
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>





The Minnesota Legislature of 1915

Carl J. Buell



V.C.

THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE OF 1915

BY
C. J. BUELL

TO THE READER.

This book is not published for profit, but to inform the voters as to the record of their Senators and Representatives. Please pass it on to your neighbor after you have read it, and write to the author your honest opinion of the work.

C. J. BUELL,
1528 Laurel Ave., St. Paul.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1915

(By C. J. BUELL)

Every citizen ought to read this book. It tells you the truth about your legislature. It shows just how your member voted on the important questions. It opens up the true inwardness of the Speakership Contest and the County Option fight.

A Brief But Clear Discussion of the Questions of
"Taxation"

"Public Service Corporations"

"Equal Suffrage"

"Efficiency and Economy"

"The Mayo Affiliation"

and Many Others

PRICE OF THE BOOK IN QUANTITIES:

In cloth - \$1.00	In paper, 5 copies \$1.50	100 copies \$15
2 copies - 1.50	10 copies - 2.50	200 copies \$25
1 copy, paper .50	25 copies - 5.00	1000 copies \$100

Address: **C. J. BUELL**

1528 Laurel Avenue

ST. PAUL, MINN.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1915

--BY--



C. J. BUELL

Author of

"The Minnesota Legislature of 1913"

"The Currency Question"

"Industrial Depressions, their Cause and Cure"

"Monopolies and Trusts"


"Our Indebtedness to the Arabs"

Copyright by C. J. BUELL

1528 Laurel Avenue

St. Paul, Minn.

1915



LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR BURNQUIST,
Who has twice organized the Senate for honesty, efficiency
and economy in government.

JKG167
1915

COMMENDATORY FORE WORD.

The manuscript for this book has been prepared by C. J. Buell, who gave his entire time, during the legislative session of 1915, to a careful study of the record of each member of both House and Senate and a thoro 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 1915 that every citizen can read with profit.

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

PREFACE BY THE AUTHOR.

This is the fourth time that a history of the Minnesota Legislature has been given to the public.

These books have attempted to analyze, in a clear, simple and fearless manner, the more important legislative work of each session; and to show to the voters just how their representatives had voted in committee and on the floor of the House and Senate on these important matters.

This publicity has had its effect. Many extreme conservatives, reactionaries, and special interest men have been retired to private life, and more progressive and honest men sent in their places.

There has been a great improvement in the direction of intelligence, honesty and independence. Steadily the people have been able to get more and the corporations and special interests less.

I believe the legislature of 1915 has to its credit as much thoroly correct legislation and as few dangerous enactments as any in the history of the state.

Some of my readers may think this a rash statement; but, when you have gone thru the different chapters carefully, perhaps the good features will look better and the sins not so heinous.

Much credit is due to those public spirited citizens whose financial aid has made these books possible. As they have always been sold at about the cost of printing and postage, they have never brought any profit to the authors.

Write me your candid opinion of this book.

J. C. BUELL,
1528 Laurel Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

425735

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Commendatory Foreword	3
Author's Preface	3
CHAPTER I.	
County Option and the Speakership.....	5
CHAPTER II.	
The Committees and the Flowers Organization.....	10
CHAPTER III.	
Tying Up Members.....	13
The Patronage Bait	14
President pro tem. of the Senate.....	15
CHAPTER IV.	
Self Government	16
The Source of Government.....	17
The Scope of Government.....	18
The Bill of Rights.....	18
Representative Government	18
Democracy (Initiative, Referendum and Recall).....	18
Equal Suffrage	22
Amending the Constitution.....	25
CHAPTER V.	
Taxation	27
Theories of Taxation.....	27
Tax Situation in Minnesota.....	29
Gross Earnings Taxes.....	31
Natural Sources of Revenue.....	32
Unemployment, Wage Regulation and Taxation.....	33
CHAPTER VI.	
Public Service Corporations	34
The Telephone Bill.....	35
The Nolan Bill	37
Semi-Monthly Pay Day Bill.....	38
Street Railway Bills.....	40
CHAPTER VII.	
Good Roads	45
Repeal of Elwell Road Law.....	46
Dunn Road Law	49
CHAPTER VIII.	
Temperance and Moral Measures.....	49
County Option	49
Prohibition	55
The Anti-Road House Bill.....	57
The Boxing Bill and Mayo Affiliation.....	60
CHAPTER IX.	
Efficiency and Economy.....	63
The "Big Bill"	63
The "Seven Sisters"	65
CHAPTER X.	
Proposed Laws that Failed.....	67
Spoiling the Merit System.....	68
Medical Legislation	72
Educational Measures	75
The Grain Bills	76
CHAPTER XI.	
A Non-Partisan Legislature	78
Some Laws that Passed.....	80
What the Legislature Spent	80
CHAPTER XII.	
The Record the Members Made.....	81
The Senators	81
The Representatives	92
Larimore's Record	112

The Minnesota Legislature of

1915

CHAPTER I.

COUNTY OPTION AND THE SPEAKERSHIP.

Why was the question of county option the supreme issue in the selection of a speaker of the House of Representatives? Are there not other state questions of equal or greater importance?

Perhaps, but the one overwhelming issue in the campaign of 1914 was the question whether the people of the several counties of the state should be permitted to vote and determine the policy of the county as to the licensing of the liquor traffic. In almost every legislative district of the state county option was either the one vital issue or else it was one of the few questions around which the contest was waged for Senator and House members.

What Does County Option Mean?

A few facts will make the answer plain. Under the present system of so called Local Option, the people who live within the boundaries of any little village or city have the entire power to license saloons within that territory. The farmers who occupy the surrounding country are wholly shut out from any voice in the matter; yet they must come there to trade; their older children must go there to school; and there is the social center where they must seek entertainment and religious and moral instruction.

Are not the surrounding farmers just as much interested in the social and moral conditions of the town as are those who happen to live within its boundaries? Yet under the present system of "local option" they can have no voice nor vote upon the most vital question that goes to determine the moral status of their town.

Is this fair to these farmers to whom the town owes to a large extent at least, its very existence?

And more than this; the licensed saloon is the one greatest direct cause of crime and poverty.

The whole county must pay the cost of prosecuting the criminals and supporting the paupers that result from the legalized saloon.

Why then, should not all the people of the county be allowed to vote on the question of licensing saloons within its borders?

Blind Pigs and Boot Leggers.

"But," you say, "If saloons are not licensed, 'blind pigs' and 'boot leggers' will spring up and flourish."

The answer is: "Such places are outlaws. The halo and sanctity of law do not surround them. They can be closed and destroyed at any time, whenever any person or group of persons see fit to take action."

If the people of the counties had a right to vote on this

question, it is reasonably certain that more than three fourths of the state would refuse to license and legalize this useless and accursed traffic.

The people of the other counties, who might wish to continue the license system, would in no way be prevented from doing so.

This issue has long been a burning one, and the election of 1914, the people chose a good working majority of both House and Senate either pledged to pass a county option law, or known to favor such an act; and thus give to the citizens of each county the right to vote upon and determine the question whether or not the open saloon should be licensed and legalized.

THE SPEAKERSHIP LINE-UP.

Before the votes were all counted, the brewery interests had selected H. H. Flowers of LeSeuer county as their candidate for speaker and were very busy lining up for him all members not pledged to county option.

From the start they made the extravagant claim of seventy-three votes, (seven more than enough to elect) and tried to produce a stampede for the band wagon.

Ed. Claggett, distributing agent of the Hamm Brewing Co. whose headquarters are at Austin, Minn., was called in and took a fine suite of rooms at the Ryan Hotel. Here he remained, during the entire contest, working his best for Flowers, helping to influence members and secure votes.

Agents of the N. W. Telephone Co. were also in evidence, as were also close friends of the Republican boss, Ed. Smith.

Referring to the speakership one prominent St. Paul wholesale liquor dealer said to the writer, "We propose to protect our interests. It will cost money, but we shall protect our interests."

The hasty activity of the liquor interests in behalf of Mr. Flowers forced the county option men to get together; and after some consultation it was apparent that most of them favored S. Y. Gordon of Brown's Valley for speaker.

Mr. Gordon had been Lieutenant Governor in 1911, and had so organized the senate committees that the brewers and other special interests were not well pleased with him.

Forty-two members pledged themselves to Mr. Gordon on the evening of Nov. 17 at a conference held at the Merchants Hotel. Others sent in their pledges until the number reached sixty-two who had authorized their names to be published. Three others had pledged themselves verbally, but did not want their names given out. One more would be enough to elect Gordon.

C. L. Sawyer, a strong temperance man and supporter of county option, had not yet given either a written or verbal pledge but had assured several friends, among them the present writer, that he should support Gordon finally, if he had to do so to defeat Flowers. He later on sent a written pledge to the Anti-Saloon League to be the sixty-sixth man to vote for Gordon.

A desperate attempt was made by the liquor interests to take men away from Gordon, and they openly avowed their determination to "protect our interests at any cost."

At one time by misrepresentation, they secured a pledge from Spencer J. Searls of Carleton, an original Gordon man, to support Flowers; but when Searls fully understood the situation he returned to Gordon, and stayed.

Later Hugh O. Thompson of Blue Earth county was deceived into declaring for Flowers, but he soon discovered the deceit and returned to Gordon.

A. M. Peterson of Itasca county and Oscar C. Stenvick of Clearwater were taken up into the high mountain and offered all in sight if they would desert Gordon and support Flowers.

Great pressure was brought to bear on C. E. Vasaly of the board of control, to secure the vote of his brother for Flowers, but Mr. Vasaly flatly refused to do anything to change his brother's vote.

Madigan of Wright, Tollefson of Dodge, Wold of Douglas, Marwin of Hennepin and several others were put under pressure. In fact every member about whose position there was the least doubt was offered good committee appointments in exchange for his support, and one member at least is ready to testify that he was offered money directly to desert Gordon and support Flowers.

When the House met Jan. 5 to elect a speaker the plot soon began to unravel.

After a number of members had seconded the nomination of Flowers and the psychological moment had arrived, J. H. Erickson of Big Stone county arose and in a carefully prepared speech seconded the nomination of Flowers.

Now Mr. Erickson had been one of the original Gordon men, and had pledged to Gordon on the evening of Nov. 17. Mr. Erickson was evidently much disturbed in mind, for his face was flushed, he trembled in every part of his body, he neither looked up nor to right or left, but sat in his seat during the rest of the day's session like one in a dream. I sat where I could watch him closely, and could read his thoughts and emotions like an open book.

He was made chairman of the committee on banks and banking.

The next act in this drama was during the first ballot, when C. L. Sawyer played the part assigned to him, and read a lengthy statement explaining his vote for Flowers. Sawyer has always been a strong temperance man and had pledged himself to support Gordon. I heard him say that he could never vote for Flowers and the brewery crowd.

The third man needed to elect Flowers was Thompson of Mahnomen county who on the second ballot deserted Gordon and gave Mr. Flowers the sixty-five votes necessary to elect.

Each of these three men was needed and each played his part effectively.

The socialist members had been instructed by their party organization to vote for no one but a socialist; so they obeyed orders and voted for Woodfill on the first ballot, but left the house before the second ballot was taken.

How these instructions were secured would make an interesting chapter if the details could be learned.

I don't think Mr. Woodfill should be blamed very much. He merely obeyed the order of his party, and yet there should

have been no party orders. Both Devold and Woodfill were elected as non-partisans, not as Socialists.

Those who voted for Mr. Flowers were:

Baker	Haislet	Novak
Baldwin	Harrison, J. M.	Papke
Barten	Harrison, H. H.	Pendergast
Bessette	Hinds	Pless
Borgen	Hynes	Ribenack
Bouck	Indrehus	Rodenberg
Boyd	Kuntz	Sawyer
Brown	Larimore	Seebach
Burrows	Lennon	Schrooten
Carmichael	Leonard	Sliter
Condon	Lydiard	Smith
Davis	McGrath	Spooner
Dunleavy	McLaughlin	Steen
Dwyer	Malmberg	Stoetzel
Erickson	Miner	Sundheimer
Ferrier	Minnette	Swenson
Flowers	Moeller	Syverson
Gerlick	Mueller	Thompson, A. L.
Gilman	Nelson	Thornton
Girling	Neitzel	Welch
Greene	Nimocks	Wilkins
Hafften	North	

Those who voted for Mr. Gordon were:

Adams	Hompe	Pikop
Anderson	Hulbert	Pratt
Bendixen	Johnson, M.	Putnam
Bernard	Johnson, J. T.	Sanborn
Bjorge	Kneeland	Searls
Bjorklund	Knutson	Scott
Bjornson	Konzen	Sorfiaten
Boehmke	Larson	Southwick
Christianson	Lattin	Stenvick
Corning	Lee	Stevens
Dare	Madigan	Swanson
Dealand	Marschalk	Teigen, A. F.
Flinn	Marwin	Teigen, L. O.
Frye	Morken	Thompson, H. O.
Gill	Murphy	Tollefson
Gordon	Nordgren	Vasaly
Grant	Norton	Warner
Guilford	Olien	Wefald
Hauser	Parker	Weld
Hogenson	Peterson, A.	Wilson
Holmes	Peterson, A. M.	Wold

In the contest for speaker Mr. Spooner played a peculiar part.

He has always posed as a temperance man, and has always voted for county option; but he and Gordon have not been friends for many years, and he refused to support his old time enemy.

Neither would Mr. Spooner declare for Flowers. It was generally believed that he would not object to having the

speakership fall into his own lap if neither Flowers nor Gordon could secure it.

Nearly at the last moment he declared for Flowers, and it is believed that he took Sawyer with him. It is said on pretty good authority that Spooner holds a second mortgage on Sawyer's Montana fruit farm. I do not know how true this is; but, whatever the reason, Mr. Spooner seems to wield a most powerful influence over Mr. Sawyer, an influence which showed itself all through the session.

Mr. Spooner was made chairman of the two most important committees—Appropriations and Efficiency and Economy.

When Mr. Flowers had been elected speaker many believed that the cause of county option was dead, but they proved to be poor prophets.

The liquor interests had used up all their ammunition on the speakership contest.

The people back home were soon heard from in tones most emphatic.

This threw a wholesome fear into the leaders of the liquor interests. They began to suspect that detectives were on the watch; and concluded that it would not be safe to attempt anything very crooked.

Many of them even believed that Gov. Hammond would veto a county option bill; but here again they were wrong. And thus again was the old truth exemplified that "out of evil good may come."

CHAPTER II.

THE COMMITTEES AND THE FLOWERS ORGANIZATION.

Mr. Flowers, all through the long contest for the speakership, promised to be fair to all in the appointment of committees.

In his address to the members, after being elected speaker, he reiterated that promise.

How well he kept his pledge may be seen from the way he distributed chairmanships and made up his committees.

The committee on rules was very properly composed entirely of men who had supported him for speaker.

In general they reported the reformed rules of 1913, but with three very important exceptions as follows:

I. First, no provision was made for putting the members of any committee on record. This left the door open for killing bills in committee with no possibility of knowing who did it.

II. The committee of the whole House was empowered to kill bills with no chance to put the members on record.

III. All credentials of newspaper representatives must be submitted to the rules committee. This gave the rules committee power to exclude any newspaper man they pleased. It was plainly intended "to get" the present writer, who was not wanted there by Mr. Lydiard, the ruling power in the rules committee.

In fact Mr. Lydiard notified me about the second or third day of the session that I would not be permitted to come on the floor of the House at all.

"But, Mr. Lydiard," said I, "I am the duly authorized representative of the St. Paul Daily News."

"Never mind, that won't go. This is not the Rines administration, and you can't be here."

"I don't know how much power you are going to have here, Mr. Lydiard, but if you want to try such a stunt as that, I think I shall rather enjoy it. We can certainly have some fun."

No further attempt, of any serious nature, was made to exclude the "News representative" from full and free access to all sessions of the House and the committee meetings.

About a dozen of the Gordon men got together and drew up amendments to the rules, covering these three points and providing further that all persons who should appear to advocate or oppose any bill at a public hearing must give name and address, and state whom they represented.

These amendments were offered to the rules committee with the suggestion that the said amendments were vital and must be incorporated in the rules.

The rules committee gracefully took their medicine. Evidently they did not care to risk a contest.

It can hardly be claimed by the rules committee that these matters were mere oversights on their part. For publicity is of the most vital importance, and their proposed rules carefully provided for no publicity at all.

As amended by the Gordon men, the rules are now the best ever adopted by a Minnesota legislature.

They now provide for the fullest possible publicity of all that goes on, not only on the floor of the House but also in committees, where most of the crooked work has heretofore been done.

The Committees.

It is probably only human that Mr. Flowers should reward his own supporters with chairmanships and places on responsible committees, but it hardly looks fair to load up the temperance committee, for example, with nine of the most bitter opponents of all temperance legislation, headed by James Dwyer of Minneapolis.

James Dwyer was a member of the 1913 House, and lined up consistently with the "wets" in every contest. On county option he voted "No." He also voted "No" on the O'Neill "road house" bill, which passed the House and Senate, but was defeated in conference. Its purpose is to deny saloon licenses except in incorporated cities and villages where there is police protection.

