower rate than mineral land, timber land, etc. Near the close of the session was sick for some time, and hence his vote is not recorded on some important measures.

N. A. STAGEBERG, Zumbrota, Goodhue Co.—Farmer; opposed equal suffrage and county option, but was for other temperance laws, for Cashman bill and the tonnage tax; favored the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, but opposed the Governor's reactionary utility bill and both vetoes.

HENRY STEEN, Winona, Winona Co.—Salesman; against equal suffrage and county option, but for other temperance laws; against the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; did not vote on Cashman bill nor tonnage tax, voted for the reactionary public utility bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their local utilities, but did not vote on either veto, because he was laid up with rheumatism.

W. T. STONE, Park Rapids, Hubbard Co.—Homeopathic doctor; strong supporter of every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure, and opponent of all things reactionary, especially the public utility bill and the two vetoes.

A. C. STOVEN, Sixth Ward, St. Paul—Lawyer; for equal suffrage; against county option and temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; opposed the reactionary public utility bill and both vetoes.

M. J. SULLIVAN, Third Ward, Minneapolis—Stone contractor; against suffrage, county option and temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Ref-

erendum, but opposed the reactionary utility bill and both vetoes.

VICTOR SUNDBERG, First Ward, St. Paul—Drug-gist; favored all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures and opposed both the reactionary vetoes and the reactionary utility bill.

OSCAR A. SWENSON, Nicollet R. 2, Nicollet Co.—Farmer; against equal suffrage and county option, but for other temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum; for Cashman bill and tonnage tax; opposed the reactionary public utility bill and both vetoes.

A. F. TEIGEN, Montevideo, Chippewa Co.—Farmer; voted for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure, and opposed everything reactionary; greatly interested in legislation for the benefit of farmers, active worker on the grain investigating committee, where he proved the value of velvet chaff wheat.

W. H. THEILEN, First Ward, Minneapolis—Printer; against equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum but opposed the reactionary utility bill and both vetoes.

J. M. THORNTON, Fifth Ward, St. Paul—Contractor; for equal suffrage; against county option, but favored other temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; was against the reactionary utility bill and both vetoes.

JULIUS THORSON, Benson, Swift Co.—Banker; for equal suffrage; against county option, but favored other temperance laws; for Initiative, Referendum, Recall and all progressive measures; for the Cashman bill but against tonnage tax; against the reactionary utility bill and both vetoes.

LOUIS VASALY, Little Falls, Morrison Co.—Lawyer; for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and against every attempt at reactionary legislation.

LEONARD VIRTUE, Blooming Prairie, Steele Co.—Farmer; against equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws; did not vote on the Brown amendment; for the Cashman bill and against the tonnage tax; voted for the reactionary utility bill and to sustain both reactionary vetoes.

H. B. VOLLMER, Stillwater, Washington Co.—Farmer; against equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws, Cashman bill and tonnage tax; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum, and for the reactionary utility bill, but did not vote on either veto.

GEO. H. VOXLAND, Kenyon, Goodhue Co.—Farmer; voted for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and against everything reactionary; only Prohibitionist in the House.

ISAAC F. WALKER, Princeton, R. 3, Isanti Co.—For

equal suffrage, but against county option and most temperance measures; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; against the Cashman bill and tonnage tax; for the reactionary utility bill and both vetoes. One of seven to vote against Initiative and Referendum on final passage.

A. L. WARNER, Duluth—Real estate dealer; for equal suffrage, county option and temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; against the reactionary utility bill and both vetoes.

C. H. WARNER, Aitkin, Aitkin Co.—Banker, lawyer, real estate; for all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures; against both reactionary vetoes, but at first favored the reactionary utility bill. As chairman of the reapportionment committee brought in a very fair bill and secured a very good reapportionment.

ELIAS WARNER, Lamberton, Cottonwood Co.—Farmer; for all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures and against everything reactionary, except that under pressure from the Governor he did not vote on either veto.

KNUD WEFALD, Hawley, Clay Co.—Retail lumber dealer; for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and against everything reactionary, especially the reactionary utility bill and the two vetoes.

BURT WELD, Slayton, Murray Co.—Banking and real estate; for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and against all reactionary bills as the utility bill and the two vetoes; against the Cashman bill for local reasons.

W. H. WESTCOTT, St. Paul, Dakota Co.—Farmer; against equal suffrage and county option, but favored some other temperance laws; for the Brown amendment to kill the Initiative and Referendum; for the Cashman bill and for the reactionary public utility bill; did not vote on the vetoes.

E. J. WESTLAKE, Fifth and Sixth Ward, Minneapolis—Insurance; against equal suffrage and county option; for the Brown amendment to kill Initiative and Referendum; against the reactionary utility bill, but did not vote on either veto.

L. O. WESTMAN, Litchfield, Meeker Co.—Farmer; for all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures, and against the reactionary utility bill and the veto of the telephone bill, but for the veto of the Nolan bill.

M. W. Williams, Lanesboro, Fillmore Co.—Merchant; for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and against all reactionary bills like the utility bill and against the two vetoes.

J. W. WILSON, Third and Tenth Wards, Minneapolis—Grocer; for all fundamental, democratic and progressive measures and against everything reactionary.