The real fight on the Wallace-Fosseen abatement act was in the House when a series of amendments was offered. It was late in the session, and passage of any amendment would have thrown the bill back into the Senate, where it would have died. On five of the amendments the roll was called, and Mr. Dwyer voted "Aye" on all of them. On final passage of the bill there were only eleven negative votes, and Mr. Dwyer was one of eighty-eight voting for it.

Best Committees Gobbled.

In twenty-two important committees the Flowers men had 245 places, with eighteen of the chairmanships, and the Gordon men, 131 places. This does not count the judiciary committee, which by custom includes all the lawyers of the House, and contained fifteen Flowers men to twenty-one Gordon men.

Several of the ablest men in the House, who had supported Gordon for speaker, were given very little committee work. This was plainly intended to put them where they could wield no influence. But it did not work out that way; for these men had more leisure to "hunt woodchucks" and a better chance to kill them.

After the county option bill had passed, the Flowers organization rapidly fell to pieces. There was nothing left to hold it together.

This situation was forcibly illustrated by the following incident:

Wholly by accident I overheard Mr. Spooner say to Job Lloyd, the speaker's private secretary: "By God, we have got to find out who is running this House. We must know whether we have got any organization or not."

These are possibly not the exact words, but they convey the idea.

Later, shortly before the Gordon committee bills were to come up, Mr. Spooner was standing by the reporter's table talking to Mr. Nagle, when he spoke about as follows, referring to the Gordon bills: "They can't do anything with them. We have got seventy votes pledged to kill them."

When these bills came up a few days later, six of them passed. The budget bill had only one vote against it, Mr. Haislet from Governor Hammond's home county. The others passed by very large majorities, excepting the bill to put the fire marshal's department under the insurance commissioner. Even this bill was passed sixty-seven to forty-seven, leaving sixteen members not voting.

Mr. Spooner, even, voted for the budget bill. He voted against the bill to abolish the game and fish commission, and give the Governor power to appoint the commissioner. On all the other Gordon bills, which came up in the afternoon, Mr. Spooner did not vote. He answered to roll call at 2:30 P. M. and was present all the afternoon, but apparently did not care to go on record.

For weeks Spooner had been hard at work for his big "efficiency and economy" bill, as it was called, and was plainly doing what he could to kill off the Gordon bills to reform in some simple and effective way, the most glaring evils of the state administration.

But it did not work out according to Spooner's forecast.

His bill gradually lost standing and never came to a vote. The more it was discussed the fewer friends it had. The organization was powerless to save it, even with the Governor's help.

Legislative Expenses.

So far as supplies were concerned, the Legislature of 1915 cost the people less than previous sessions of recent

times. Mr. Haislet, chairman of the committee on legislative expenses, and Chief Clerk Oscar Arneson both took great care in purchasing supplies to get the lowest possible prices and to purchase only the necessary amounts.

But there was not the same economy in the matter of clerks, stenographers, doorkeepers, etc. Far from it. Every man who voted for Flowers for speaker exacted some of the patronage and got it, with the result that there were pages, doorkeepers, clerks, etc., with nothing to do but stand around in the way, or wander about the Capitol killing time. They had little to do but draw their pay. There were nine clerks at \$10 per day, where three have usually been enough.

The Speaker.

Speaker Flowers tried to be fair, tho some of his rulings will hardly stand criticism. No one could charge him with gross partiality or trickery; and yet he has not been what could truthfully be called a good presiding officer.

He lacked experience, his knowledge of parliamentary procedure was very limited, his voice is not strong enough, and he did not keep as good order as should have prevailed.

On the other hand he is a man of exceptionally good personal habits, kind, considerate, clean and generous—never touches either tobacco or liquor—and you will know him a long time without hearing an oath or vulgar expression.

When the liquor interests organized the House, the "powers that prey" held a jubilee and prepared for a feast; but they have had to be content with very poor pickings—indeed they have gone away very hungry, and they are likely to wander in the desert for some time to come.

This is largely due to the "non-partisan" Legislature.

CHAPTER III.

TYING UP MEMBERS.

Don't handle pitch. It is pretty sure to spoil your good clothes.

The child that plays with fire is apt to burn his fingers.

The member who makes a deal and gets patronage, has put his foot into a trap that will be hard to get out of.

The representatives of the special interests know this very well and lay their plans accordingly.

With the bait of patronage and committee appointments, the members are led along. Little by little they become entangled. The insidious influence of obligation is wound about them. They do not realize it until it is too late. Then they find themselves firmly bound and escape impossible.

George H. Sullivan is a bold, open, avowed opponent of what is known as "progressive legislation." Most of his work is above board, and he has the reputation of being a fair fighter.

But George is long-headed and wise. If by means of patronage he can tie up a large number of members, several of them at least will be pretty sure to stay tied. Unconsciously they will have leanings, and their votes will be secured for measures that they would not otherwise support.

The Patronage Bait.

There are sixty-seven members of the Senate. There are not enough jobs to give each senator one place to fill.

Senators Lende and Sageng proposed that lots be drawn and one half the senators be allowed to name employees for the session of 1915, and that the other half be given the patronage of 1917. This they contended would be ample help to do the work of the session.

Sullivan and Putnam wanted more jobs to fill and offered patronage to all who had been in either house before. Some of the old members refused and then new members were taken in.

After the Senate had elected, according to custom, a chief clerk, a first assistant, an engrossing clerk, an enrolling clerk and a sergeant-at-arms, Mr. Putnam offered a complete list of all Senate employees, and moved the adoption of his resolution.

Mr. Sageng raised the point of order that the resolution was contrary to the laws of the state, and therefore could not be adopted, as the Senate had not yet adopted any rules providing for the appointment of employees.

Lieutenant Governor Burnquist ruled with Sageng, and Putnam appealed from the ruling.

However, this was a little too raw to try to put over, so the combine moved to take a recess till 4 P. M.

In the meantime they prepared two permanent rules which would allow them to put through their patronage program.

The two permanent rules and the patronage resolution were combined, and offered as a new resolution after they had backed down from their appeal from the ruling of Burnquist.

Senator Alley offered a substitute resolution providing for a much smaller force of helpers, but not naming them.

Alley's resolution was defeated and the program of the combine was put over by the following vote, forty-seven to twenty.

Those who voted for fewer employees and economy were:

Alley	Hanson	Peterson, Clay
Bonniwell	Hegnes	Peterson, Meeker
Campbell, Henn.	Holmberg	Potter
Gandrud	Jones	Rustad
Gillam	Lende	Sageng
Gjerset	Lobeck	Vermilya
Griggs	O'Neill	

Those who stood for patronage were:

Adams	Collister	Handlan
Andrews	Denegre	Healy
Baldwin	Dunn, Mille Lcs.	Hilbert
Benson	Dunn, Ramsey	Jackson
Blomgren	Duxbury	Johnston
Buckler	Dwinnell	Knopp
Callahan	Gardner	McGarry
Campbell, Mower	Glotzbach	Millett
Carley	Grose	Nelson

Nord	Rockne	Van Hoven
Orr	Rystrom	Vibert
Palmer	Steffen	Wallace
Pauly	Sullivan, Stearns	Ward
Peterson, St. L.	Sullivan, Wash.	Weis
Putnam	Swenson	Westlake
Ries	Turnham	

Some of the members had got jobs for their friends, and the process of tying them up had begun.

The Next Move—President Pro Tem.

Who shall be the temporary president of the Senate may not be a matter of much concern; and yet it may.

If the Lieutenant Governor is always there to preside, the honor of being president pro tem. is an empty one or nearly so except the prestige it gives; but if the Lieutenant Governor should be sick or die, the place of president pro tem. would carry with it much power.

The interests are always alert. Having tied up a large number of members with the rope of patronage, the next move was to make George H. Sullivan president pro tem. of the Senate. And it worked.

True, not all of those who had secured plums of patronage stayed put. The following revolted and refused to go any further:

Andrews	Jackson	Rockne
Benson	Nelson	Rystrom
Blomgren	Orr	Turnham
Dwinnell	Palmer	

However, Griggs and Hegnes, who had not been in the patronage deal, now joined the successful forces and helped elect Sullivan president pro tem.

The opponents of Sullivan put forward Benson of Nicollet county, who had been a consistent supporter of progressive measures, but were unable to control enough votes to elect him.

The vote stood as follows:

For Sullivan—

Adams	Glotzbach	Peterson, G. M.
Baldwin	Griggs	Putnam
Buckler	Grose	Ries
Callahan	Handlan	Steffen
Campbell, A. S.	Hegnes	Sullivan, J. D.
Carley	Hilbert	Swenson
Collester	Johnston	Van Hoven
Denegre	Knopp	Vibert
Dunn, R. C.	McGarry	Wallace
Dunn, W. W.	Millett	Ward
Duxbury	Nord	Weis
Gardner	Pauly	Westlake

Senator Healy should be credited as being for Sullivan, though he was absent and could not be located.

For Benson—

Alley	Campbell, W. A.	Gjerst
Andrews	Dwinnell	Hanson
Blomgren	Gandrud	Holmberg
Bonniwell	Gillam	Jackson

Jones	Palmer	Rystrom
Lende	Peterson, E. P.	Sageng
Lobeck	Peterson, F. H.	Turnham
Nelson	Potter	Vermilya
O'Neill	Rockne	
Orr	Rustad	

If Griggs and Hegnes had stood out, and Vibert, Wallace and Ward who are also supposed to be progressives, had voted the other way, the results would have been thirty-three to thirty-one for Benson.

Several senators who voted for Sullivan denied that it meant anything, and insisted that they were still free and independent. Maybe so, but we shall see later.

It is probable that Mr. Putnam and several others who were in this patronage deal would disclaim any intention to tie up members in order to use them; and we may freely admit that their motives and intentions might have been of the best; but the results are the same, whatever the intentions, and new members especially are sure to be influenced in such ways as this.

A careful scrutiny of the votes on measures all through the session will show that this patronage deal at the start did tie men up more or less effectively and influence their votes.

After the session was over one senator remarked to a friend, "Thank God, I'm a free man once more; I'll never get tied up again."

In the House.

In the House it was the same. Some of the men who had gone into the Flowers organization and received patronage were plainly held in more or less bondage all the session.

Next to the evil of patronage and prestige, comes the evil of local and special legislation. Many members come with only one object in view—some special law they want passed, some local improvement they want to get at the expense of the whole state; or some state institution that they want for their district. The demand for a new normal school at Bemidji kept the members from that and surrounding districts tied up all the session. Perhaps the school is needed, perhaps not, but it was good trading stock all the session, and was used for all it was worth. They did not get much—\$25,000 for a foundation—but once started it will go on.

But thru it all there was one kind of bondage that was absent. The legislature was non-partisan. The party lash could not be cracked, nor party superstition appealed to.

CHAPTER IV.

SELF GOVERNMENT.

It is more important that people should have the *right* to govern themselves than that they should govern themselves *right*.

Whence comes it—this thing we call the right to vote? this right to have a voice in our common affairs? this right to take part in making the laws by which we are to be governed?

Is it a *right* at all, or is it a mere *privilege* that may be

granted or withheld? If it is a *privilege*, who may grant it—who withhold?

Are some of us so endowed by nature that we may arrogate to ourselves all rights and powers over our fellow men and women? that we may dole out to them such *grants of privilege* as we may graciously see fit to bestow? that we may deny and withhold anything or all things as best may please ourselves?

Are some of us created kings and czars and overlords, and the rest of us servants and subjects, serfs and slaves who may have no voice nor vote, but, meek and humble, must cringe and cower and obey?

Is the Declaration of Independence wrong when it declares that "all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among these are the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?"

Is that Declaration wrong when it asserts that governments are set up among men for the sole purpose of guarding and protecting these rights, and that they derive all their *just* power from the consent of the governed?

I believe in the Declaration of Independence. I believe that it sets forth an eternal truth. All men *are* "created equal," so far as their right to be in this world is concerned, and to use its surface on which to live and from which to draw the materials for their food, clothing and shelter and all the other good things which their labor applied to the earth's resources is capable of producing.

It is true that all men are not equally strong nor equally intelligent; but they all have the same right to be in this world and to work for their living.

These differences in strength and intelligence are Nature's method for the improvement of the race. The strongest and ablest will get the most, of course; but if all have the same chance, each will get what his labor produces, and none will have cause to complain.

Why Government at All?

Here then is the reason for government—to secure to all an *equal chance—a square deal*. When governments fail to do this, they fail in their first and most important duty, and it is only too true that they *have* failed in the past and *do now* fail.

For this reason we should mend our government, not end it.

This is the reason why we should restore to the people the rights that have been denied them,—why we should amend and repeal bad statutes and bring them into harmony with the laws of Nature. She brings us all into the world naked and empty-handed, but she has furnished us here a most wonderful storehouse, full of all the things we need in the pursuit of *life, liberty and happiness*.

It is the duty of government not to lock the doors of this storehouse to any, but to see that they are open to all on equal terms.

Early Society Always Democratic.

Among all races, and in every part of the world, primitive societies have always been *democratic*. All the people have come together to talk over their common affairs and to decide what shall be done. And in these primitive gatherings the women as well as the men had their say and their vote.

Herbert Spencer, in his descriptive sociology, cites hundreds of cases of this kind and other investigators confirm his conclusions.

It is not until militarism supplants the primitive industrial society, that classes arise, that privileges are granted, that some are set above others, and women denied their place in the public council and their vote in the final decision.

It is the greatest problem of modern democracy to wipe out these classes, to destroy privilege, and to restore to all—men and women alike—their equal and inalienable right to be in this world, to use its material substance to get a living, and to take part in the common affairs of their local communities, the state and the nation.

The Scope of Government Limited.

To take part in the *common affairs*—this is the scope of government.

Most of our affairs are not common. Most of the relations of men and women are personal and private and in these fields government must not meddle.

Wherever it has so meddled it has made a mess of it.

The human race is not yet as wise as it will be, and hence our constitution and laws are imperfect. They must be changed, if our civilization is to grow and expand.

The Bill of Rights.

All written constitutions contain a *bill of rights*—an enumeration of certain things that are the sacred rights of the people with which governments must not meddle.

This is good so far as it goes; but until recently no constitution contained any provision by which the people could act directly. They all provided for what is called

Representative Government.

Now representative government is not democracy. It is not self government, any more than monarchies and despotisms are self government.

This is the reason why there is everywhere a demand for a restoration to the people of their ancient and natural right to govern themselves directly.

Not that any one desires to destroy representative government and supplant it with a system where the people shall do all things directly; but that the people shall reserve to themselves the right to act directly if their representatives refuse or neglect to obey their wish.

Initiative, Referendum, Recall.

With the *initiative* the people themselves can start things. They can propose and enact laws, or amend or repeal existing laws, if the legislature fail or neglect to do so.

By means of the *referendum* the people can veto bad laws that their representatives may have passed.

We now invest the Governor with the power of the veto. The *referendum* would add to this a veto by the people. Perhaps then the Governor's veto would not be needed.

By means of the *recall* the people can put out of office and retire to private life any public servant who goes wrong.

These three simple measure give back to the people those inherent rights that all arbitrary and even representative governments have denied them. As President Wilson so aptly put it, "They are the gun behind the door." They will not need to be used very much. The simple fact that they are there will usually be enough. But it is well to have them there.

The legislature of 1913 submitted to the people constitutional amendments providing for the initiative and referendum and for the recall.

Both these amendments received enormous majorities,—the initiative and referendum over four to one, and the recall nearly four to one,—but they both failed because it is so very difficult to amend our state constitution.

Why it is so hard is fully set forth in the section on amending our constitution.

The bill to submit to the people again the initiative and referendum amendment came up in the House on March 3rd and was very hotly opposed by a few reactionaries.

Larimore and Carmichael eloquently defended our *sacred representative system*, and declared the initiative and referendum a failure.

Mr. Steen rather took the wind out of them by demanding to know if they had been a failure in Switzerland.

Mr. Larimore replied that the legislature is good enough, and Mr. Gilman expressed great fear of the people; but they had few supporters when it came to the roll call.

The bill was passed 106 to twelve, as follows:

Adams	Ferrier	Lee
Anderson	Flinn	Lennon
Baker	Frye	Leonard
Baldwin	Gill	McGrath
Barten	Gordon	McLaughlin
Bendixen	Grant	Madigan
Bernard	Gullford	Marschalk
Bessette	Hafften	Marwin
Bjorge	Haislet	Miner
Bjorklund	Hauser	Minnette
Bjornson	Hinds, E. R.	Morken
Boehmke	Hynes, J. H.	Mueller
Borgen	Hogenson	Murphy
Burrows	Holmes	Nelson
Christianson	Hompe	Nietzel
Corning	Hulbert	Nimocks
Dare	Indrehus	Nordgren
Davis	Johnson, J. T.	Norton
Dealand	Johnson, M.	Novak
Devold	Kneeland	Olien
Dunleavy	Kuntz	Parker
Dwyer	Larson	Pendergast
Erickson	Lattin	Peterson, A.

Peterson, A. M.	Spooner	Tollefson
Pikop	Steen	Vasaly
Pless	Stenvick	Warner
Putnam	Stevens	Wefald
Ribenack	Stoetzel	Welch
Sanborn	Sudheimer	Weld
Sawyer	Swanson	Wilkins
Searls	Swenson	Wilson
Seebach	Syverson	Wold
Scott	Teigen, L. O.	Woodfill
Sliter	Thompson, A. L.	Mr. Speaker
Smith	Thompson, H. O.	
Sorflaten	Thornton	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bouck	Gilman	Lydiard
Carmichael	Girling	Papke
Condon	Harrison, J. M.	Rodenberg.
Gerlich	Larimore	Schrooten

The following twelve members did not vote: Boyd, Brown, Green, H. H. Harrison, Knutson, Konzen, Malmberg, Moeller, North, Pratt, Southwick and A. F. Teigen. Mr. Knutson did not have much faith in the bill but would have voted "Yes" if necessary to pass it.

All of the others would have voted for the bill if they had been present.

Mr. Boyd had been sick for sometime. Konzen, North and Teigen were away on an important legislative investigation, and some of the others had been excused.

In the Senate.

As it came from the House and with some amendments by the Senate, the bill was liberal and fair, not radical by any means. It provided a method by which the constitution could be amended somewhat more easily than at present; but only a little more easily. It still required an affirmative vote of three-sevenths of all those voting at the election to carry an amendment to the constitution; and it also required that four-sevenths of all those voting on the question should be in the affirmative.

The first attack was made by George H. Sullivan in an amendment requiring a majority of all voting at the election to vote for the amendment in order to pass it.

This is the present system under which we have found it so nearly impossible to change our fundamental law.

Sullivan and Duxbury spoke long and earnestly defending our "*sacred representative system*" and the "wisdom of our ancestors" who created the "perfect document," our "wonderful constitution."

They carefully refrained from explaining that this particular feature of our constitution which they were defending was slyly slipped in by the liquor interests in 1898, when the people were not looking.

Senator Sageng showed up this feature of the constitution as a system that takes all the ignorance and stupidity of the state—all the voters who are too careless or too stupid to vote at all—and carefully counts them just as if they had intelligently voted "no" on the proposition.

"Does this tend to intelligent citizenship? Let us make it a little easier to amend this document."

When the votes were counted Sullivan had succeeded thirty-five to thirty-two, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Griggs	Ries
Baldwin	Grose	Steffen
Blomgren	Handlan	Sullivan, G. H.
Buckler	Healy	Sullivan, J. D.
Callahan	Hilbert	Swenson
Campbell, A. S.	Johnston	Van Hoven
Denegre	Knopp	Vibert
Dunn, R. C.	McGarry	Wallace
Dunn, W. W.	Nelson	Ward
Duxbury	Nord	Weis
Gjerset	Pauly	Westlake
Glotzbach	Peterson, G. M.	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Alley	Hanson	Peterson, E. P.
Andrews	Hegnes	Peterson, F. H.
Benson	Holmberg	Potter
Bonniwell	Jackson	Putnam
Campbell, W. A.	Jones	Rockne
Carley	Lende	Rustad
Collester	Lobeck	Rystrom
Dwinnell	Millett	Sageng
Gandrud	O'Neill	Turnham
Gardner	Orr	Vermilya
Gillam	Palmer	

Duxbury next attacked the provision which placed this amendment first upon the ballot. It had been first in 1914, for the reason that it was regarded as the most important. And if this could be passed it would make it easier to pass other much needed amendments.

Duxbury, Sullivan and other howled against favoritism and secured five votes that had refused to go with them on the first amendment—Andrews, Collester, Gardner, Hegnes and Millett. Griggs refused to go this time and voted with those who thought this amendment worthy of first place.

The line of cleavage was nearly the same as on county option.

Only five "*wets*" voted for the liberal bill: Bonniwell, Carley, Collester, Gardner and Millett.

Eight of the dry men went with Sullivan: Bob Dunn, Duxbury, Gjerset, Griggs, Nelson, Vibert, Wallace and Ward.

Only eight voted against the bill on final passage: Bob Dunn, W. W. Dunn, Duxbury, Healy, Knopp, Ries, Steffen and Van Hoven.

At first Handlan voted no, but changed to yes before the vote was announced.

These eight may be set down as utterly opposed to the initiative and referendum—opposed to any return to democratic government and the rule of the people.

Duxbury admitted that he had voted for county option against his personal convictions, but because his constituents required it of him.

Sageng showed that Duxbury's district had cast more votes in favor of the initiative and referendum than for Duxbury himself, but this did not phase the doughty champion of things as they are.

In the long drawn-out contest only four men attacked the bill: George H. Sullivan, R. C. Dunn, W. W. Dunn and Duxbury.

On the side of the people and greater liberality of amendment were Sageng, William A. Campbell, Gillam, Alley, F. H. Peterson, Rockne, Putnam and Dwinnell, all of whom spoke favorably for the bill.

The House refused to concur in the Senate amendments, and the conference finally agreed on a bill almost exactly like the one voted on in 1914.

This bill gives the people at least three considerable gains over the present system.

First, it is considerably easier to amend the constitution.

Second, it gives us a practical working initiative, fair and reasonably easy to operate.

Third, it establishes the referendum with easy working machinery.

Let every one help and this will be adopted in 1916.

Equal Suffrage.

If the initiative, referendum and recall are an essential part of self government, then surely equal suffrage for women is more so.

If "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the *governed*," what shall we say of a system that denies to one-half the *governed* all opportunity to vote?

In the Senate on March 4th the matter came up in the form of an amendment to the constitution. The men of the state were to be permitted to vote on the question.

As Senator F. H. Peterson of Moorhead put it, "What is before us? We are the court. The voters are the jury. We have no right to hold this case away from the jury."

Senator Putnam: "It is with you. It will not down. Send it to the men. Let them decide."

Senator Jones: "The federation of labor, 38,000 strong, demand it. You can't afford to ignore them."

Senator Dwinnell: "I have seen it work. It works well. It has brought good results where it has been tried. Submit the question to the men. Let them settle it. It is not our right to decide, but the right of the voters."

Pauly, George H. Sullivan and Duxbury did most of the speaking in opposition.

None of them said anything on the real question at issue—to let the male voters of the state decide—but all went into long arguments against votes for women.

Mr. Pauly had a carefully prepared speech which he read with considerable force and eloquence. It contained all the usual objections to equal suffrage, but not a word to show why the men of the state should be denied the right to vote on the question.

George H. Sullivan gave utterance to some gems. "The women now begin the political education of the men." "They

train the boys." Does that therefore unfit the women from taking any part in public affairs *themselves*?

"The social unit is the family, and this should be the voting unit." What is the logic of this? Wouldn't it require the father to do all the voting? Where would the grown up boys come in? Suppose there were no men in the family, who then would do its voting?

"If the women want anything or need anything let them come to us." And pray, who are "us"; and who has given "us" all political rights, even to deny to the men of the state a vote on this vital question.

"Women now have the right to elect their husbands." But perhaps they have other needs, George; and then how about the women who have no husbands?

"If women vote they will undermine the family and destroy the social unit." Oh, yes, George, we all know how completely they have undermined the family and destroyed the social unit wherever they have had a chance to vote.

The bill finally came to a vote with the following result: Thirty-three to thirty-four.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Alley	Gillam	Peterson, E. P.
Andrews	Gjerset	Peterson, F. H.
Benson	Griggs	Potter
Blomgren	Hanson	Putnam
Campbell, W. A.	Holmberg	Rustad
Carley	Jones	Rystrom
Denegre	Lende	Sageng
Dunn, R. C.	Lobeck	Turnham
Dwinnell	O'Neill	Vermilya
Gandrud	Orr	Vibert
Gardner	Palmer	Wallace

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Healy	Ries
Baldwin	Hegnes	Rockne
Bonniwell	Hilbert	Steffen
Buckler	Jackson	Sullivan, G. H.
Callahan	Johnston	Sullivan, J. D.
Campbell, A. S.	Knopp	Swenson
Collester	McGarry	Van Hoven
Dunn, W. W.	Millett	Ward
Duxbury	Nelson	Weis
Glotzbach	Nord	Westlake
Grose	Pauly	
Handlan	Peterson, G. M.	

For some time the vote stood a tie, thirty-three to thirty-three. Then Senator A. S. Campbell of Austin was found and voted no. To Mr. Campbell belongs the distinction of having saved the male voters of the state the labor of taking thought and voting upon this important question.

The women had good reason to expect the vote of Adams, Grose and Ward. Indeed they claimed that these men had all pledged their support.

In the House.

Having lost their case in the Senate the advocates of equal suffrage for women concluded to bring the matter up in the House in a different form.

A bill was introduced to secure to women the right to vote at presidential primaries and for the nomination and election of presidential electors.

A majority of the elections committee reported the bill out for indefinite postponement, which is the usual way to kill a bill.

A minority report to place the bill on general orders was signed by T. T. Morken, Carl A. Wold, Charles L. Sawyer and J. H. Boyd.

The vote was taken upon the minority report to give the bill a chance and stood sixty-five to forty-four in favor.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Harrison, J. M.	Sanborn
Anderson	Hauser	Sawyer
Baldwin	Hynes, J. H.	Searls
Bendixen	Holmes	Seebach
Bernard	Hompe	Scott
Bjorge	Hulbert	Sorflaten
Bjorklund	Johnson, M.	Southwick
Bjornson	Larimore	Stenvick
Boyd	Larson	Stevens
Christianson	Lattin	Swanson
Corning	Lee	Teigen, A. F.
Dare	Madigan	Teigen, L. O.
Davis	Marwin	Thompson, A. L.
Dealand	Morken	Thompson, H. O.
Flinn	Murphy	Tollefson
Frye	Nordgren	Vasaly
Gill	Norton	Warner
Gordon	Olien	Wefald
Grant	Parker	Weld
Greene	Peterson, A.	Wilson
Guilford	Pratt,	Wold
Harrison, H. H.	Putnam	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baker	Hogenson	North
Barten	Indrehus	Papke
Bessette	Johnson, J. T.	Peterson, A. M.
Boehmke	Konzen	Rodenberg
Bouck	Kuntz	Schrooten
Carmichael	Lennon	Smith
Condon	Leonard	Spooner
Dunleavy	McGrath	Steen
Dwyer	McLaughlin	Stoetzel
Erickson	Malmberg	Sudheimer
Gerlich	Minnette	Swenson
Gilman	Moeller	Syverson
Girling	Nelson	Thornton
Hafften	Nietzel	Welch
Haislet	Nimocks	

This left twenty-one members not voting: Borgen, Brown, Burrows, Devold, Ferrier, E. R. Hinds, Kneeland, Knutson, Lydiard, Marschalk, Miner, Mueller, Novak, Pendergast, Pikop, Pless, Ribenack, Sliter, Wilkins, Woodfill and Speaker Flowers.

Of these Burrows, Devold, Kneeland, Marschalk, Pikop,

Pendergast and Woodfill are known to be for equal suffrage.

This would have passed the House with a good majority if it could ever have secured the necessary eighty-seven votes to bring it to final passage.

It was near the close of the session and the bill failed along with several hundred others.

Amending the Constitution.

Should the fundamental law of the state put a premium on ignorance and carelessness? Is it fair that men who are too ignorant of the merits of a question to vote on it at all should have their votes counted either way? Is it right that the voter who is so careless or indifferent that he neglects his opportunity to vote should be counted as voting no?

There would seem to be but one answer to these questions. It would seem that constitutions should be made and amended by the votes of those who have enough interest in such matters to cast a ballot, and not by those who fail to do so. By what process of logic do we persist in counting the votes of those who voluntarily disfranchise themselves? Why should we presume that everyone who does not vote at all intends to vote "no?"

All this seems very stupid and ridiculous, and yet it is a fact that we have just those conditions in Minnesota. Our constitution cannot be amended in the slightest detail unless more than half of all those who go to the polls and vote at all shall cast a vote in favor of the amendment proposed.

Every voter who is so ignorant of the proposed amendment that he does not vote—every one who is so careless that he neglects to vote—every one who is so stupid that he knows nothing about the proposed amendments—all these are carefully counted as voting "no." The result is that it is almost impossible to amend our constitution, and so we must submit to be governed by the dead hand of the past.

How It Works in Practice.

At the election of 1914, eleven amendments were proposed—some of them, at least, of most vital importance to the people. The first amendment, and perhaps the most vital of all, was the one establishing the initiative and referendum. By the initiative the people themselves may enact statutes or amend the constitution, when the legislature fails to act. By the referendum they can veto bad laws which the legislature may enact.

This system has been in successful operation for many years in Switzerland, in Australia and New Zealand. Recently it has been adopted in about one-third of the states in the union. All Minnesota cities may have it for local purposes by adopting a home rule charter.

The initiative and referendum amendment received 168,004 votes, and only 41,577 votes against it. Yet the people are denied this change in their constitution, because of a stupid, vicious and unjust provision that counts every ignorant and careless voter, who failed to vote at all, as if he had intelligently voted against it.

Amendment No. Three.

This amendment was intended to enable the state to construct roads, ditches, and firebreaks, in through and around unsold school and swamp lands. Under the present constitution this cannot be done.

The framers of the constitution could not foresee the needs of coming generations, and so we are now helpless even to adopt so sensible a provision as this to enable us to conserve our public lands and protect our standing timber and the neighboring settlers from the ravages of fire.

This amendment received 162,951 votes. The opposing vote was 47,906. Nearly four to one favored it, yet we can't have it.

The Recall.

The recall amendment enabling the people to recall objectionable public servants received 139,801 votes. 44,961 voted "no."

Of the eleven amendments ten of them received overwhelming majorities, some not quite two to one, and some more than four to one. Yet only one of the eleven got votes enough to carry. And all this because our constitution contains such a stupid and unjust provision as to require a majority of all those present and voting at the election to vote "yes" in order that we may change our fundamental law.

Why?

It has not always been so. As originally adopted our constitution could be changed by a majority of those voting on the proposed amendment. From the time Minnesota was organized as a state until 1898 this system prevailed. Many needed changes were made in our constitution always by a majority of those who were intelligent enough to vote on the questions at issue.

How the Change Was Made.

It was during the legislative session of 1897 that the change was made. W. W. Dunn was at that time attorney for the Hamm Brewing Company of St. Paul, and was their representative in the legislature, having been elected on the Republican ticket by the voters of that part of the city near the plant of the brewing company.

Mr. Dunn brought in a bill proposing to so amend the constitution that thereafter it should require a majority of all those present and voting at the election to favor an amendment before it could become a part of the fundamental law.

On the floor of the house S. A. Stockwell, a member from Minneapolis, put the question squarely up to Mr. Dunn, as follows:

"Do the forces that are behind this amendment intend to put up the bars so high that no further amendment of the constitution will be possible on any subject, in order to head off the possibility of the passage of a prohibition amendment at some time in the distant future?"

Mr. Dunn answered, "The gentleman from Hennepin is correctly informed."

The proposed amendment passed both House and Senate,

and was submitted to the people at the election of 1898. The brewery interests were united and alert. The word was sent out to every saloon in the state to get all the votes possible, in a quiet way, in favor of the brewer's amendment.

The decent people of the state were caught napping, and the amendment was carried. If the people could have been informed they would probably have voted it down.

The following facts seem to warrant this conclusion:

In 1898 S. A. Stockwell ran for the Senate in the seventh eleventh and twelfth wards of Minneapolis. The district was strongly Republican and Stockwell was a Democrat. In every speech he called attention to this amendment and urged its defeat. The eleventh and twelfth wards had many saloons, the seventh none. In all three wards most of the voters were working men.

Stockwell was not only elected, but his district cast a good majority against the brewer's amendment. The people can be trusted to vote right if they understand.

CHAPTER V.

TAXATION.

Next to the right of self government, taxation is the most basic problem that has ever confronted the people of the world.

If taxes are just and fair the people will be prosperous, contented and happy.

Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," declares that "great estates ruined Rome"; and we know that an unjust distribution of the burden of taxation was the cause of those "great estates."

"Great estates" have been the ruin of every nation that has gone down to destruction in all the history of the world; and in every case unjust taxation has been the foundation on which these "great estates" have always been built.

Theories of Taxation.

There are two theories of taxation.

One says "tax everything"; the other says "tax nothing that labor of hand or brain has produced."

A man tries to get a home. He takes up a piece of land and begins to use it. Tax him.

He gets a team of horses and some tools. Tax him.

He grubs out the stumps, and puts in a crop. Tax him.

He builds a cabin to shelter himself and wife. Tax him.

He gets a cow to furnish milk for his family. Tax him.

He builds a fence to protect his crops, to keep his cattle and horses in and to keep other animals out. Tax him again.

He needs more room and builds a better house. Double his taxes and more.

He gets a new stove and table. Increase his taxes.

He cleans up his front yard, plants flowers and shrubs, and gives his house a new coat of paint. He is a bad citizen; tax him again.

By this time he has been pretty well robbed of his earnings, and has to borrow money to go on with. Tax him again by means of taxes on money and mortgages, notes and other credits, and then add a registration tax which some stupid people used to think the money lender would have to pay.

They are wiser now and know that the money lender never pays any taxes except such as he has first taken out of the borrower.

For every good and useful thing that this man has tried to do to get a home, to develop his farm and earn an honest living, tax him, fine him, penalize him as if he were a criminal; and then wonder why he can't get on in the world.