Speaker Henry Rines, Mora, Kenabec Co.—Editor Times; nominated speaker as choice of the progressive

element of the House and finally elected with only 19 votes against him; organized the committees to do the work laid out by the best progressive and fundamentally democratic sentiment of the state; made a capable and popular presiding officer, always faithful to the trust he assumed when he took the speakership and always active in the interest of honesty, efficiency, economy and progress.

THE SENATE.

In the senate the situation was somewhat different.

The equal suffrage bill furnished a vital test and the rejection of the bill after it had passed the house was quite unprecedented and served to strongly emphasize the test.

The attempt to take the committees away from Burnquist was a decidedly reactionary move but did not get much support.

About the most vital test of all, so far as country members were concerned was the vote sustaining the two vetoes of the Nolan bill and the Telephone bill. Though a few country members yielded to the pressure and voted to sustain the vetoes, their general record was democratic and progressive. The city members were solid against the vetoes.

But they were also practically solid against the Cashman Anti-Discrimination bill—local conditions are powerful.

On the Initiative and Referendum the test was on the proposition to make it hard to amend the constitution.

On the Recall bill the test came on the attempt to save the judges.

So far as election laws were concerned there were two reactionary attempts—both of which failed—one to keep county officers partizan and the other to cut out second choice voting at the primaries.

On Temperance and Moral measures there was no clear line up. The Coller amendment that spoiled the Anti-Roadhouse bill was adopted without roll call, and the question of county option in the licensing of the sale of liquor did not reach the senate at all.

In their votes on these questions the senators have made their own records.

J. J. AHMANN, Torah, Stearns Co.—Merchant and banker; voted to sustain both reactionary vetoes, to make it hard to amend the constitution by initiative, to cut second choice out of the primary bill; against equal suffrage on every ballot; opposed taking committees away from Burnquist; favored non-partisan county officers, and the recall; for the Cashman bill.

B. N. ANDERSON, Hartland, Freeborn Co.—Farmer; favored the recall and Cashman bill, but on all the other questions was consistently opposed to progressive measures.

S. B. BEDFORD, Rushmore, Nobles Co.—Banker;

voted for every fundamental, democratic and progressive measure and against everything reactionary.

H. N. BENSON, St. Peter, Nicollet Co.—Lawyer; voted to sustain the veto of the Nolan bill and did not vote on the question of partisan county offices, but was otherwise on the progressive side.

JAMES P. BOYLE, Eveleth, St. Louis Co.—Lawyer; against the Cashman bill and voted to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative, but in general was a very strong advocate of progressive measures.

GEO. C. CARPENTER, Buffalo, Wright Co.—Merchant and local Republican leader; for the Cashman bill, but against every other progressive and for all reactionary measures.

THOMAS E. CASHMAN, Owatonna, Steele Co.—President Clinton Falls Nursery Co.; author of the Cashman Anti-Discrimination bill, a quiet, persistent worker; for every progressive measure and against all reactionary attempts.

H. W. CHEADLE, Duluth—Real estate, formerly City Clerk; against the Cashman bill; against equal suffrage on every ballot, tho he voted for equal suffrage two years before; opposed easy amendment to the Constitution by initiative, but opposed all other reactionary measures.

FRANK CLAGUE, Lamberton, Redwood Co.—Lawyer; voted to sustain the veto of the Nolan bill; against the Cashman bill; voted to cut second choice out of the primary law, but generally favored progressive measures and opposed reactionary ones.

JULIUS A. COLLER, Shakopee, Scott Co.—Lawyer; for the Cashman bill; against the Nolan veto and against making county officers partizan, but was generally opposed to progressive measures like equal suffrage, recall, etc., and favored most of the reactionary attempts, as taking committees away from Burnquist, sustaining veto of telephone bill, cutting out second choice from primary bill, rejecting equal suffrage and was one of eight against the Recall on final passage.

C. F. COOK, Austin, Mower Co.—Real estate and insurance; favored every important progressive measure and opposed every reactionary one.

L. O. COOKE, Kellogg, Wabasha Co.—Farmer and Republican party leader; consistently favored every reactionary move and opposed all progressive measures; one of eight against Recall on final passage.

O. G. DALE, Madison, Lac qui Parle Co.—Banker; opposed every reactionary move and voted for all progressive measures.

JAMES D. DENEGRÉ, St. Paul—Lawyer; against taking committees away from Burnquist; voted to sustain the Nolan veto, but to override the telephone veto; was for equal suffrage, but against recall of judges and against easy amendment of the Constitution by initiative; against second choice at primary, but is not recorded on the ques-

tion of partizan county officers. Mr. Denegre introduced and put thru the senate a bill to make it a crime to trespass on the property of a railway company and also making it a crime to accept and use a street car transfer except from the conductor. Both these bills were killed in the house.

C. R. DONALDSON, Stewart, McLeod Co.—Merchant; favored Cashman bill, and the Recall including judges, also non-partisan county officers, but supported both the reactionary vetoes; voted to take the committees away from Burnquist, to cut out second choice at the primaries, to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative, and was against equal suffrage on every ballot.

S. B. DUEA, Rutherford, Pipestone Co.—Banker; voted for the Cashman bill, for equal suffrage and the recall including judges; was against taking committees away from Burnquist, but supported both reactionary vetoes; favored partisan county officers, and voted to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative; did not vote on the question of second choice at primaries.

W. W. DUNN, St. Paul—Vice President and attorney for Hamm Brewing Co.; voted for every reactionary attempt and against all progressive measures; one of four to vote against conference report on recall.

F. A. DUXBURY, Caledonia, Houston Co.—Lawyer; voted for the Cashman bill; against the veto of the telephone bill; against the attempt to make it hard to amend the constitution by initiative, but favored all other reactionary attempts, as taking committees away from Burnquist, supporting the Nolan veto, partisan county officers, no second choice, against recall of judges, and against equal suffrage on every ballot, tho he had voted for equal suffrage two years before.

W. S. DWINNELL, Minneapolis—Lawyer, member American Bar Association, officer and director in various corporations; voted for partisan county officers, against recall of judges, and against easy amendment of Constitution by initiative; otherwise opposed reactionary attempts and favored progressive measures. Led the fight to pass the Nolan bill over the veto.

JAMES T. ELWELL, Minneapolis—Real estate dealer and large land owner; was against recall of judges and against easy amendment of the Constitution by initiative, but otherwise favored all progressive measures and opposed all reactionary ones.

M. L. FOSSEEN, Minneapolis—Lawyer; against easy amendment of the Constitution by initiative, but otherwise favored all progressive measures and opposed all reactionary ones.

S. J. FROSHAUG, Benson, Swift Co.—Physician; only prohibitionist in the senate; opposed every reactionary attempt and favored all progressive measures; especially interested in temperance laws and the establishment of tuberculosis sanitarium.

F. S. GLOTSBACH, Faribault, Rice Co.—Pharmacist;

was for the Cashman bill and recall including judges; against taking committees away from Burnquist, but was strongly opposed to equal suffrage and voted to sustain both the reactionary vetoes.

C. J. GUNDERSON, Alexandria, Douglas Co.—Lawyer; strongly favored all progressive, temperance and moral measures and opposed everything reactionary.

D. M. GUNN, Grand Rapids, Itasca Co.—Hotelkeeper; voted for every reactionary proposition and against every progressive measure; was one of eight to vote against recall on final passage.

J. M. HACKNEY, St. Paul—Lawyer; President Hackney Land Co. and Hackney Manufacturing Co.; strongly and actively against equal suffrage on every ballot; against easy amendment of the Constitution by initiative, but otherwise favored progressive measures and opposed reactionary attempts.

JAMES HANDLAN, St. Paul—Meat business; opposed taking committees away from Burnquist; was against partisan county officers; opposed equal suffrage on every ballot; favored recall including judges, but voted to sustain both reactionary vetoes; did not vote on the Cashman bill nor on the second choice, and is not recorded on the amendment to the initiative to make it hard to amend the Constitution.

A. L. HANSON, Ada, Norman Co.—Farmer and banker; voted every time for progressive measures and always against everything reactionary.

JULIUS E. HAYCRAFT, Madelia, Watonwan Co.—Lawyer; voted for every progressive measure and against every reactionary one.

C. D. JOHNSON, Brainerd, Crow Wing Co.—Druggist; was against the Cashman bill; against equal suffrage on every ballot, tho he voted for it two years ago; against the recall of judges; in favor of such reactionary measures, as taking the committees away from Burnquist, sustaining both vetoes, cutting out second choice at primaries, and making it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative.

V. L. JOHNSON, Center City, Chisago Co.—Lawyer; favored every progressive measures except Cashman bill and opposed every reactionary one.

JAMES JOHNSTON, Bertha, Todd Co.—Farmer and stock breeder; did not vote on taking committees away from Burnquist; favored Cashman bill and recall including judges, but otherwise opposed equal suffrage and other progressive measures and favored both reactionary vetoes and other similar measures.

CHARLES H. KLEIN, Chaska, Carver Co.—Brick manufacturer; opposed Cashman bill, equal suffrage, recall of judges, and favored all reactionary attempts except the taking of committees away from Burnquist.

O. A. LENDE, Canby, Yellow Medicine Co.—Lawyer; a strong, intelligent and able supporter of every progressive measure, and opponent of everything reactionary.

N. A. L'HERAULT, Minneapolis—Lawyer; against equal suffrage, recall of judges, second choice at primaries, and easy amendment of Constitution by initiative, but opposed taking committees away from Burnquist, opposed the Nolan veto, opposed partisan county officers, but voted to sustain telephone veto.

M. J. McGRATH, Winona—Farmer; opposed equal suffrage and the Cashman bill but was otherwise in favor of all progressive measures, and against reactionary ones.

CHAS. S. MARDEN, Barnesville, Clay Co.—Lawyer; was for the Cashman bill, for recall including judges, for second choice at primaries, and against taking committees away from Burnquist; but voted to reject the equal suffrage bill when it came from the house; voted to sustain both the reactionary vetoes and for partisan county officers.

JOHN MOONAN, Waseca, Waseca Co.—Lawyer; ably advocated every progressive measure and opposed all reactionary attempts except that he voted to sustain both vetoes.

FRANK MURRAY, Bird Island, Renville Co.—Lawyer; voted to take committees away from Burnquist and for every other reactionary attempt except that he is not recorded on the question of partisan county officers and second choice at primaries; was against equal suffrage, recall of judges, easy amendment of Constitution by initiative; supported both vetoes and introduced a state-wide public utility bill to deprive cities of home rule as to their public service utilities, but voted for the Cashman bill.