There are some men who are strong enough to stand all this and still make a living; but many more could do far better if they could be free from the crushing burden of unjust taxation.

And how the land grabbers and speculators enjoy this system! They always get in ahead of the home maker, in both country and city, get hold of as much land as possible, and put up the price every time the useful citizen does anything to improve the neighborhood.

Our system of taxation could not do it more effectively, if it had been deliberately and maliciously designed by the Devil himself, to prevent people from opening up farms, getting homes, producing food, clothing and the other necessities and comforts of life.

But this is not the worst of it. This system that penalizes industry while it encourages land grabbing and speculation, is the direct cause of so much land held out of use at a price which industry can never hope to pay.

This is the reason why the homeseeker is forced to travel miles and miles beyond the border of settlement and civilization to find land cheap enough for his meager purse.

This is the reason why our booming cities sprawl over two or three times the space they should, building skyscrapers in some parts where people live and work like sardines in a box, and leaving block after block empty and unused because the owners find it more profitable to hold idle for the increase in value than to put it to use and pay the extra taxes.

By encouraging the vacant lot industry, this system enormously increases the cost of opening and grading streets, of sewers and water mains, of sidewalks and pavements, of curbs and boulevards, of gas, electric and street car service; all of which must be carried across these waste spaces at enormous expense.

All these and many more are the evils that inevitably flow from the false theory that we should "tax everything."

Another Picture.

"Tax nothing that will come to you—nothing that your taxes will drive away—nothing that labor produces."

The people of the three northwestern Canadian provinces are wiser than we.

There the farmer is not taxed more because he breaks the prairie sod and raises a crop, or fences his farm, or builds a house and out buildings, or buys furniture, or tools or cattle or horses. He is not fined and penalized because he paints his buildings and beautifies his surroundings.

There the people of the towns and cities are not taxed more because they build houses and stores and factories and fill them with furniture and goods and machinery.

There they are not taxed more because they use the land, employ labor, and produce useful things.

The man in the country with an improved farm, the best of buildings, cattle, horses, machinery and all the crops he can raise, pays no more taxes than does the speculator who holds idle and unused an equally desirable piece of land.

The city man who builds a store and fills it with goods is taxed no more than the owner across the corner who holds idle and prevents improvement. Goods can be sold cheaper.

The city man who builds a factory and fills it with machinery to make useful things is taxed no more than is the owner of an equally desirable factory site that he is holding for a higher price. He can sell his products cheaper.

The city home owner is not fined because he has built himself a house and furnished it for the comfort of his family. The man who owns the vacant lot next to him pays the same taxes as the home owner.

The value of land is created by the people. It is there because the people are there doing useful things. It increases as the people increase in number and develop a better civilization. The value of land would all disappear if the people should go away.

What we call "land value" is really a "people value." The people as a whole create every dollar of it, and therefore in justice they have a right to it.

The products of labor are not like the value of land. They are not created by the people as a whole, but by the individual efforts of the workers. Therefore the public as a whole has no right to these products of labor and should not tax and penalize their owners.

The Tax Situation in Minnesota.

In 1906 the people adopted an amendment to the constitution, which permits the legislature to classify property for purposes of taxation, and to tax different classes at different rates. But probably it cannot exempt any class entirely.

Under this provision laws have been enacted taxing money and credits at three mills on the dollar and substituting for the tax on mortgages a fee for the registration of fifteen cents for each one hundred dollars.

This is an improvement over the old system; but why tax borrowers at all?—for it is the borrower who must pay all such taxes.

In 1913 Mr. Spooner introduced a bill to classify property for purposes of taxation. This bill was amended in several particulars and finally became the law.

It contained two good features.

First, it taxed iron ore, mined or unmined, at a higher rate than any other property.

Second, it taxed household furniture at only twenty-five per cent of its full and true value. This let out many poor people from the visits of the assessor.

The bill was bad in two particulars:

First, it attempted to class land as platted and unplatted and taxed the platted at forty per cent and the unplatted at thirty-three and one-third per cent of full and true value.

This looks like a wholly unwarranted distinction, and one of very doubtful constitutionality.

Why should a man be taxed more heavily simply because he has platted his land and thus taken the first step toward making it useful for homes and business?

Why should a man be taxed less because he refuses to plat his land and bring it into the market, but holds on to get the increase in value that will come to him because of the building up and improvement of the surrounding lots?

In all the large cities of the state there are very valuable tracts of land left unplatted.

In all such cases these lands and the improvements on them are let off at thirty-three and one-third per cent, while the surrounding platted lots with the homes and business buildings on them are rated at forty per cent.

There is one house on Summit Avenue, St. Paul, worth over \$40,000 on a piece of unplatted land worth many thousands more, and all this goes in at thirty-three and one-third per cent, while the people who own the homes all around are taxed at forty per cent.

This is only one case. There are many more in all the cities of the state like this.

Any law that permits such injustice ought to be amended.

But the second defect in this law makes it more unjust still. It makes no distinction between land on the one hand and the products of labor on the other. Here is a natural line of demonstration and one that the county boards, auditors and assessors have been making ever since the state was organized.

Everywhere and always the tax officials have assessed buildings and improvements and all kinds of personal property at a much lower rate than land.

This new law as introduced by Mr. Spooner and as finally passed removes this distinction and provides that the buildings and improvements must be taxed at the same rate as land.

Under this law the taxes on buildings and improvements have been increased in all parts of the state, and in St. Paul we were forced to add about \$20,000,000 to their valuation, while the lands of the city were only increased about one million. Most of this increase on buildings will fall on homes and business structures.

It works well for the land speculators, but is hard on the home owners and business men, and these are the ones that Mr. Spooner and the legislators claimed to be helping.

They made a bad bungle of it which the next legislature ought to correct.

S. R. Child and C. H. Warner were the only House members to vote against the Spooner bill.

In the Senate the bill was amended and passed with only ten votes against it.

And thus was placed on the statute books a law so framed as to do great injustice where it was intended to correct injustice.

Taxation in the 1915 Legislature.

During the session of 1915, Jones in the Senate, and

Marwin, Indrehus, Anton Peterson, L. O. Teigen, Welch, Vasaly and Woodfill in the House, introduced a bill to amend the tax classification law so as to reduce household goods to one per cent, all buildings, structures and improvements in or upon land to ten per cent, all personal property now in class three to ten per cent, and put all land in one class at forty per cent.

Mr. Searls brought in a bill to tax improved unplatted real estate at a lower rate than unimproved. The principle of this bill met with popular approval, but its doubtful constitutionality and the practical difficulty of defining the amount of improvement necessary to secure the lower rate caused its advocates to abandon it.

These bills were reported unfavorably by the tax committee of each house. But something along this line is sure to be considered favorably before many years. Public sentiment is drifting strongly in this direction, and the legislature will respond.

Later Indrehus and Gordon introduced a resolution, directing the tax commission to investigate the working of the present system and report their findings with recommendations for relief to the next legislature. Mr. Spooner brought in a bill reducing taxes on buildings to twenty-five per cent. Spooner's bill was indefinitely postponed, and the resolution died on general orders along with about two hundred other measures.

Gross Earnings Taxes.

Public service corporations have but one source of income—what they collect from their patrons. It therefore follows that the greater burdens of taxation we put upon them the higher their charges must be.

The St. Paul Gas Light company pays a five per cent gross earnings tax, and they are allowed to charge five cents a thousand more for gas. Plainly this is not a tax on the company, but a tax on the users of gas. It amounts to a five and one-half per cent tax on every dollar's worth of gas consumed. The company gets it all back out of the consumers and makes a good profit besides.

A large part of the state revenue is collected by a system of gross earnings taxes from the railways and other public service corporations.

Of course the charge of these companies must be enough more to cover all such taxes and a good margin besides.

So far as the earnings of the railways come from the handling of grain and other farm products, all taxes on these earnings are taxes on the farmers of Minnesota.

So far as railway earnings are derived from merchandise brought into the state, the taxes on such earnings are paid by the final consumers, with a good profit on the tax, not only to the railways, but to every jobber, wholesaler and retailer who handles the goods.

Gross earnings taxes are not taxes on these corporations, but taxes on the people. It is time the people stopped fooling themselves with the idea that they are getting any taxes out of the railways and these other corporations by this system.

Of course if we had no control over their charges, then any such taxes would be clear gain; but we do have control over their charges, and so the whole system fails of its object and taxes the wrong people. More than this it taxes them far more heavily than if the same amount were raised by direct taxation.

There is another bad feature of this system that is usually overlooked. In every city and village in the state all kinds of street improvements—grading, paving, sewer, water mains, sidewalks, etc.—are paid for by special assessment against the owner of the abutting property. The railways escape all this. They also escape all taxes on their valuable terminal lands, and even on the lands that were freely given them by the state and the nation to encourage the building of the roads.

Exemption from these land taxes and special assessments is just so much clear gain to the corporations.

The gross earnings system is a very successful method of letting the corporations off with no taxes at all, and putting a double burden on the patrons of the companies and the consuming public.

In the session of 1915, Mr. Gilman introduced a resolution for a committee to investigate the whole gross earnings system and report to the next session; but he did not push it and it never came to a vote.

Natural Sources of Revenue.

The state of Minnesota was wonderfully rich in natural resources. Its mines and forests and water power were among the greatest in the world. Its soil the most fertile, and its locations for great and powerful cities the most desirable.

The forests are largely cut off—gone forever—and we have a few millionaire lumber barons as the net result.

The minerals are fast going and we are not getting half what we should. If we could devise a system of taxes that would reach the royalties that now swell the fortunes of the mine owners, we would have tapped a source of vast public revenue. This should be done without delay,—not by a tonnage tax on the output of the mines, but by a very heavy tax on the royalties now paid to the fee owners. Such a tax could not be passed on, but must be paid by the mine owners themselves.

The enormous value of our water power and the fabulous wealth in our city lands and lots could be made to yield much larger revenues to the state if we would cease taxing industry and increase the taxes on the value of these lands.

As every one knows, these values are created by all the people, and so far as justice and fair play are concerned, the whole people ought to have them to meet public needs, instead of permitting them to swell the fortunes of land grabbers and speculators.

The man who owns the title deed to an iron mine, or a city lot, or a water power, or to any other part of Nature's free gift to the children of men, has no moral nor legal right to these values that are not due to his efforts, but are due to the presence and energy, the civilization and moral status of the whole people.

The people always have the moral right to change their system of taxation; and when they shall decide to stop fining and penalizing themselves for their thrift and industry, and to take for public use these publicly-created values, there will not be so many useless millionaires in the world; but there will be more useful citizens who can afford to have decent homes and comfortable surroundings.

Unemployment, Wage Regulation and Taxation.

There is just one natural source of employment in any community, namely, the land, the resources of nature in that community. If the land is easy to get for use people will make farms and gardens on it and employ labor. They will erect factories, warehouses and stores on it and employ labor. They will build homes on it and employ labor. In fact, no matter to what use the land is put labor must be employed. You can't use land without employing labor.

On the other hand, if land is hard to get—if the burden is so heavy that people cannot afford to put it to use—then labor will not be employed. It will walk the street vainly looking for a job. Every idle lot means idle men. If all the land were held idle, all the people would necessarily be idle and would soon starve to death.

Now, what has taxation to do with all this? Everything! Everything! Our present system of taxation lets a man off easy so long as he holds his land idle and thus keeps labor off of it. The moment he starts to make his land useful and sets labor to work—he can't use his land without setting labor to work—that moment we begin to pile the taxes on him as if he were a criminal to be fined and penalized.

To illustrate:

A certain enterprising firm of St. Paul has erected on University avenue a beautiful, commodious building—a gem of art and convenience—heated, lighted and ventilated in the most up-to-date fashion. Here, in the midst of beautiful surroundings, in fresh air and sunshine, they employ about 750 people, mostly young men and women, making useful things, which are sold in all parts of the civilized world. Because they are doing this, because they have erected this beautiful building, assembled here the machinery and materials of industry, brought here these 750 people and set them to work, the tax laws of the state of Minnesota compel us to impose on them every year a fine of over \$2,000 on the building and an additional fine of more than \$3,000 on their machinery, money and credits and on the raw material and finished products of their industry. This is in addition to the taxes they pay on their land. This is the fine that we impose upon them because they are making their land useful and employing labor on it, instead of holding it idle and keeping labor off it.

And this is only one case in many thousands in the city of St. Paul alone. Every city, town and village, every farm and mine and industry, in the whole country is another case of the same kind. Everywhere we fine and penalize men because they put their land to use and employ labor on it. Everywhere we let men off easy because they hold their land idle and keep labor off it. And then we stand in amazement

and wonder why workers are idle and wages low. Could anything be more stupid? Yes, and we do it.

We could make a simple change in our system of taxation. We could stop fining people for using their land and employing labor, but we don't. We could increase the taxes on those who held their land idle and prevent labor from working, but we don't.

Instead of this we establish charities, and woodyards, and soup-houses for those that we prevent from working and earning their own living. Instead of this we pass minimum wage laws and other meddlesome regulations to compel employers to pay higher wages than the market price, stupidly failing to see that low wages are the direct result of idle land and industry overburdened by taxation.

If we should relieve this enterprising firm of the annual fine of more than \$5,000, now imposed upon them, because they are using their land and employing labor—if we should relieve all industry from the burden of taxation—and increase the taxes on the forestallers and land grabbers, don't you suppose wages would rise all along the line, far more than you can ever force them up by minimum wage laws? And wouldn't wages keep on going up and stay up just as we made it easy to put land to use and employ labor, instead of making it easy to hold land idle and keep labor out of work?

How long would it be till there were two jobs looking for each man and woman, instead of two or more workers looking for each job?

Nor can we be charged with trying to create jobs by law. We are only asking for the repeal of the laws that lock up the natural opportunities—the laws that shut workers away from the land in country and city, in forest and mine and everywhere.

Instead of fining and penalizing those who put their land to use and thus employ labor, repeal these unwise and unjust tax laws. Take the padlock off the door that leads to opportunity and give enterprise and labor a chance.

Require the forestallers and speculators to pay to the public in taxes the value that the public creates, and there will no longer be profit in land grabbing.

It will pay them to use the earth rather than to hold it idle.

Labor can then take care of itself. Meddlesome legislation in the interest of labor will no longer be needed.

Employers and worker will both be free, and both will be far better off.

Even the public service corporations and the other great employers of labor will be powerless to enslave the workers.

Tax out the land grabbers in country and city, and labor will take care of itself.

CHAPTER VI.

PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATIONS.

A public service corporation is vitally different from an ordinary business. It is even different from an ordinary corporation that is engaged in competitive business.

We have individuals, co-partnerships, joint stock com-

panies, industrial corporations and co-operative associations all engaged in ordinary competitive occupations like operating stores, manufacturing plants, creameries, farms, insurance companies, newspapers, and hundreds of other lines of business which are not in their nature monopolies.

All these compete in the open markets for business and their success depends upon the efficiency of their management, the quality and price of the articles they furnish and the general satisfaction they give to their customers.

No one is forced to deal with them if he does not wish to do so. Their customers are free at all times to leave them and go somewhere else. For these reasons such lines of business need no special regulation by the government. The natural principles of free competition are usually quite sufficient. The best way to treat such lines of business is to let them alone.

Public service corporations are wholly different. They owe their very existence to a grant of public authority. They are the creatures of statute law. Without a grant from government they could not exist at all. In short they are created to perform public functions. They do things that the government itself would be obliged to do if these public functions were not turned over to them.

It therefore follows that all these public service corporations must at all times be subjected to public control, and the courts have always held that any reasonable regulations relating to such corporation will be sustained, and the corporations must obey.

Many people do not believe that such corporations should be created. They believe that all public business, including all kinds of public service, should be performed by the people thru their chosen agents; and not farmed out to corporations at all.

But that is another question.

We have created these corporations, and we have turned over to them our railways, telegraphs, telephones, street car systems, gas, electricity, and, in many cities even the water supply systems.

The problem now is how shall these corporations be controlled—to what extent shall they be brought under public regulation?

The Telephone Bill.

For many years we have had the railway and warehouse commission whose business it has been to control and regulate the railways and public warehouses of the state.

But the telephone companies that operate in all parts of the state have been a law unto themselves. There has been no legal provision for their control, and the Northwestern Telephone monopoly especially has most vigorously resented all attempts to bring it under the control of the railway and warehouse commission.

The rural telephone companies and their patrons are subsidiary to the two great companies, the Northwestern and the Tri-State; and for many years these small companies and their subscribers have demanded that the whole telephone system of the state be put under the control of the railway and warehouse commission, and that the large com-

panies be required to make physical connection so that the subscribers of the subsidiary lines of one large company could talk with the subscribers to the other line or its subsidiaries.

As early as 1907, J. T. Johnson of Fergus Falls, introduced a bill to bring about these results, but it was smothered in committee.

In 1909 Mr. Johnson introduced another bill with the same result.

In 1911 F. E. Minnette introduced a bill to the same effect, but it failed to pass.