S. A. NELSON, Lanesboro, Fillmore Co.—Banker and merchant; favored every progressive measure and opposed every reactionary attempt except to make county officers partisan.

C. W. ODELL, Wilmar, Kandiyohi Co.—Banker; favored all progressive measures and opposed everything reactionary except the two vetoes of the Nolan bill and the telephone bill.

A. C. OLSON, Windom, lives in Jackson Co.—Farmer; favored Cashman bill, recall of judges, opposed taking committees away from Burnquist, the telephone veto and the attempt to cut out second choice at the primary, but favored Nolan veto, partisan county officers and the attempt to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative; opposed equal suffrage on every ballot, tho he voted for it two years ago.

J. W. PAULY, Minneapolis—Cigar manufacturer; opposed equal suffrage, second choice at primaries, and easy amendment to Constitution by initiative; favored recall including judges, and non-partisan county officers; opposed taking committees away from Burnquist and voted to override both reactionary vetoes.

E. P. PETERSON, Litchfield, Meeker Co.—Lawyer; favored all progressive measures and opposed every reactionary attempt except the two vetoes, which he voted to sustain.

A. A. POEHLER, Henderson, Sibley Co.—General mer-

chandise, grain and stock; favored the Cashman bill, recall including judges, and favored taking committees away from Burnquist; opposed equal suffrage on every ballot, and supported both reactionary vetoes and to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative.

T. M. PUGH, Duluth—Grain and produce commission business; voted against every progressive measure and in favor of every reactionary attempt except to take the committees away from Burnquist.

F. E. PUTNAM, Blue Earth, Faribault Co.—Lawyer; voted to sustain the Nolan bill veto, to make it hard to amend Constitution by initiative, and against recall of judges, otherwise for all progressive measures and against reactionary attempts.

A. J. ROCKNE, Zumbrota, Goodhue Co.—Lawyer; against Cashman bill, equal suffrage on every ballot, and recall of judges; favored partisan county officers, amendment to cut out second choice at the primaries, and to make it difficult to amend Constitution by initiative; opposed taking committees away from Burnquist, and voted to override both reactionary vetoes.

EDWARD RUSTAD, Wheaton, Traverse Co.—Lawyer and banker; voted for every progressive measure and against every reactionary attempt.

OLE O. SAGENG, Dalton, Otter Tail Co.—Farmer; only Populist in the senate; author of the equal suffrage bill; voted for every progressive measure and against all reactionary attempts.

JOHN SAUGSTAD, Climax, Polk Co.—Farmer; chairman of committee to investigate brewery owned saloons; voted for every progressive measure and against all reactionary attempts.

ALBERT SCHALLER, Hastings, Dakota Co.—Lawyer; voted to sustain both reactionary vetoes, to cut out second choice at primaries, and to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative; but otherwise stood for progress and against reaction.

A. T. STEBBINS, Rochester, Olmstead Co.—Hardware merchant; voted against every progressive measure, and for every reactionary attempt except that he voted for recall of judges.

GEO. H. SULLIVAN, Stillwater, Washington Co.—Lawyer; active leader of reactionary element; supported and voted for every reactionary attempt, and was against all progressive measures; one of eight against the recall bill on final passage, and one of four against conference report for recall.

JOHN D. SULLIVAN, St. Cloud—Lawyer; attorney for G. N. Ry.; against all progressive measures, and in favor of every reactionary move except to take the committees away from Burnquist; one of eight to vote against the recall on final passage.

B. E. SUNDBERG, Kennedy, Kittson Co.—Large

farmer; voted for every progressive measure except the Cashman bill, and against every reactionary attempt.

C. J. SWANSON, Fridley, Anoka Co.—Brick and tile manufacturer; voted for every reactionary attempt except to take committees away from Burnquist, and against every progressive measure, even to voting against recall on final passage.

F. J. THOE, Hayfield, Dodge Co.—Farmer; favored all progressive measures and opposed every reactionary attempt except to make county officers partisan.

PETER VAN HOVEN, St. Paul—Meat packer and politician; opposed equal suffrage, and voted for all reactionary attempts except to take committees away from Burnquist and make county officers partisan.

CARL L. WALLACE, Minneapolis—Lawyer; opposed equal suffrage on every ballot, against recall of judges; favored reactionary amendments to primary law, but opposed taking committees away from Burnquist; introduced the extremely reactionary public utility bill that deprived all cities of the control of their local public utilities and gave everything into the hands of the corporations; was sick all the last half of the session and thus his record is blank on the two vetoes, but it is supposed he would have voted to override them.

HARRY F. WEIS, LeSueur, LeSueur Co.—Banker; opposed equal suffrage on every ballot, against the Cashman bill, favored recall of judges; opposed the reactionary amendments to the primary law, but voted to sustain both reactionary vetoes and to take the committees away from Burnquist.

GEO. P. WILSON, Minneapolis—Lawyer; voted to take the committees away from Burnquist, to cut out second choice at primaries, to make it hard to amend the Constitution by initiative, to exempt judges from recall and was one of eight to vote against recall on final passage in the senate, and one of four to vote against adoption of conference report on recall. On the other hand he voted to override both reactionary vetoes, against partisan county officers; for equal suffrage on every ballot, and was the only city senator to vote for the Cashman bill.

S. D. WORKS, Mankato, Blue Earth Co.—Real estate and lumber; voted in favor of every reactionary attempt except the two amendments to the primary law to cut out second choice and make county officers partisan; voted against recall on final passage and was one of four to vote against the conference report on recall; against the Cashman bill and against equal suffrage on every ballot.

APPENDIX I.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL HOUSE GRAIN INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

To the Speaker and the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota:

Your committee, appointed under resolution of January 21, 1913, to investigate the organization, management, control, and methods of doing business of any and all corporations or co-partnerships and of every person in any manner engaged in the business of buying and selling or handling of grain or live-stock products in the State of Minnesota, and into the details in every respect whatsoever referring to the State board of grain inspection and its methods of procedure and of doing business, authorized by such resolution to employ counsel to assist the committee in the examination of witnesses and of books and papers and other instruments of evidence in the matter of this investigation and to assist in the preparation of its report on the conclusion of such investigation; this committee, consisting of C. M. Bendixen (chairman), A. F. Teigen, Martin Schwartz, D. P. O'Neill and Frank Hopkins, respectfully make the following report:

JAMES MANAHAN was employed as counsel for the committee and public hearings were held in the capitol at St. Paul, as well as at Minneapolis and Duluth, at which representatives of all parties interested appeared in person and by attorney.

The rules, by-laws, and reports of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and of the Duluth Board of Trade, together with many letters from shippers, statements and tabulations prepared by commission merchants and elevator companies, and the rules, reports, and statistical tables prepared by the railway and warehouse commission regarding the inspection and moving of grain, were received in evidence and considered in connection with the testimony of a large number of witnesses, who testified as shown by the transcript of such testimony submitted herewith in connection with the exhibits offered in evidence as a part of this report.

Your committee thoroughly investigated the manner in which grain received at the terminal markets of Minneapolis and Duluth is sampled, inspected, and marketed, taking the testimony of samplers, inspectors, and officers of the railway and warehouse commission and of the State board of appeals, officers of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and Duluth Board of Trade, managers of terminal elevator companies and commission merchants, pit traders and independent dealers, as well as a large number of country elevator men, managers of farmers' co-operative concerns, representatives of the American Society of Equity, and farmers.

We find that the grain markets of Minneapolis and Duluth handle the bulk of the grain produced in the Northwest. The business of buying and selling grain at each

of these terminals is well organized, and the commission men generally have adopted a method of promptly and accurately reporting all trades made by them. There seems to be no opportunity or inclination for individual traders on these markets to engage in any practice detrimental or unfair to either the shipper or receiver of grain, but in certain respects conditions have prevailed which your committee considers unsatisfactory and tending to burden the producers and to some extent the general public, and regarding these conditions we find and recommend as follows:

Committee's Recommendations.

First. The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the Board of Trade of Duluth are voluntary associations organized under the general laws, and consisting of a limited number of members elected by the board of directors of these associations under rules which at the same time confer upon such board of directors substantially absolute control over the admission of new members.

The number of members is limited, but any member may own an unlimited number of memberships. Notwithstanding the tremendous increase in the grain business of the Northwest, the number of members of the chamber of commerce has not been enlarged for more than 10 years past.

Your committee therefore recommends that the State should assert and have sufficient control over the internal management of these associations to insure at all times freedom of the market from any possibility of control by any combination (should such combination be attempted) and recommends that the by-laws and rules of such associations should be so made and enforced that the general officers and directors and membership committees should be elected by the full membership by secret ballot, and that all nominations for such officers should be made by a suitable primary system.

Your committee also recommends that suitable rules and by-laws be adopted to enable an applicant for admission to membership to such associations to appeal from an adverse decision by the board of directors to the vote of the membership at large, and your committee further recommends that such legislation be enacted as will enable such applicant to appeal to a court of competent jurisdiction in any case where he is arbitrarily denied admission to such associations.

Rules Criticized.

Second. The following rules of these associations your committee believes are arbitrary and objectionable:

(a) Upon violation of any rule, regulation, or custom of the association any member may be punished by a fine, suspension, or expulsion from the association by vote of the board of directors only.

(b) Another rule provides that members cannot bid against each other for carload lots on track at country points. This rule makes such bids absolutely noncompetitive, which your committee believes is against the best interests of producers and shippers.

Your committee believes and recommends that all secrecy as to the doings and rules of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the Duluth Board of Trade should be eliminated so far as that may be done without unduly disclosing what may be termed private business relations of the members of these associations. Publicity is the greatest possible corrective of all public evils, and your committee believes that publicity in this would result in a wholesome improvement in matters referred to as well as strengthening of public confidence in the doings and practices of said Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and Duluth Board of Trade.

Third. Your committee also finds that for a number of years a private price list bureau has been operated with officers in the Chamber of Commerce, Minneapolis, and with access to the floor, and in close relation with the quotation committee of said chamber. The business of this private price list bureau is to furnish subscribers at country points a daily card showing what purports to be the price on grain at the local station where such card is sent and as a guide to buyers at such station, which price card is based upon the closing prices of that date at the terminal markets, with freight charges and what is supposed to be a reasonable margin of profit deducted. Under this practice this card is sent to subscribers at the various stations upon the theory that the prices quoted may be changed at any station whenever any subscriber at that station desires to pay more for the grain than is quoted by the card itself. The prices quoted on this card are generally followed at country points by the buyer, and on account of the recognition of the right of the buyer at any station to raise the price as given on these cards sent to that station it has often been used to crush out competition. We believe that this grain bulletin should be substituted by a public agency, and that the railroad and warehouse commission should be authorized and directed to adopt suitable rules and take the necessary steps to send daily price cards to all subscribers willing to pay therefor, showing on a uniform basis the prices that are being paid at the terminals and that may be paid at the country stations after allowing for freight and a uniform and reasonable margin of profit.