In 1913 Minnette and Holmberg came in with a bill which passed both House and Senate by very large majorities, but was vetoed by Governor Eberhardt, as a part of his plan to force upon the state his scheme for a state-wide public utility commission to regulate and control all public utilities in the state—those belonging wholly within the cities as well as all others.

This veto aroused a furore of opposition and was one of the chief causes of Eberhardt's defeat at the primaries in June, 1914.

Early in the session of 1915 Minnette and Burrows introduced the same bill again, and after full discussion it passed the House without a dissenting vote.

As thus passed it contained a clause, permitting the people of any community, by a 65 per cent vote, to let in a second telephone system.

If a second exchange is to be established at all, a vote of the people who are interested is the best and most democratic way to do it.

But is this the best way to remedy a poor service?

Can competition solve this problem? Is competition possible in regard to public service, as it is in the matter of groceries, carpenter shops, or any other private business?

Is not the telephone business, like all public service, a necessary monopoly? And if such a monopoly is in the hands of a private corporation, is it not the wisest and best course—is it not the only practical course—to require the first company to give good service at a reasonable price? or get out entirely?

The Senate committee on corporations cut out this referendum clause, and after a very thoro discussion the action of the committee was sustained.

Senator Lobeck showed that only a small part of the users of phones in the rural parts of the state lived inside the villages and cities where the exchanges are located; and hence to refer the question of a second exchange to all the voters of such cities and villages whether they were users of phones or not, would not be a true referendum. It would refer the question to the wrong people.

This argument seemed conclusive, for only one, Ward of Fairmont, voted against the bill on final passage.

Mr. Minnette made a strong plea to have the referendum clause restored, but the conference committee sustained the action of the Senate, and the House concurred.

Thus ended the long struggle with a popular victory over the great Northwestern Telephone monopoly.

The Nolan Bill.

For a number of years the Minneapolis General Electric Company has been operating without a franchise, and has been charging all the traffic would bear.

The city of Minneapolis is not operating under a home rule charter and therefore has no power to regulate this company in any way whatever.

In 1913 W. J. 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."

The people of Minneapolis were eager for this bill, and the manufacturers and merchants thru their association were very active in its support.

This bill passed the House without a dissenting vote, and only four in the Senate really opposed it, W. W. Dunn, Murray, G. H. Sullivan and J. D. Sullivan.

Then Governor Eberhardt vetoed it. The House passed it over his veto 83 to 26, but the corporations had too strong a grip in the Senate and so they and the Governor won the day and the bill was killed.

Senator Dwinnell had led the fight in the Senate in favor of this bill; but for some reason, very early in the session of 1915, Senator William A. Campbell introduced the bill as Senate File No. 20.

Now Campbell is very unpopular with the stand-patters and the corporation men in the Senate.

The first move was to amend the bill so as to apply to Minneapolis only, and then the Senators from Hennepin county voted five to four for indefinite postponement. Those voting against the bill were Callahan, Grose, Pauly, Wallace and Westlake. Those for the bill were Campbell, Dwinnell, Palmer and Turnham.

Later, on April 10, the Senate supported the majority of the Hennepin delegation and killed the bill by the following vote, 32 to 16.

Those voting to kill the bill were:

Adams	Grose	Ries
Andrews	Handlan	Steffen
Callahan	Hegnes	Sullivan, G. H.
Campbell, A. S.	Hilbert	Sullivan, J. D.
Carley	Knopp	Van Hoven
Denegre	McGarry	Vibert
Dunn, W. W.	Nord	Wallace
Duxbury	Orr	Ward
Gjerset	Pauly	Weis
Glotzbach	Peterson, G. M.	Westlake
Griggs	Putnam	

Those viting to save the bill were:

Campbell, W. A.	Jones	Rystrom
Dwinnell	Lobeck	Sageng
Gardner	Nelson	Turnham
Gillam	O'Neill	Vermilya
Hanson	Palmer	
Holmberg	Peterson, E. P.	

Nineteen Senators did not vote:

Alley	Dunn, R. C.	Peterson, F. H.
Baldwin	Gandrud	Potter
Benson	Healy	Rockne
Blomgren	Jackson	Rustad
Bonniwell	Johnston	Swenson
Buckler	Lende	
Collester	Millett	

Five were not present—Baldwin, Collester, Healy, Millett and F. H. Peterson. The other fourteen refused to vote at all, regarding it a local quarrel.

Why was this bill killed?

Was it not as correct in principle in 1915 as it was in 1913?

Were not the great mass of consumers just as much in need of relief from the exactions of this company as they had been two years before?

Perhaps the common mass of consumers are not paying quite as much as formerly; but the merchants and manufacturers have got such rates as they wanted, and so their zeal for the bill had largely died out.

The common people had no one to plead their cause but the men they had elected and sent to the Senate, and five of these did not seem to feel it necessary to represent the voters.

Semi-Monthly Pay Day Bill.

This bill required all public service corporations to pay their employees at least twice a month.

What could be more fair than this? The men have earned the money. It is theirs. Why should the public service corporations be permitted to exact forced loans from their hired men? Even the semi-monthly pay day leaves a large amount of wages in the hands of the employers. Even then they would have in their possession at all times about three weeks wages, rightfully belonging to each man in their employ.

Suppose one of these corporations employed a thousand men. Their wages would average at least seventy-five dollars a month. Here's a capital of about \$75,000 that the men are forced to furnish to their employers without interest.

The bill passed the House 89 to 33 as follows:

Anderson	Dare	Hulbert
Baker	Davis	Johnson, M.
Barten	Devold	Kneeland
Bendixen	Dunleavy	Knutson
Bernard	Dwyer	Kuntz
Bessette	Erickson	Larimore
Bjorge	Frye	Larson
Bjorklund	Gill	Lattin
Boehmke	Girling	Lee
Borgen	Grant	Lennon
Bouck	Greene	Lydiard
Boyd	Guilford	McGrath
Brown	Haislet	McLaughlin
Burrows	Harrison, J. M.	Madigan
Christianson	Hynes, J. H.	Malmberg
Condon	Holmes	

Marschalk	Pendergast	Stevens
Marwin	Peterson, A.	Stoetzel
Minnette	Pikop	Sudheimer
Moeller	Pless	Swanson
Mqrken	Putnam	Syerson
Mueller	Ribenack	Teigen, L. O.
Murphy	Rodenberg	Thompson, H. O.
Nelson	Sawyer	Thornton
Nimocks	Seebach	Vasaly
Nordgren	Scott	Welch
Norton	Sliter	Weld
Novak	Sorflaten	Wilson
Olien	Steen	Wold
Papke	Stenvick	Woodfill

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Hauser	Sanborn
Bjornson	Hogenson	Searls
Carmichael	Hompe	Schrooten
Corning	Indrehus	Smith
Dealand	Johnson, J. T.	Southwick
Ferrier	Leonard	Spooner
Flinn	Miner	Swenson
Gerlich	Nietzel	Thompson, A. L.
Gilman	Parker	Tollefson
Hafften	Peterson, A. M.	Wefald
Harrison, H. H.	Pratt	Wilkins

The public service corporations now got busy in the Senate. Petitions were circulated among the railway employes urging Senators to vote against the bill, and many who could not be charged with having corporation leanings were convinced that the working men actually did not want their pay oftener than once a month.

Several men in Senator Gandrud's district told him they were afraid it would be taken out of them if the railway companies should be put to the extra expense that a semi-monthly pay day would make necessary; and it is probable that other Senators were influenced by the same kind of argument.

But it was perfectly plain where the corporation men in the Senate stood. Those who can always be found on the side of the special interests were strong and strenuous against the bill.

The most convincing speech for the bill was made by Senator Dwinnell of Minneapolis, who declared it absurd to suppose that any considerable number of working men did not want the money they had earned. He showed that it would not place any considerable burden upon the corporations, but even if it did they ought to meet it like men, and not try to make their employees furnish them with capital on which to do business. Even as it is the companies retain all the time fifteen to thirty days' wages that they have no right to.

Others who made strong pleas for justice to the men were Campbell of Minneapolis, Jackson, Palmer, Pauly, Griggs, Handlan, Jones and Gardner, who had fathered the bill and who had worked for it as if his life depended on its passage.

The opposition to the bill in both Senate and House may be summed up about as follows:

First, there were those who are always found on the side of the corporations.

Second, the fact that most of the leading supporters of the bill had been very bitter opponents of county option, caused the temperance people to look on the bill from the start with some prejudice.

Third, the fear that the railways would take it out of their workmen, caused many of the better paid employees to oppose the bill in a mild way, or at any rate not to be very zealous in its support. This had its influence especially on some country members.

Fourth, several members felt that the extra expense would give the railways an added excuse to ask for increased freight rates.

And finally there were a number of temperance men who were quite sure that two pay days a month would mean two drunks a month, and would not be for the best interest of even those of the men who most needed their money.

The fault is not with the workers, but with the system. Change the system. Do away with privileges and the workers will be independent and self-respecting. They will need no guardians.

The bill had not a vote to spare in the Senate.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Grose	Peterson, E. P.
Alley	Handlan	Peterson, F. H.
Benson	Hanson	Peterson, G. M.
Bonniwell	Jackson	Rockne
Buckler	Johnston	Sageng
Callahan	Jones	Steffen
Campbell, A. S.	Knopp	Turnham
Campbell, W. A.	Lobeck	Van Hoven
Dunn, W. W.	McGarry	Vermilya
Dwinnell	O'Neill	Ward
Gardner	Palmer	
Griggs	Pauly	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Andrews	Glotzbach	Ries
Baldwin	Healy	Rustad
Blomgren	Hegnes	Rystrom
Carley	Hilbert	Sullivan, G. H.
Collester	Holmberg	Sullivan, J. D.
Denegre	Millett	Swenson
Dunn, R. C.	Nelson	Vibert
Duxbury	Orr	Wallace
Gandrud	Potter	Weis
Gjerst	Putnam	Westlake

Gillam, Lende and Nord were unavoidably absent.

It has been a battle of many years, but at last the men have won.

The Twin City Rapid Transit Company—Its Blunder And Its Success.

In about eight years the franchises of the Twin City Rapid Transit Company will expire.

When that times comes the people of the two great cities will have a chance to make a new deal and a fairer one.

The company is in a hurry. They don't want to wait. Times are changing. The people are getting wiser. The public ownership movement is growing very rapidly.

Early in the session this company, thru certain members of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, secured the consent of Senator Denegre to introduce a bill that just suited them. Senator Orr joined with him and they introduced the bill, not as their own, but "by request."

This bill tied the people of the three large cities of the state hand and foot and turned them over to the company gagged and bound.

It ripped the home rule charters of St. Paul and Duluth wide open, gave the company everything they could ask and more, and left the people without a word to say.

But this bill did not last long. The people began to be heard from. The St. Paul Daily News showed up its true inwardness. Commercial clubs and other organizations passed resolutions against it. The St. Paul City Council directed City Attorney O'Neil to investigate and report; and when his report was read, the bill was condemned unanimously. The Minneapolis City Council also condemned the bill after the citizens had packed the chamber to overflowing in opposition.

Orr repudiated the bill, and later both he and Denegre withdrew it and there it died.

It was plain that St. Paul and Duluth would have nothing to do with such a measure.

The company saw that it had blundered and blundered badly; and it started on a different plan.

St. Paul and Duluth, with their home rule charters and their popular referendum were both left out, and their new bill applied to Minneapolis only.

At the request of the company the Civic and Commerce Association had a bill drawn by Mr. Rockwood, its attorney, that looked fair on its surface; but lacked many things that it should have contained to safeguard the people's rights.

In order to make its passage sure, it provided that no franchise to the company should go into effect until ratified by the people.

The bill was still very dangerous; but it was almost impossible to make the legislature see the danger.

A considerable majority of the Hennepin delegation had been brought to favor it. Men who had denounced the corporations in unmeasured terms were found voting for it. The referendum clause saved it.

When the bill came up in the House April 13th, Mr. Guilford made a good but losing fight to amend it so as to give the city council at all times the "power to require reasonable extensions, betterments, equipment and adequate service, and to regulate construction, operation, rates of fares, and the power herein granted shall not be contracted away."

This amendment was defeated 57 to 62.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Holmes	Pratt
Baldwin	Hompe	Putnam
Bendixen	Hulbert	Searls
Bernard	Indrehus	Sliter
Bjorge	Johnson, J. T.	Smith
Bjornson	Johnson, M.	Sorflaten
Burrows	Kuntz	Stevens
Christianson	Larson	Stoetzel
Corning	Lattin	Swanson
Davis	Lee	Teigen, A. F.
Dealand	McGrath	Teigen, L. O.
Devold	Madigan	Thompson, H. O.
Frye	Marwin	Tollefson
Gordon	Morken	Vasaly
Grant	Nordgren	Wefald
Guilford	Norton	Wilson
Hafften	Novak	Wold
Hauser	Olien	Woodfill
Hynes, J. H.	Peterson, A.	Mr. Speaker

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Harrison, J. M.	Peterson, A. M.
Baker	Hinds, E. R.	Pikop
Besette	Hogenson	Pless
Borgen	Knutson	Ribenack
Bouck	Konzen	Rodenberg
Boyd	Larimore	Sanborn
Brown	Lennon	Sawyer
Condon	Leonard	Seebach
Dare	Lydiard	Schrooten
Dunleavy	McLaughlin	Scott
Dwyer	Malmberg	Southwick
Erickson	Marschalk	Steen
Ferrier	Miner	Stevick
Flinn	Minnette	Sudheimer
Gerlich	Murphy	Swenson
Gill	Nelson	Syverson
Gilman	Nietzel	Thompson, A. L.
Girling	Nimocks	Thornton
Greene	North	Warner
Halslet	Papke	Wilkins
Harrison, H. H.	Parker	

As introduced the bill contained this clause: "The franchise may provide for the operation of suburban cars over the tracks of the company."

Mr. Guilford moved to amend this clause to read as follows: "The city shall reserve the right to authorize any existing or future suburban railway company the joint use of tracks, poles, wires, appliances, power and electric current, of any company to which a franchise is granted under this act, and the franchise shall contain provisions for determining the compensation to be paid for such joint use."

This amendment carried, yeas 65 and nays 57, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Bernard	Bjornson
Barten	Bjorge	Borgen
Bendixen	Bjorklund	Boyd

Burrows	Johnson, J. T.	Searls
Christianson	Johnson, M.	Sliter
Corning	Larson	Sorflaten
Davis	Lattin	Spooner
Dealand	Lee	Stevens
Devold	McGrath	Stoetzel
Erickson	Madigan	Swanson
Frye	Marwin	Swenson
Gill	Morken	Teigen, A. F.
Gordon	Nordgren	Teigen, L. O.
Grant	Norton	Thompson, H. O.
Guilford	Novak	Tollefson
Hafften	Olien	Vasaly
Hauser	Parker	Wefald
Hynes, J. H.	Peterson, A.	Wilson
Holmes	Pikop	Wold
Hompe	Pratt	Woodfill
Hulbert	Putnam	Mr. Speaker
Indrehus	Sawyer	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Hinds, E. R.	Papke
Baker	Hogenson	Peterson, A. M.
Baldwin	Kneeland	Pless
Bessette	Knutson	Ribenack
Bouck	Konzen	Sanborn
Brown	Kuntz	Seebach
Condon	Larimore	Schrooten
Dare	Lennon	Scott
Dunleavy	Leonard	Smith
Dwyer	Lydiard	Southwick
Ferrier	McLaughlin	Steen
Flinn	Malmberg	Stenwick
Gerlich	Marschalk	Sudheimer
Gilman	Minnette	Syverson
Girling	Murphy	Thompson, A. L.
Greene	Nelson	Thornton
Haislet	Nietzel	Warner
Harrison, H. H.	Nimocks	Weld
Harrison, J. M.	North	Wilkins

The bill was considerably improved.

Why there should have been any opposition to either of the Guilford amendments it is difficult to understand; but the supporters of the bill as it was reported out by a majority of the Hennepin delegation made strong pleas against any amendments, and many country members vote on city questions with the majority of the city members.

And then they were too much influenced by the referendum clause.

A large number of members were really made to believe that something must be done at this session.

Another thing that helped pass the bill was the fact that Mr. Devold, a Socialist member, had made a strong fight against it. His arguments were good but prejudice is strong; and some members frankly admitted that they were influenced to vote for the bill because the Socialist opposed it.

On the other hand, one or two open-minded members

gave Devold credit for helping them to see objections to the bill.

But the corporation men had been very busy trading for the bill and tying up all the votes possible.

On the final ballot the bill passed 77 to 44.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Hulbert	Pless
Baker	Högenon	Pratt
Bessette	Johnson, J. T.	Putnam
Bjorklund	Kneeland	Ribenack
Borgen	Knutson	Rodenberg
Bouck	Konzen	Sanborn
Boyd	Kuntz	Sawyer
Brown	Larimore	Searles
Burrows	Lennon	Schrooten
Condon	Leonard	Scott
Dare	Lydiard	Smith
Dealand	Madigan	Southwick
Dunleavy	Malmberg	Spooner
Dwyer	Marschalk	Steen
Erickson	Miner	Stevens
Ferrier	Minnette	Sudheimer
Flinn	Morken	Swenson
Gerlich	Murphy	Syverson
Gill	Nelson	Thompson, A. L.
Gilman	Nietzel	Thornton
Girling	Nimocks	Tollefson
Gordon	North	Warner
Haislet	Papke	Wefald
Harrison, H. H.	Parker	Weld
Harrison, J. M.	Peterson, A. M.	Wilkins
Hinds, E. R.	Pikop	Mr. Speaker

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Hynes, J. H.	Peterson, A.
Baldwin	Holmes	Seebach
Barten	Hompe	Sliter
Bernard	Indrehus	Sorflaten
Bjorge	Johnson, M.	Stenvick
Bjornson	Larson	Stoetzel
Christianson	Lattin	Swanson
Corning	Lee	Teigen, A. F.
Davis	McGrath	Teigen, L. O.
Devold	McLaughlin	Thompson, H. O.
Frye	Marwin	Vasaly
Grant	Nordgren	Wilson
Guilford	Norton	Wold
Hafften	Novak	Woodfill
Hauser	Olien	

When this bill reached the Senate William A. Campbell made a hard fight to amend it in several particulars, but here again prejudice was strong, and he failed either to amend or defeat the bill.

On final passage the vote stood 45 to 21.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Andrews	Benson
Alley	Baldwin	Blomgren

Buckler	Griggs	Peterson, G. M.
Callahan	Grose	Putnam
Campbell, A. S.	Handlan	Ries
Carley	Healy	Rustad
Colleston	Hegnes	Sullivan, G. H.
Denegre	Hilbert	Swenson
Dunn, R. C.	Holmberg	Turnham
Dunn, W. W.	Johnston	Van Hoven
Duxbury	McGarry	Vibert
Dwinnell	Nord	Wallace
Gandrud	O'Neil	Ward
Gjerset	Pauly	Weis
Glotzbach	Peterson, E. P.	Westlake

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bonniwell	Knopp	Peterson, F. H.
Campbell, W. A.	Lende	Potter
Gardner	Lobeck	Rockne
Gillam	Millett	Rystrom
Hanson	Nelson	Sageng
Jackson	Orr	Steffen
Jones	Palmer	Vermilya

These twenty-one are pretty strong anti-corporation men.

The Jitney Bus Bill.

This was another bill that the street railway company was anxious to get thru, but here they failed completely.

For this little funeral the people are largely indebted to Pratt of Anoka, who has shown himself to be one of the keenest and ablest men in the House, always fearless and independent.

If the traction company can't keep the jitneys off the streets entirely, the next best thing is to tie them up as much as possible, with heavy license fees and excessive indemnity bonds, and that is what this bill was for.

Westlake and Wallace were its sponsors in the Senate.

Westlake was also father of a bill to permit the railways of the state to charge 2½ cents per mile passenger fare. This bill did not get very far, tho Pennington, J. J. Hill and other railway magnates, at a great public hearing, made eloquent pleas for an increase of passenger fare.

CHAPTER VII.

GOOD ROADS.

Everybody wants good roads.

The dispute comes over the question how they shall be built and paid for.

It is universally admitted that good roads greatly increase the value of lands that abut upon them or lie near them.

The farm crops are worth much more, if there is a good road over which to haul them to market—for it costs much less to get them there.

All products of equal grade bring the same price at the market, regardless of the distance they have been hauled or the cost of getting them there.

Let us suppose a farm of 160 acres any distance from market on a very poor road. That farm is not very valuable. It can't be sold for a very large price. The cost of hauling its

products to the market is so great that their value is largely eaten up in the expense of transportation.

Now suppose a good road to be built to the market town. What effect will it have on the selling price of that farm? What effect will it have on the selling price of all the land along the road, from the market town out as far as the road is built?

Any good road, economically built, suitable to the needs of the people who own the adjoining lands, will cause an increase in the value of those lands by more than enough to pay for the entire cost of the road.

The Elwell Road Law.

This law owes its name to Senator Elwell of Minneapolis who secured its passage.

The vital features of this law only need to be stated. The injustice of the law will speak for itself.

First, only six land owners were required to sign a petition to start proceedings for an Elwell road.

Second, a mere majority of the board of county commissioners could then order the road built.

Third, only one-fourth of the cost of the road must be paid by the benefited land owners; while three-fourths must be shared by other people who got no direct benefit at all; and worst of all these three-fourths could be paid for in bond issues, thus saddling this part of the cost upon the county and state to be paid later.

Fourth, when lands were drained under the ditch law, the dirt can be used to make a good road along the ditch.

The benefited land owners have to pay the entire cost as they ought.

After the Elwell law was passed these could be called "roads" instead of ditches. The lands would be drained just the same, but the benefited owners would pay only one-fourth the cost, the whole county and state paying the rest.

Thus this law lent itself to fraud as well as to injustice.

A considerable number of both houses had been elected to repeal the Elwell law. The most active and determined of these was Senator Vermilya of Olmstead county, who introduced a bill for repeal early in the session.

March 3rd the bill was passed and sent over to the House.

Vermilya, O'Neil, Rockne, Duxbury and Geo. Sullivan spoke in favor of repeal.

Nord, Adams, Andrews and Dwinnell defended the Elwell law.

As the discussion progressed it became very plain that the opponents of the law had the best of the argument. Several senators, who had not given much thought to the question, were convinced and voted against the Elwell law. This feeling was expressed by Senator Alley who declared that he had been convinced that the law should be repealed.

The vote stood thirty-nine to twenty-five in favor of repeal as follows:

Those who favored repeal were:

Alley	Bonniwell	Campbell, W. A.
Benson	Buckler	Carley
Blomgren	Campbell, A. S.	Duxbury

Gandrud	Lende	Rustad
Gardner	Lobeck	Rystrom
Gillam	Millett	Sageng
Gjerset	Nelson	Steffen
Glotzbach	O'Neill	Sullivan, G. H.
Hanson	Peterson, E. P.	Sullivan, J. D.
Hilbert	Peterson, F. H.	Swenson
Holmberg	Potter	Turnham
Johnston	Ries	Verlimya
Knopp	Rockne	Ward

Those against repeal were:

Adams	Grose	Palmer
Andrews	Handlan	Pauly
Baldwin	Healy	Peterson, G. M.
Callahan	Hegnes	Van Hoven
Collester	Jackson	Vibert
Denegre	Jones	Wallace
Dunn, W. W.	McGarry	Westlake
Dwinnell	Nord	
Griggs	Orr	

It is noticeable that the opponents of repeal nearly all came from the cities and the northern part of the state; and yet the cities and the iron country had to pay the largest part of the expense under the Elwell law.

Wm. A. Campbell was the only city senator to vote for repeal.

R. C. Dunn was excused. Putnam and Wels did not vote.

In the House it was the same. When the bill came up, on special order March 11th, it was put over till the 18th at the request of the city members, and then, on the 18th, Larimore tried to postpone a week more. This move met with a storm of opposition, and was defeated forty-six to sixty.

Much of the opposition was vigorous and to the point.

Dealand of Nobles county "Let's do it now."

Christianson of Lac Qui Parle "Why haven't they introduced amendments before this?"

Seebach of Goodhue "This is House file No. 2. Haven't we had time enough?"

Johnson of Meeker "I can't see any reason for delay. Let's knock it in the head."

Olien of Yellow Medicine, "We can't make the Elwell law good. It is a bad egg. Throw it away."

Oscar Swenson of Nicollet "If we repeal the law it will not affect existing contracts. Extra time is wanted for lobbying purposes. Repeal it now."

Stenvick of Clearwater declared his county had refused to use the law. As county attorney he had opposed it as unjust. Repeal it now.

Bjornson objected that the proposed amendments were out of order, as they were not germane to the bill. The speaker sustained him.

Holmes made a strong point. "Who pays for the Elwell roads? All the people. Who vote the Elwell roads? A few benefited land owners."

Several members urged delay, but no one attempted to defend the law on its merits.

Sawyer continually interrupted the opponents of the law by asking if they had built any roads under it, apparently oblivious to the fact that those who had not used it, had got no part of the benefit, but must pay a part of the cost.

The Elwell law was repealed in the House by a vote of eighty to forty-one.

The vote for repeal was:

Anderson	Holmes	Pikop
Baker	Hompe	Pless
Baldwin	Hulbert	Pratt
Barten	Indrehus	Putnam
Bendixen	Johnson, J. T.	Sanborn
Bessette	Johnson, M.	Seebach
Bjorge	Knutson	Schrooten
Bjornson	Konzen	Sliter
Boehmke	Kuntz	Smith
Boyd	Larson	Sorflaten
Carmichael	Lattin	Spooner
Christianson	Lee	Stenvick
Davis	Leonard	Stevens
Dealand	McLaughlin	Stoetzel
Erickson	Madigan	Swanson
Ferrier	Malmberg	Swenson
Flinn	Minnette	Teigen, A. F.
Frye	Moeller	Teigen, L. O.
Gerlich	Morken	Thompson, A. L.
Gill	Mueller	Tollefson
Girling	Nietzel	Wefald
Gordon	Nordgren	Welch
Hafften	Novak	Wilkins
Haislet	Olien	Wilson
Hauser	Papke	Wold
Hynes, J. H.	Parker	Woodfill
Hogenson	Peterson, A.	

Opposed to repeal:

Bernard	Harrison, J. M.	Pendergast
Bjorklund	Hinds, E. R.	Peterson, A. M.
Borgen	Kneeland	Ribenack
Bouck	Larimore	Rodenberg
Brown	Lennon	Sawyer
Burrows	Lydiard	Scott
Condon	McGrath	Southwick
Corning	Marwin	Steen
Dare	Miner	Thompson, H. O.
Dunleavy	Murphy	Thornton
Dwyer	Nelson	Vasaly
Gilman	Nimocks	Warner
Greene	North	Weld
Guilford	Norton	

The following did not vote:

Adams, Devold, Grant, H. H. Harrison, Marschalk, Searls, Sudheimer, Syverson, Mr. Speaker.

Adams, Grant, Marschalk and Syverson had been excused.

H. H. Harrison, Searls and Sudheimer had voted a few moments before.

Devold had not answered at roll-call and had not been found.

Speaker Flowers was present of course, but is not recorded as voting.

The Dunn Road Law.

The same members who had come pledged to repeal the Elwell law were also determined to amend the Dunn road law in some very important particulars.

The Dunn law had placed great power in a state highway commission, and had taken away from the people immediately interested in the roads a large part of the control.

It was freely charged that the state highway commission employed young and inexperienced men as assistant engineers, that these young men were often impractical, doing poor work at great expense to the counties.

This law was amended so as to cut out the worst of the evils.

In my opinion it will need much more amendment before it will work justly, or give satisfactory results.

CHAPTER VIII.

TEMPERANCE MEASURES.

In both House and Senate there was a considerable number who were avowed prohibitionists though only three were members of that party. Some of these were representing "wet" districts, and voted the wish of their constituents rather than their personal convictions. Several who were not avowed prohibitionists voted for Prohibition because they felt their districts expected it of them. A number who favored county option opposed Prohibition, because they believed that it was better to allow the county option law to have two years to prove its usefulness before going any further. There were enough of these to prevent the passage of a prohibition amendment to the constitution.

On the whole the opponents of the liquor traffic got more from this legislature by far than in all the preceding history of the state.

The County Option Bill.

This bill came up in the Senate on Thursday, Feb. 4th.

It was carefully drawn providing for a special election upon petition of twenty-five per cent of the votes for governor at the last preceding election.

The bill did nothing but refer to the voters of the county—"Shall the sale of liquor be prohibited?" When once determined the question cannot be raised again for a term of three years.

The voters of the entire county were to decide whether the whole country should be "dry" or the present system of "local option" should continue. The supporters of the bill pointed out that under the present so-called "local option" law the farmers outside the village or city limits have no voice on this question.

It would seem that the village is hardly a logical social unit to determine a question that is of such vital importance to all the people of the surrounding country.

The county is the unit for the support of paupers. The

county must stand the expense for the prosecution of criminals. Why then is not the county the logical unit to decide whether this pauper-breeding, crime-producing traffic shall be permitted or not?

Wrongs should never be licensed, and right acts need no license. An acknowledged evil like the liquor traffic should never be forced on the people of any community, and no community should be permitted to selfishly maintain such a traffic to the physical, moral, and financial injury of the people outside such community who are denied all voice or vote on the question.

The first attack upon the bill was made by Senator J. D. Sullivan of St. Cloud, who offered an amendment to force the liquor traffic on every community in the county in case a majority of the county voted "wet."

Senator Sullivan denounced the bill in a long and vigorous speech, declaring that it violated every principle of home rule and local self government—wholly ignoring the fact that his own amendment was a far worse violation of local self government.

This amendment of the St. Cloud senator was too much for even George H. Sullivan of Washington county, who declared himself a logical believer in the present local option system and would not stand for any law that forced the liquor traffic on any unwilling community—nor would he vote to deprive any community of liquor if they wanted it licensed.

The flaw in the last part of Geo. Sullivan's reasoning is this:

That the present so-called "local option" system does force the liquor traffic on the farmers who live outside the village limits, and without whom the village could not exist.

And it does force the expense of the traffic on the whole county, who must support the paupers and prosecute the criminals directly resulting from the license system.

In spite of the utter lack of logic and consistency the following twenty-nine senators voted for the J. D. Sullivan amendment:

Baldwin	Grose	Peterson, G. M.
Bonniwell	Handlan	Ries
Buckler	Healy	Rockne
Callahan	Hilbert	Steffen
Campbell, A. S.	Johnston	Sullivan, J. D.
Carley	Knopp	Swenson
Collester	McGarry	Van Hoven
Denegre	Millett	Weis
Dunn, W. W.	Nord	Westlake
Glotzbach	Pauly	

The following thirty-eight were against it:

Adams	Dwinnell	Holmberg
Alley	Gandrud	Jackson
Andrews	Gardner	Jones
Benson	Gillam	Lende
Blomgren	Gjeraset	Lobeck
Campbell, W. A.	Griggs	Nelson
Dunn, R. C.	Hanson	O'Neill
Duxbury	Hegnes	Orr

Palmer	Rustad	Vermilya
Peterson, E. P.	Rystrom	Vibert
Peterson, F. H.	Sageng	Wallace
Potter	Sullivan, G. H.	Ward
Putnam	Turnham	

The next attack was made by Senator W. W. Dunn of St. Paul, attorney for the Hamm Brewing Company, who tried to cut out the special election feature of the bill and mix the question up with all the distracting interests of a general election.

This plea for economy caught R. C. Dunn of Mille Lacs and Ward of Farimont; but Collester and G. M. Peterson voted against it and it was lost thirty-one yeas to thirty-six nays.

Then on motion of Geo. H. Sullivan, by a vote of thirty-seven to thirty, the date of the special election was fixed on Monday instead of Tuesday, for the benefit of traveling men.

It is difficult to see any valid objection to this amendment and there are good reasons for it. Yet it only secured the votes of the following "dry" senators: Adams, Wm. A. Campbell, Duxbury, Griggs, Hegnes, Jones.

All the other "drys" seemed to fear the "Greeks bearing gifts."

On final passage county option won 36 to 31 as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Griggs	Peterson, E. P.
Alley	Hanson	Peterson, F. H.
Andrews	Hegnes	Potter
Benson	Holmberg	Putnam
Blomgren	Jackson	Rustad
Campbell, W. A.	Jones	Rystrom
Dunn, R. C.	Lende	Sageng
Duxbury	Lobeck	Turnham
Dwinnell	Nelson	Vermilya
Gandrud	O'Neill	Vibert
Gillam	Orr	Wallace
Gjerset	Palmer	Ward

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baldwin	Grose	Ries
Bonniwell	Handlan	Rockne
Buckler	Healy	Steffen
Callahan	Hilbert	Sullivan, G. H.
Campbell, A. S.	Jonnston	Sullivan, J. D.
Carley	Knopp	Swenson
Collester	McGarry	Van Hoven
Denegre	Millett	Weis
Dunn, W. W.	Nord	Westlake
Gardner	Pauly	
Glotzbach	Peterson, G. M.	

John Lind.

After the bill had passed the Senate a hearing was held in the House chamber at which, among other speakers, Ex-Governor John Lind made a most effective argument for the bill, completely answering every point made by the paid

attorneys of the breweries who were there opposing the measure.

In the House the contest was long and fierce. The special order was set for eleven o'clock Wednesday morning, February 24th. Long before that hour arrived the galleries were packed with friends and foes of the bill.

Oratory was abundant; but mostly had little bearing on the merits of the measure.

Mr. Warner opened in favor of the bill with a speech that fairly set forth the reasons urged by its supporters.

He was followed by Mr. Carmichael, who eloquently defended the "foundations of our free institutions" which were in great danger of being overthrown if such a measure should ever become a law. Even our Christianity and Civilization are endangered.

Others who spoke for the bill were Hompe, Stenvick, Holmes, Wefald, Corning, A. F. Teigen, Bendixen and Bjornson.

Against the bill were H. H. Harrison, Lennon, Moeller, Pendergast, Minette, Dwyer, Devold, Gilman, Davis and Larimore.