Switching Charges.

For years the members of the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis have imposed an arbitrary charge of \$1.50 switching charge upon every car of grain handled at Minneapolis. This charge has been imposed under authority of the association and was made to appear to be justified on the ground that it was an "average" of the charges actually imposed by the railroads for switching services. As a matter of fact, the statistics of the railroad and warehouse commission show the charge to be in excess of the average imposed by the railroads.

Moreover, according to the testimony adduced before this committee, Minneapolis is the only grain terminal in the United States where a switching charge is charged against the shipper; and, as was admitted by witnesses before your

committee, this arbitrary charge of \$1.50 a car has been assessed annually upon thousands of cars which actually paid no switching charge whatsoever. Consequently, this excessive and unjust switching charge has been an unfair burden inflicted upon the grain growers of the State, and your committee therefore recommends:

Fourth. Legislation that will abolish these unfair switching charges against grain marketed at Minneapolis and that the railroad and warehouse commission make, and enforce such regulations as will secure to shippers and consigners of grain at terminal market at Minneapolis a free switching service to any industry located in said city.

Fifth. Under the law of Minnesota, corporations are permitted to transact business with subsidiary corporations when the dealings are fair, and, as a result, the buying and selling of grain by commission merchants at terminal markets to their own subsidiary companies has been practiced to a considerable extent, generally with the knowledge and consent of the customer, in some instances where no such consent has been obtained. We think this is an unwise practice and one which, if continued, would afford opportunity for abuse; and we therefore recommend legislation to prevent the sale of any sort of product or grain by any broker or commission merchant to any company, with or without the consent of its consignor, in which such broker or commission merchant has any interest, either direct or indirect.

Selling to Subsidiaries.

That this custom of selling grain to subsidiary companies is recognized by the chamber of commerce to be an unwise custom, likely to be abused, is shown by the fact that the board of directors of said chamber of commerce during this investigation has made and adopted a rule forbidding any member to sell or buy consigned grain to or of a subsidiary company, whether the consent of the consignor has been obtained or not.

Sixth. A large part of the business at the terminal market is closely connected with what is known as future trading. The operations in the "pit," so-called, and the prices listed from similar future markets at other terminal points, like Chicago, to a very large extent fix the prices paid for a car of wheat on its arrival at Minneapolis, as the same is offered for sale by and inspected on the floor of the trading room in the Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis and the Duluth Board of Trade. It is claimed that this so-called future market serves a useful purpose by permitting what is known as "hedging" and what may be termed investment by those who wish to speculate and are competent to assume and carry the commercial risk of a change in prices between the gathering and distribution of the crops. It also appears evident from the testimony adduced before your committee that there are some small investors and poorly informed speculators who are not financially able to incur such risk and who do not know enough about the business to justify their dealings in futures, and they should be protected against this inclination toward gam-

bling so far as such protection is possible. We therefore recommend:

(a) Such rules and legislation as will confine dealing in futures to the "hedging" of grain and grain products actually bought and sold to investors who are ready, willing, and able to carry the burden of the purchase or sale as a straight investment on a reasonable margin.

(b) That brokers' offices for future dealings in grain should be confined to cities of the first class and to the principal place of business of such brokers, who should be prohibited from operating branch offices in the same city where the principal office is located.

(c) That the initial margin required of investors in futures be not less than 10 cents per bushel on lots of less than 5,000 bushels.

Apparently recognizing the evils of this indiscriminate speculating in futures, the chamber of commerce directors during the closing days of March, 1913, passed a resolution instructing the officials of the chamber of commerce to enter into correspondence with the officials of other grain exchanges throughout the country and arrange if possible so as to require the purchasers of futures to comply with the conditions recommended above. It was admitted by the officials of the chamber of commerce before this committee that if these rules were generally adopted by grain exchanges of the country it would go far to eliminate the gambling element in future transactions and would at the same time practically prevent the small, inexperienced, and financially unfit speculators from undertaking to carry the burden of speculative risk involved in future transactions. At the same time, we wish to affirm that we believe any transaction in futures is legitimate and commendable, where the parties engaged have an actual purchase or sale to hedge or protect, and where by reason of experience, business sagacity, and ample means they are fitted to engage in such business.

Seventh. It is the opinion of your committee that the State board of appeals is, under the present law, too intimately connected with the railroad and warehouse commission and too restricted in its operations to enable it to fully and satisfactorily perform the duties imposed on it by law. Your committee would therefore recommend that legislation be enacted that would make the State board of appeals an independent body in fact as well as in name and confer upon it such authority as will enable it to provide for the necessary help and facilities for carrying on its work in the most thorough and efficient manner possible.

Inspection Commended.