Devold pleaded the cause of the workingman that would be thrown out of employment, wholly ignoring two important facts:

First, that any definite amount of money spent for liquor, only employs a small fraction of the labor that the same amount of money employs when spent for other necessities of life, and

Second, that under a county option system the readjustment of business would be very gradual and the displaced men would have plenty of chance to find other employment.

Mr. Lennon, who represents the district where the Minneapolis Brewing Company is located, made a strong plea against the bill, quoting President Wilson's argument for local option, but wholly ignoring the facts that Wilson favored local option as against no option, as a means of allowing the people to get rid of saloons, and further, that Wilson's words are a stronger plea still for county option, for he declared that the "people interested" should be allowed to vote on the question; and surely the people of the county are very especially interested.

Mr. Lennon also feared for the farmer whose corn would go begging in the market if it could not be sold to make whiskey of. He was forcibly answered by the statement that the farmers would "raise more hogs and less hell."

Larimore, Davis and Harrison declared their belief in state wide prohibition, and said they would vote for such a bill; but Mr. Larimore, at least had written a letter to the Saturday Lunch Club and to Mr. Chadbourne of the Association of Church Clubs, which are hardly capable of any other interpretation than that he would, if elected, vote for a county option bill.

It is hard to understand the vote of Mr. Sawyer against the bill. He has always heretofore voted for the measure, and time and again has declared that he would support county option and all other reasonable temperance measures.

Mr. Baker of Fillmore County also repudiated his written and verbal pledges and voted against the bill.

We can respect the honest opponent of county option, who made his campaign on that issue and faithfully carried out the will of his constituents; but what shall we think of the man who repudiates his pledges, misrepresents his district and casts his ballot against a measure that he was pledged and elected to support!

After nearly four hours of oratory for and against the bill, and when the liquor men began to see that they were defeated unless they could gain time to bring pressure to bear on some of the weaker ones that were pledged to support the bill, a desperate effort was made to take a recess.

If anything could beat this bill this would do it, but there were several opponents of the bill who refused to lend themselves to such tactics, and so all the attempts failed.

It was noticeable, however, that Spooner, Erickson, Sawyer and Baker voted with the wets to gain time.

On final passage Sawyer and Baker stayed with the wets, but Spooner and Erickson voted for the bill.

Why?—Perhaps Mr. Spooner can explain this course. He should be given every possible opportunity to do so. He will need it.

One vote was all that was needed, and it looked very much as if Mr. Spooner was helping them to get-it.

There were three motions for a recess. The first was offered by Mr. Lydiard and was voted down sixty-one to sixty-seven.

Four men who were pledged to support county option voted for this recess: Baker, Erickson, Sawyer and Spooner.

Four opponents of county option voted with the "drys" to defeat the motion for a recess, H. H. Harrison, Scott, Sliter and Swenson.

The next motion for a recess was offered by Mr. Erickson and was supported by the same four men pledged to county option. Only Scott, Swenson and Thornton of the wets opposed this motion.

Mr. Konzen, a county option man, was now feeling quite weak and sick, and felt that he must get out into the open air and get something to eat, so he moved to recess until seven p. m. This motion received only his own and the other four supposedly "dry" votes and was defeated sixty-three to sixty-five. Scott, Swenson and Thornton were the only "wets" to vote against this motion. At this point Mr. Spooner spoke in favor of a recess, saying he was very hungry.

It had now become plain that no recess could be secured, so the next move was to try to kill the bill by amendments:

The first amendment was offered by McGrath of St. Paul and attempted to exempt all cities of the state from the operation of the bill.

This was defeated fifty-two to seventy-five. Baker, Sawyer and Erickson voted for this amendment to kill the bill.

The following opponents of the bill refused to vote for this amendment to kill it: Brown, Burrows, Greene, H. H. Harrison, J. H. Hynes, Murphy, Novak, Scott and Swenson.

The next move to kill the bill was made by Gerlich of

Mankato who tried to exempt from its operation the three large cities of the state.

This amendment was lost thirty-nine to eighty-six, the thirty-nine were all consistent opponents of the bill and the following twenty-one who finally voted against the bill refused to help kill it in this way: Baker, Barten, Brown, Burrows, Green, H. H. Harrison, E. R. Hinds, J. H. Hynes, Kuntz, Malmberg, Miner, Minnette, Murphy, Nelson, Novak, Papke, Rodenberg, Sawyer, Scott, Smith, Stoetzel and Swenson.

After Mr. Welch had failed to amend the bill so as to permit a brewer located in a dry county to sell at wholesale within that county, the bill was passed by a vote of sixty-six to sixty-two.

Devold not voting, and Boyd, who was sick and excused, making up the total House of 130.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Holmes	Pratt
Anderson	Hompe	Putnam
Bendixen	Hulbert	Sanborn
Bernard	Johnson, J. T.	Searls
Bjorge	Johnson, M.	Sorflaten
Bjorklund	Kneeland	Southwick
Bjornson	Knutson	Spooner
Boehmke	Konzen	Stenvick
Christianson	Larson	Stevens
Corning	Lattin	Swanson
Dare	Lee	Teigen, A. F.
Dealand	Madigan	Teigen, L. O.
Erickson	Marschalk	Thompson, A. L.
Flinn	Marwin	Thompson, H. O.
Frye	Morken	Tollefson
Gill	Nordgren	Vasaly
Gordon	Norton	Warner
Grant	Olien	Wefald
Gullford	Parker	Weld
Harrison, J. M.	Peterson, A.	Wilson
Hauser	Peterson, A. M.	Wold
Hogenson	Pikop	Woodfill

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baker	Greene	Moeller
Baldwin	Haften	Mueller
Barten	Haislet	Murphy
Bessette	Harrison, H. H.	Nelson
Borgen	Hinds, E. R.	Nietzel
Bouck	Hynes, J. H.	Nimocks
Brown	Indrehus	North
Burrows	Kuntz	Novak
Carmichael	Larimore	Papke
Condon	Lennon	Pendergast
Davis	Leonard	Pless
Dunleavy	Lydiard	Ribenack
Dwyer	McGrath	Rodenberg
Ferrier	McLaughlin	Sawyer
Gerlich	Malmberg	Seebach
Gilman	Miner	Schrooten
Girling	Minnette	Scott

Sliter	Sudheimer	Welch
Smith	Swenson	Wilkins
Steen	Syverson	Mr. Speaker
Stoetzel	Thornton	

Great credit is due to Oscar A. Swenson of Nicollet county for his stand during the long contest.

He was expected by his constituents to vote against the bill and did so; but he stood out firmly in strong combat to some of those who voted for the bill on final passage, in his refusal to support any scheme for recess or delay to allow the "wets" to get in their work to defeat the bill; and he stoutly opposed all amendments to kill or emasculate it.

State Wide Prohibition.

This question came up in two different forms:

First, Prohibition by statute,

Second, Prohibition by amendment to the constitution.

There is little doubt that a statute prohibiting the manufacture, importation, and sale of all intoxicating liquors within the state of Minnesota would be declared constitutional.

There is some doubt whether this would be a wise course to pursue.

A statute passed by one legislature can always be repealed by the next or any succeeding legislature.

The question would not be settled. It would be all the while in politics. There would be a constant strife between "wets" and "drys." The liquor interests would be on the watch to secure a majority of each legislature favorable to the repeal of the statute. This would be almost sure to continue until one side or the other was worn out and ready to give up.

For these reasons many members of both houses were not willing to support the extremely drastic bills introduced into the Senate by Mr. Lobeck and into the House by Mr. Anderson.

The Lobeck bill came up on March 11th and received only 17 votes as follows:

Andrews	Hegnes	Putnam
Blomgren	Lende	Rystrom
Gandrud	Lobeck	Sageng
Gillam	Palmer	Turnham
Gjerset	Peterson, E. P.	Vermilya
Hanson	Peterson, F. H.	

Even some of these voted for the bill out of personal regard for Mr. Lobeck.

Constitutional Prohibition.

To submit the question to a vote of the people is a different matter.

The people are the source of all governmental authority. They alone can amend the constitution.

Senator Gandrud had introduced a bill to submit state wide prohibition to the people.

This bill came from the temperance committee with two reports:

Gandrud, Vermilya and Lobeck recommended the bill to pass.

Hilbert, Van Hoven, Pauly and Ward recommended indefinite postponement.

Twenty-eight voted to pass the bill—

Alley	Holmberg	Potter
Andrews	Jackson	Putnam
Benson	Jones	Rockne
Buckler	Lende	Rustad
Campbell, W. A.	Lobeck	Rystrom
Gandrud	O'Neill	Sageng
Gillam	Orr	Turnham
Gjeraset	Palmer	Vermilya
Hanson	Peterson, E. P.	
Hegnes	Peterson, F. H.	

In the House this question made much more noise.

When the county option bill was passed Mr. Larimore made a most bitter fight against it; but declared that he would favor a constitutional amendment for state wide prohibition.

A few days later he and Mr. Davis of Todd county introduced a bill for a constitutional amendment to be voted upon at the next election.

At the time of its introduction it looked very much as if such amendment would pass; but when the matter came up on March 25th on the question of indefinite postponement only 56 could be found to recommend the bill to pass.

Adams	Holmes	Sawyer
Anderson	Hompe	Searls
Baker	Hulbert	Sorflaten
Bendixen	Indrehus	Southwick
Bernard	Johnson, M.	Spooner
Bjorge	Larimore	Stenvick
Bjornson	Larson	Stevens
Christianson	Lattin	Swanson
Corning	Lee	Swenson
Davis	Marwin	Teigen, A. F.
Dealand	Morke	Teigen, L. O.
Flinn	Nordgren	Thompson, H. O.
Frye	Norton	Tollefson
Gill	Olien	Vasaly
Gordon	Parker	Wefald
Grant	Peterson, A.	Weld
Guilford	Pikop	Wilson
Hauser	Pratt	Wold
Hinds, E. R.	Putnam	

Seven who voted against county option voted to submit this amendment: Baker, Davis, E. R. Hinds, Indrehus, Larimore, Sawyer and Swenson.

Thirteen who voted for county option voted "no" on this question: Bjorklund, Boehmke, Dare, Erikson, Hogenson, J. T. Johnson, Kneeland, Konzen, Madigan, A. M. Peterson, Sanborn, A. L. Thompson, Warner.

It was evident that the House was in no mood to pass

a state-wide prohibition statute; for only 28 were willing to give the bill even a chance to be voted on:

Anderson	Lee	Southwick
Baker	Marwin	Stenvick
Bernard	Morken	Stevens
Christianson	Nordgren	Swanson
Corning	Norton	Teigen, L. O.
Frye	Olien	Thompson, H. O.
Grant	Peterson, A.	Tollefson
Hinds, E. R.	Pratt	Weld
Hulbert	Putnam	Wilkins
Johnson, M.	Sawyer	Wold
Larson	Searls	
Lattin	Sorfiaten	

Against the Road-side Saloon.

For many years the people of many parts of the state have been trying to get an act of the legislature that would prohibit the granting of licenses for the road-side saloons.

These saloons are outside the limits of police regulation of the cities and villages, and many of them have become the centers of crime and vice far beyond the imagination of any who are not familiar with their nightly orgies. Some of them have also become dens of gambling and prostitution.

In some places these roadhouses are fairly respectable, if saloons can ever be called respectable; but most of them are very tough.

Two years ago the House passed a bill by a very large majority prohibiting these road-side saloons, but the Senate so amended the bill that the board of county commissioners might grant a license if the town board should vote in favor, and the sheriff and county attorney order it.

The bill was lost in conference committee.

In the session of 1915 the temperance committee of the Senate in the absence of Mr. Vibert, divided evenly on the same question.

Pauly, Ward, Van Hoven and Hilbert were for the road houses.

Vermilya, Lobeck, Gandrud and Blomgren were against them.

The Senate voted against all road houses forty-one to twenty-four as follows:

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Gillam	Peterson, E. P.
Alley	Gjerset	Peterson, F. H.
Andrews	Grose	Potter
Benson	Hanson	Putnam
Blomgren	Hegnes	Rockne
Bonniwell	Holmberg	Rustad
Buckler	Jackson	Rystrom
Campbell, W. A.	Jones	Sageng
Collester	Lende	Swenson
Dunn, R. C.	Lobeck	Turnham
Duxbury	Nelson	Vermilya
Dwinnell	O'Neill	Vibert
Gandrud	Orr	Wallace
Gardner	Palmer	

Denegre and G. M. Peterson did not vote.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baldwin	Healy	Ries
Callahan	Hilbert	Steffen
Campbell, A. S.	Johnston	Sullivan, G. H.
Carley	Knopp	Sullivan, J. D.
Dunn, W. W.	McGarry	Van Hoven
Glotzbach	Millett	Ward
Griggs	Nord	Weis
Handlan	Pauly	Westlake

Later, on March 24th, the Senate passed the bill by a vote of forty-nine to fourteen as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Gjerset	Peterson, G. M.
Alley	Griggs	Potter
Andrews	Hanson	Putnam
Baldwin	Hegnes	Rockne
Benson	Holmberg	Rustad
Blomgren	Jackson	Rystrom
Bonniwell	Jones	Sageng
Buckler	Lende	Sullivan, G. H.
Campbell, W. A.	Lobeck	Swenson
Collester	Millett	Turnham
Denegre	Nelson	Vermilya
Dunn, R. C.	Nord	Vibert
Duxbury	O'Neill	Wallace
Dwinnell	Orr	Ward
Gandrud	Palmer	Weis
Gardner	Peterson, E. P.	
Gillam	Peterson, F. H.	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Callahan	Hilbert	Ries
Carley	Johnston	Steffen
Dunn, W. W.	Knopp	Sullivan, J. D.
Grose	McGarry	Van Hoven
Handlan	Pauly	

A. S. Campbell, Glotzbach, Healy and Westlake did not vote.

The house temperance committee, (James Dwyer, chairman) held this bill for about twenty days without reporting it out. This is five days more than the rules permit. Dwyer's committee was trying to smother the bill.

Saturday morning, April 10, Paul Guilford moved to take the bill away from the committee.

The opponents of temperance, headed by Girling of Hennepin and McGrath of Ramsey pleaded for time, but the House passed a resolution by Wefald compelling the committee to report in one hour.

Then the "wets" moved to recess until 1:30, but when that time was up they still continued to filibuster by motions to adjourn, demands for roll call and other methods of delay.

Fred Brown of Ramsey walked out of the house and could not be found. McGrath objected to any further business till all who had answered to roll call were in their seats. Brown was still out of sight. Speaker Flowers ruled with McGrath and the delay continued. Later he reversed his

ruling and the call of the House was dispensed with, seventy-five to twenty-four.

This is about the way the vote went on all questions. There were about thirty members absent. The temperance people had about ten more than enough to pass the bill, but lacked about ten of a two-thirds majority to suspend the rules.

It was plain that the temperance people could win in the end, but the "wets" decided to die hard, and they used up an entire day in a wholly useless attempt to save the road-side saloon, the very worst feature of our iniquitous license system.

How They Voted.

The following members voted against suspending the rules, which was regarded as one of the crucial roll-calls: Barten, Bessette, Borgen, Bouck, Boyd, Carmichael, Dwyer, Ferrier, Gerlich, Gilman, Girling, Kuntz, McGrath, McLaughlin, Minnette, Moeller, Nietzel, Nimocks, North, Papke, Pendergast, Pless, Ribenack, Rodenberg, Seebach, Schrooten, Scott, Steen, Welch.

On the final ballot the vote stood ninety-four to ten as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Hogenson	Peterson, A.
Anderson	Holmes	Peterson, A. M.
Baldwin	Hompe	Pikop
Bendixen	Hulbert	Pratt
Bernard	Johnson, J. T.	Putnam
Bjorge	Johnson, M.	Ribenack
Bjorklund	Kneeland	Rodenberg
Bjornson	Knutson	Sanborn
Boehmke	Konzen	Sawyer
Boyd	Larimore	Searls
Burrows	Larson	Schrooten
Carmichael	Lattin	Sliter
Christianson	Lee	Smith
Condon	Lydiard	Sorflaten
Corning	McGrath	Southwick
Dare	McLaughlin	Stenvick
Davis	Madigan	Stevens
Devold	Malmberg	Swanson
Dunleavy	Marschalk	Swenson
Dwyer	Marwin	Teigen, A. F.
Ferrier	Moeller	Teigen, L. O.
Frye	Morken	Thompson, H. O.
Gill	Mueller	Tollefson
Girling	Murphy	Vasaly
Gordon	Nietzel	Warner
Grant	Nimocks	Wefald
Guilford	Nordgren	Welch
Harrison, H. H.	North	Wilson
Harrison, J. M.	Norton	Wold
Hauser	Novak	Woodfill
Hinds, E. R.	Ollen	Mr. Speaker
Hynes, J. H.	Parker	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bessette	Gilman	Scott
Borgen	Kuntz	Steen
Bouck	Minnette	
Gerlich	Seebach	

Twenty-six did not vote. Of these Dealand, Flinn, Hafften, Spooner, Stoetzel, Syverson and Weld had been excused for the day. All the others had answered at roll call in the morning. Mr. Indrehus had been excused at noon. This left the following unaccounted for: Baker, Barton, Brown, Erickson, Greene, Haislet, Lennon, Leonard, Miner, Nelson, Papke, Pendergast, Pless, Sudheimer, A. L. Thompson, Thornton and Wilkins.