Eighth. The railroad and warehouse commission has perfected a system of sampling and inspecting grain well designed to protect producer and consumer and secure uniformity and stability of grades. Under the rules and practices that have prevailed in the grading and inspecting department of the board of appeals and the railroad and warehouse commission, the reliability of the grades shipped in Minnesota are recognized by markets of the world gen-

erally. Producers everywhere know that the grain they buy on Minnesota inspection will not fall below the grade designated. But your committee believes that the desire of the boards and departments to maintain this reputation for its grading has unconsciously led them to an unnecessary severity in grading grain on its arrival at the terminal markets from country points, and that the terminal elevators and mills at the terminal markets have, by taking advantage of the right to mix and blend wheat, secured large quantities of newer, inferior, and no grade wheat at prices that were lower than the producers should receive; and it is the belief of your committee that an absolute separation of the board of appeals from the regular grain-inspection department will result in a more efficient check on the first inspection and thus secure more exact justice to the producer without in any degree lowering what is known the world over as "Minnesota grades." In connection herewith, it should be borne in mind that what is known as "Minnesota grades" is established on the grading of the wheat out of the terminal elevators, and not on the wheat arriving at these terminals from the country elevators. Consequently the price received by the producer is not based on the severe grading of wheat on its arrival from the country, but is based on the more lenient grading out of the terminals; and to the extent that these two grades differ, to that extent the producers are deprived of what is justly due them.

The testimony adduced before your committee proved that what is known as no-grade wheat is lowered from the higher grades principally because it is presumed to contain a percentage of moisture exceeding the limit for safe storage, but testimony adduced would tend to prove that under the present method of inspection it is a mere matter of guess as to whether wheat, being somewhat damaged, should be placed in the no-grade class or in the class of the higher grades. As the difference in price between No. 1 northern and no-grade wheat is considerable, ranging all the way from 5 to 15 cents per bushel, your committee believes that the board of appeals and the railroad and warehouse commission should provide facilities for ascertaining what per cent of moisture wheat may contain and still be safely stored, as only by this method can a fair and just grading be established on this class of wheat. In connection herewith your committee feels it is its duty to state that the testimony before this committee proved that the board of appeals had at various times requested the railroad and warehouse commission to furnish it with such facilities, but as yet this request has not been granted.

Ninth. We recommend that more attention be given to determining the commercial value by laboratory and baking tests, particularly of the newer grades of grain, and in establishing grades, and that the benefit of the doubt be given the wheat in determining the grade.

Tenth. We recommend further that the rules of inspection and the practice of the inspection department be so revised and changed as to secure on the inspection of

grain shipped into the terminal markets a more liberal and fair grade. That the grading of so-called "plugged" cars should be changed so as to protect innocent shippers from being penalized to the profit of the purchaser in cases where poor or inferior wheat may be shipped in the same car; and suitable legislation should be enacted that will severely punish a shipper who deliberately plugs a car, but the penalty should not work to the benefit of the purchaser or that car, but rather to the State.

Eleventh. We find that the variety of wheat known as velvet chaff has been unjustly discriminated against, both as to its milling and its true commercial value, as certified to by millers and exporters testifying before this committee, causing great loss to the producers of the State. The fact is shown in the testimony that as an export wheat this variety will command a premium over No. 1 northern. On account of its merits, particularly as to weight, it has been used for mixing purposes to lift millions of bushels of no-grades into No. 1 and No. 2 northern. Therefore we further find that its classification as No. 1 northern was justified by the authorized board.

Price Cards Sent Out.

But this established grade has been absolutely disregarded by the buyers who have, as above referred to, arbitrarily discriminated against this variety of wheat, and this private price-list bureau previously referred to has absolutely disregarded the established grade on this wheat and on the price cards sent out to country points has put this wheat in a different class and at a lower price than was warranted by the grade established by such authorities. This your committee deems unfair.

Twelve. In view of that fact the testimony adduced before your committee proved that millions of bushels of low-grade wheat had been raised to higher grades by drying, blending, and cleaning, which has resulted in large profits to those engaged in the business without corresponding benefit to the producers; and in view of the further fact that this question of blending, cleaning, and drying wheat, judging from past experience and attempts along this line, is too large for farmers' co-operative associations to solve, your committee would therefore recommend that suitable legislation be enacted that would enable the State to provide facilities for this purpose and that such facilities be operated by the State at least until such time as farmers' co-operative associations have developed to such an extent that they will be strong enough to undertake this business.

As to Equity Exchange.

Thirteenth. Some time after the appointment of this committee by the speaker of the house the senate appointed a similar committee, ostensibly for the same purpose. This senate committee devoted nearly all its time and effort to inquiring into the business methods of what is generally known as the "Equity Exchange of Minneapolis." In view of the fact that this senate committee went into this mat-

ter so thoroughly, your committee considered that it would be a duplication of effort and a waste of time and money to devote any great amount of time to this subject, as the senate committee will undoubtedly in due time make its report to the legislature. The only witnesses in regard to these matters that appeared before this committee were Messrs. Holt, Bundy, and Schmitt, who appeared in behalf of the Voltaire Farmers' Elevator Co., of North Dakota. Messrs. Bundy and Schmitt made charges of irregular practices on the part of the equity exchange. Mr. Holt testified that the business relations between the Voltaire Farmers' Elevator Co. and the Equity Exchange had been entirely satisfactory to his company and repudiated many of the statements made by Bundy and Schmitt, pointing out the inconsistencies in their claims.

Your committee feels that it would not be doing its full duty if it should refrain from mentioning that certain undesirable features of future trading do not prevail in the Duluth Board of Trade to any considerable extent. Your committee also found that all switching charges were eliminated at Duluth and consequently to that extent the expense against grain arriving at that market is lessened. Your committee also believes that the market bulletin published and circulated by the various members of the Duluth Board of Trade comes nearer to reflecting and quoting the exact market conditions than does the Minneapolis so-called price-list bureau card.

Respectfully submitted,

C. M. BENDIXEN, Chairman,
MARTIN SCHWARTZ,
A. F. TEIGEN.

We concur in the findings of the majority report of the committee except in the following respect:

We do not believe that the grain board of appeals has been limited in any respect in doing its duty under the present law and therefore dissent from section 7 of the report.

FRANK HOPKINS,
D. P. O'NEILL.

APPENDIX II.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MINORITY REPORT OF THE SENATE GRAIN COMMITTEE.

We recommend:

1. That the legislature so far as possible provide for full and complete publicity as to the rules, regulations, practices and procedure of the Chamber of Commerce.
2. That legislation be enacted to abolish the switching charges now charged to shippers.
3. Legislation to abolish the rule of the Chamber of Commerce which eliminates competition in track bids for grain at country points.
4. The abolition of that rule of the Chamber of Commerce which gives to one member of the Association a

lien on the membership of another, superior and prior to ordinary claims and demands on account of indebtedness existing between such members and persons not members of the Association.

5. Legislation which will make the membership of a member of the Chamber of Commerce liable to seizure and sale upon execution in the same manner as other un-exempt property.

6. Legislation making the number of memberships of the Chamber of Commerce unlimited, and enabling an applicant for admission to appeal from an adverse decision by the board of directors to the vote of the membership at large, and thereafter to any court of competent jurisdiction in any case where he is denied admission to such association arbitrarily or in bad faith.

7. Legislation which will permit a member of the Chamber of Commerce to sell consigned grain for any charge or margin of profit which he sees fit.

8. That the Railway and Warehouse Commission be authorized and directed to take the necessary steps to send daily quotations of actual market prices paid for all varieties of grain at terminal points.

9. Finally, That legislation be enacted covering the entire field pertaining to the handling and marketing of the farm products of the state.

Respectfully submitted,

O. A. LENDE,
A. L. HANSON.

APPENDIX III.

"FINDINGS" TRANSMITTED TO SENATE REGARDING BREWERY CONTROL OF RETAIL LIQUOR TRADE.

712 out of 814 licensed saloons in St. Paul and Minneapolis either owned or controlled by breweries.

418 buildings occupied by saloons in St. Paul and Minneapolis owned by breweries; in many other cases breweries own fixtures and hold mortgage on property.

In Minneapolis three brewing companies own 270 saloon buildings.

16 brewing companies engaged in wholesale liquor business in St. Paul and Minneapolis.

Agents for brewing companies appear with applicants for liquor licenses and practically control granting of licenses.

From 60 to 75 per cent of liquor licenses in St. Paul paid by breweries; over 40 per cent paid in Minneapolis.

As many as 25 licenses paid for by one brewery company's check.

Many licenses paid indirectly by breweries; saloonkeepers required to repay same in weekly installments of \$20.

Many contracts between breweries and saloonkeepers requiring latter to sell only one kind of beer.

Brewing companies buy property for "blind pig" purposes and evil resorts, placing agents in charge of same.

"Blind pigs" encouraged by breweries, which deposit

as high as \$1,000 to pay possible fines of proprietor.

As many as 40 cases of beer found in "blind pigs" in residence districts.

Federal liquor licenses found in "blind pigs" paid for by breweries.

Disorderly houses are frequently houses of assignation, frequented by 16-year-old girls.

"Blind pigs" found over saloons in business districts.

Places raided three or four times and same persons were in charge.

Agent of brewery usually present at prosecution of "blind pig" cases.

Secretary of a brewing company signed 15 to 20 bail bonds for persons caught in a raid of disorderly houses.

Agents and officers have sought to influence and control election of aldermen and have successfully dictated affairs of city with reference to liquor traffic.

Saloons located within a block of school buildings, notwithstanding protests.

Brewery-owned saloons tend to increase number of saloons, making competition keener and resulting in saloonkeepers violating laws by permitting gambling, keeping open after hours and permitting women of questionable repute to enter their places of business.

Legislative Remedies Proposed.

Law to prohibit wholesale liquor dealers either directly or indirectly from engaging in retail liquor business.

Prohibiting breweries from selling liquor to "blind pigs."

Law to empower municipalities with right to regulate wholesale as well as retail liquor traffic within their limits.

Making it unlawful for agents of breweries to assist in procuring licenses for saloons.

Prohibiting brewing companies from leasing property for saloon purposes to persons under any other agreement than a cash rent basis.

Making void any leases where breweries stipulate that lessees must sell their product.

Making it unlawful for any one to solicit assistance from a brewing company to have himself established in a saloon business.

Violations of proposed laws made gross misdemeanor.

Penalty—Fine of from \$500 to \$1,000 for each conviction.

JOHN SAUGSTAD, Chairman,
JAMES P. BOYLE,
EDWARD RUSTAD.

328.768 B86

1913

DEMCO
LIBRARY SUPPLIES
114 South Carroll Street
Madison, Wisconsin

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

wils 1913

328.768 B86

Buell, Carl J., 1853-

The Minnesota Legislature of ..., by C.



3 1951 002 483 377 V