Only ten stood by the roadhouse to the last.

The So-Called Boxing Bill.

This bill professed to do three things.

First, to encourage clean and legitimate sport by legalizing "ten round exhibitions of the manly art of self defense."

Second, to create a state Athletic Commission to supervise and regulate all such exhibitions.

Third, to turn over ten per cent of the gross proceeds of these matches to the state to be used in the fight against the white plague.

But

"Ten round exhibitions of the manly art of self defense" are not now prohibited by law. The present law in no way interferes with any such proper sport.

The present law does interfere with any thing in the way of a prize fight.

The so-called boxing bill, as first drawn and introduced, did specifically repeal the present law against prize fights, but this feature was cut out of the bill.

So it would seem that if there is any field at all for its operation as finally passed, it creates a state commission to license and regulate "exhibitions" that are now legal and need no regulation.

Would the law empower the proposed commission to step in and regulate such exhibitions in Y. M. C. A., or athletic clubs or physical culture leagues?

If not where would be its field of operations? Any right and proper "exhibitions" need no license nor regulation.

Prize fights should not be licensed nor regulated nor even permitted at all.

It looks very much as if the only standing room this commission could possibly have would be to wedge its way in between illegal prize fights and perfectly proper "exhibitions."

It seems plain that the bill was intended to open the door to "exhibitions" that are not now permitted by law. If not why were the three sections of the existing law prohibiting prize fights specifically repealed?

The State a Partner.

But no matter what the law as finally passed may do for the prize fighters, it **does** put the state into partnership with whatever exhibitions would be legal and permitted under its provisions.

Is this wise?

Ought the state to interfere with, and place a special tax upon proper sport?

On the other hand ought the state to legalize and share in the proceeds of prize fights?

The advocates of this bill must hang themselves on one or the other horn of this dilemma.

The Methods of Its Promoters.

It was common talk about the capitol that the methods employed by the promoters of this bill were the most brutal and scandalous.

One clean and honest member who voted for the bill declared that he was forced to do so by threats that, if he did not, none of his bills would be permitted to pass. Several others admitted substantially the same thing.

Before passing the House the bill was amended as follows:

First, Corning moved to reduce the appropriation for the use of the commission from \$3,500 to \$1,200, and to increase the percentage of gross receipts for the benefit of the Tuberculosis Sanitoria from seven to ten per cent.

Second, Davis moved to amend so the law should apply only to the three large cities.

Third, Madigan moved to strike out the section which specifically repealed the existing statutes against prize fights.

Moeller and the friends of the bill were so eager to pass it that they accepted all these amendments.

As it passed the House it did not mean very much, but it never could have passed in its original form.

Here is the vote on final passage seventy-five to forty-seven.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Gordon	Novak
Baldwin	Greene	Papke
Bessette	Harrison, H. H.	Pendergast
Bjorge	Harrison, J. M.	Peterson, A. M.
Bjorklund	Hynes, J. H.	Pless
Boehmke	Hompe	Rodenberg
Borgen	Kneeland	Sanborn
Bouck	Konzen	Sawyer
Boyd	Kuntz	Searls
Brown	Larimore	Scott
Burrows	Lennon	Sorflaten
Carmichael	Leonard	Spooner
Condon	Lydiard	Steen
Corning	McGrath	Stenvick
Dare	McLaughlin	Stoetzel
Devold	Marschalk	Sudheimer
Dunleavy	Miner	Syverson
Dwyer	Minnette	Teigen, A. F.
Erickson	Moeller	Thornton
Ferrier	Mueller	Vasaly
Flinn	Murphy	Warner
Gerlich	Nelson	Welch
Gill	Nietzel	Wilkins
Gilman	Nimocks	Woodfill
Girling	North	Mr. Speaker

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Indrehus	Putnam
Bendixen	Johnson, J. T.	Seebach
Bjornson	Johnson, M.	Schrooten
Christianson	Knutson	Sliter
Davis	Larson	Smith
Dealand	Lattin	Southwick
Frye	Lee	Stevens
Grant	Mädigan	Swanson
Guilford	Morken	Swenson
Hafften	Nordgren	Teigen, L. O.
Haislet	Norton	Thompson, A. L.
Hauser	Olien	Thompson, H. O.
Hinds, E. R.	Parker	Tollefson
Hogenson	Peterson, A.	Wilson
Holmes	Pikop	Wold
Hulbert	Pratt	

Eight members did not vote: Baker, Barton, Bernard, Malmberg, Marwin, Ribenack, Wefald, Welch.

In the Senate it was plain that the advocates of this bill were trading with the opponents of the Mayo proposition.

The great objection to the Mayo affiliation scheme was that it would put the state into partnership with a private enterprise.

The boxing bill did the same.

And yet the following twenty-three Senators who voted to put the state into partnership with the boxing and sparring industry, voted against state partnership with the Mayos: Adams, Andrews, Baldwin, Bonniwell, Callahan, Wm. A. Campbell, Carley, W. W. Dunn, Gardner, Glotzbach, Griggs, Grose, Handlan, Hilbert, Jackson, Knopp, Millett, Nord, Pauly, G. M. Peterson, Ries, Turnham and Van Hoven.

Surely here is something that needs explanation. The following eleven senators consistently voted for both partnerships:

Buckler, A. S. Campbell, Denegre, R. C. Dunn, Healy, Johnston, Jones, O'Neill, Steffen, Vibert and Westlake.

The following thirteen senators voted consistently against both partnerships:

Alley, Blomgren, Gillam, Gjerset, Hanson, Holmberg, Lobeck, Rustad, Rystrom, G. H. Sullivan, J. D. Sullivan, Swenson, Weis.

These thirteen were consistent not only with themselves but also with the principle that the state ought not to become a partner in private enterprise of any kind.

Several of those who voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation can easily defend their course on the ground that the Regents had passed a resolution to the effect that they had no intention or desire to enter into any such permanent arrangement.

After the friends of the boxing bill had defeated an amendment to cut out the state's share in the proceeds, the bill passed the Senate thirty-five to thirty-two.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Bonniwell	Campbell, A. S.
Andrews	Buckler	Campbell, W. A.
Baldwin	Callahan	Carley

Denegre	Hilbert	Pauly
Dunn, R. C.	Jackson	Peterson, G. M.
Dunn, W. W.	Johnston	Ries
Gardner	Jones	Steffen
Glotzbach	Knopp	Turnham
Griggs	McGarry	Van Hoven
Grose	Millett	Vibert
Handlan	Nord	Westlake
Healy	O'Neill	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Alley	Holmberg	Rustad
Benson	Lende	Rystrom
Blomgren	Lobeck	Sageng
Collester	Nelson	Sullivan, G. H.
Duxbury	Orr	Sullivan, J. D.
Dwinnell	Palmer	Swenson
Gandrud	Peterson, E. P.	Vermilya
Gillam	Peterson, F. H.	Wallace
Gjerset	Potter	Ward
Hanson	Putnam	Wels
Hegnes	Rockne	

After this bill had passed both houses the Governor was very strongly urged to veto it, but he signed it on the last day, and so the bill became a law.

CHAPTER IX.

EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY.

These are good words to conjure with, but they may mean much or little.

Everyone admits that the machinery for the administration of our state government is neither efficient nor economical.

For fifty years or more there has been a steady growth in the wrong direction.

Board after board, commission after commission, has been created, appointed by the Governor and given large powers, but responsible to no one.

These boards and commissions serve without pay except necessary expenses; but each has its paid secretary and large number of assistants and workers.

In the nature of things each is all the while on the alert to enlarge the field of its operations, and to get from the state all the money possible.

Such a system is bound to be both inefficient and extravagant; and in both these directions our state administration has reached a high degree of perfection.

What is the Remedy?

Former Governor Eberhardt appointed another unauthorized, unpaid commission of thirty more or less prominent men, and asked them to investigate and report. Some of them did little or nothing, and some of them worked hard and faithfully.

The product of their labors was a very complete report in the form of a bill for an act pretty thoroly upsetting and making over all that part of our state government having to do with the administration of our public affairs.

Nearly all the boards and commissions were abolished and a very beautiful and complete plan was adopted, correlating all the parts, each department under a high paid head appointed by the Governor and responsible to him. This plan gave the Governor very great power and responsibility.

The Good In It.

Now concentration of responsibility is very good. It is well that the people know who is running things.

The plan also established a good budget system requiring all departments of the state government to report their needs for money to the Governor, and requiring him to submit all these estimates to the legislature early in the session, thus allowing ample time for full consideration and intelligent action.

Another good feature was a fairly well worked out **civil service system** which would prevent the Governor and the heads of departments from filling the service with henchmen and politicians.

Then the commission told us that we must take their plan just as it was—all or none.

Objections.

Of course such a plan as this would arouse objections. And there were plenty of them right soon—some valid and some senseless, but plenty of them.

I. The Board of Control.

Perhaps the most efficient part of our state administration is the board of control. It has always been composed of able, honest and capable men. It has never known politics. It has appointed for merit and removed for cause, never asking nor knowing the party of the applicant.

The efficiency and economy bill abolished this board, and turned over its work to one commissioner appointed by the Governor for two years only. Many objectors thought that this looked very much like politics.

II. The Public Examiner.

This bill made the public examiner subordinate to the state auditor. Now the public examiner has to check up the accounts of the state auditor. Is it right to set a hired man to checking up his boss?

If the constitution could be so amended as to take the land department and all other public business away from the auditor, leaving him with no duties except as a state accounting officer, then he could be, and would be, the logical public examiner, but until this can be done the public examiner should not be subject to any department whose accounts he must check up.

III. The Natural Order.

You can't make a full grown man in a minute.

You can't rip your state government from top to bottom and put it together again at one stroke.

Things don't come about that way. Changes come slowly, generally one at a time.

There were other objections. Some thought it gave the

Governor too much power—too much opportunity to build up a great political machine. Some did not like Mr. Spooner, who was chairman of the house committee that had the bill in charge. Nearly every member felt that the bill tried to do too much at once. Most of them had too little time to study it, and were not willing to vote for a thing they did not understand.

The more the bill was discussed the less chance it seemed to have. The harder Mr. Spooner worked to make its provisions known, the more unpopular it became until finally, by a sort of general consent, it died without ever coming to a real test.

Even a second message from the Governor urging its passage could not save it.

The Seven Sisters.

When it began to look as if the big efficiency and economy bill could not command much support, Representative Gordon moved for the appointment of a special committee to draft and present to the legislature such bills as they might think practical for correcting abuses in the administration of the state government.

This committee brought in seven simple bills, each designed to correct an acknowledged fault.

The Budget.

I. First a bill establishing a complete budget system. This bill passed the House with only Mr. Haislet against it. Later it passed the Senate and is now the law of the state. Thus is one of the greatest defects in our state government corrected.

Game and Fish.

II. Second a bill abolishing the game and fish commission, and turning over its duties to one commissioner appointed by the Governor. Only 31 voted against this bill.

Bjornson	Hynes, J. H.	Ribenack
Bouck	Kneeland	Rodenberg
Boyd	Kuntz	Schrooten
Carmichael	Larimore	Sorfaten
Devold	Lennon	Spooner
Dwyer	Lydiard	Steen
Ferrier	Miner	Syverson
Gerlich	Nietzel	Thornton
Haislet	Nimocks	Woodfill
Harrison, J. M.	North	
Hinds, E. R.	Olien	

The Senate passed this bill and the Governor signed it.

Hotel Inspector.

III. Third a bill to abolish the office of hotel inspector and turn over the duties of that office to the dairy and food department. Only nine voted against this bill.

Brown	Dwyer	Hynes, J. H.
Carmichael	Haislet	McLaughlin
Condon	Harrison, J. M.	Miner

This bill was passed by the Senate but vetoed by the Governor after the legislature had adjourned.

It is generally conceded that the hotel inspector's office is merely a place where hotel and restaurant keepers mail their fees for inspection, without getting much inspection.

State Capitol and Grounds.

IV. A bill to put the State Capitol and grounds under the board of control. Only 15 voted against this bill.

Boyd	Hynes, J. H.	Nietzel
Carmichael	Indrehus	North
Dwyer	Lennon	Rodenberg
Gerlich	Madigan	Schrooten
Haislet	Miner	Steen

In the Senate Mr. Duxbury's committee reported against this bill and he was sustained by a vote of 45 to 18.

Oil Inspection.

V. A bill to abolish the department of oil inspection and impose the duties thereof upon the dairy and food commission. This bill passed the House by a vote of 74 to 26.

There were strong objections to this bill.

First, there were many who wanted to abolish oil inspection entirely. Inspection is wholly useless, now that gasoline is worth about twice as much as kerosene. No oil refiner would leave any light explosive oil in kerosene.

Second, the cost of inspection is now borne by the oil companies, and if it should be done by the dairy and food department it would be an expense to the state. The Senate sustained the majority report of the Duxbury committee by 35 to 23.

Mr. Christianson had introduced a very well considered bill to abolish oil inspection and provide penalties for the sale of impure or adulterated oil.

This was the most sensible proposition of all, as it did away entirely with the whole grafting political machine that has so long disgraced the state under the pretense of oil inspection.

But many house members thought it would be better to put this work under the control of the dairy and food department and leave that department to use its judgment as to inspection and to employ its regular force of inspectors to do such work as might be required.

This bill received 59 votes but was lost because it takes 66 votes to pass a bill.

Fire Marshal.

VI. A bill to give the Insurance Commissioner control over fires and explosives and to abolish the office of Fire Marshal.

This bill passed the house 67 to 47; one more than enough but was recalled the next day on motion of Mr. Stoetzel.

The friends of the Governor were active in opposition to this bill; that helped to recall it, but there were others who did not like the Insurance Commissioner, S. D. Works; and, were determined to give him as little power as possible.

State Inspectors.

VII. A bill to provide for the appointment of State inspectors, one or more to each senatorial district, according

to the size of the district and the work to be done. These inspectors were to have the same duties as are now performed by all the various inspectors who now travel at state expense. This included game wardens, forest rangers, fire marshals, factory inspectors, dairy and food inspectors, hotel inspectors, etc.

The bill lacked eight votes of passing. The vote stood 58 to 53.

This bill had been amended by Mr. Pratt to leave out forest rangers.

Mr. McGrath moved to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was lost, and his motion carried. On motion of Mr. Warner it was then placed on the calendar subject to amendment, but was not reached and died there.

Thus a start was made in a modest and quiet way toward remodeling our state administration and placing it on a more rational basis.

The Carley Resolution.

Senator Carley introduced a resolution providing for a commission of eleven members to be appointed by the governor to recommend reforms in the State administration. Later this resolution was amended on motion of Senator Duxbury, making the commission to be composed of four to be appointed from the House by the speaker, four from the Senate by the lieutenant governor and three to be appointed by the governor.

This resolution passed both Senate and House by large majorities.

CHAPTER X.

PROPOSED LAWS THAT FAILED.

Efficiency and economy commission's bill to reorganize state civil administration.

Woman suffrage amendment to the state constitution.

Prohibition, statutory and constitutional.

Restoration of capital punishment as first degree murder penalty.

State census.

Limiting expenditures of iron range cities in the interest of the mine owners.

St. Louis county division into two counties.

Constitutional convention to revise organic law.

Recall amendment to the state constitution.

"Blue sky" legislation to regulate sale of securities.

Bill aimed at trading in grain "futures" in Minnesota.

Legalizing party conventions to recommend candidates for primaries.

Bill amending the Minneapolis union station act passed by 1913 legislature.

Abolishing state tuberculosis sanatorium commission.

Abolishing state fire marshal's office.

Abolishing the oil inspection department of the state government.

Placing care of capitol buildings under state board of control.

Bill to prohibit linking of university medical school with Mayo foundation, lost in the House.

Repeal of Minneapolis civil service law, killed in Senate.
 Amendment of Minneapolis civil service law, lost in house.
 Anti-tipping bill, killed in the Senate.
 Minneapolis housing act, desired by Civic and Commerce
 association.

Abolishing hotel inspection department. (Vetoed.)
 "Blue milk" bill, reducing butter fat standard of milk.

Spoiling the Merit System.

The Legislature of 1913 passed a law establishing the merit system in the civil service of the city of Minneapolis. St. Paul and Duluth had provided for this system in their new home rule charters.

The merit system means death to the spoils system.

Ward heelers and party clackers have no special privilege in securing city employment.

Like all others they must stand or fall according to their fitness for the jobs they seek.

The Other Side.

Yet this question is not all one sided.

Civil service commissions and examiners are very prone to regard mere book learning in picking men for public employment. Their rules are often arbitrary and technical.

Probably in most cases book learning is good, yet it is far from being the only qualification; and it may easily happen that much bookishness is worse than none. The man who knows nothing but books, is very poorly fitted for anything else.

Both the spoils system and the so-called "merit system" are about equally apt to fill the services with fossils and barnacles; and once in, it is harder to get them out under civil service than under the other system.

The Pension System.

Another evil of the civil service system is that it fosters the pension system.

It tends to establish an office holding class, and to retire them on pension when they can no longer do their work.

The pension system is vicious.

Why should the workers be burdened with taxes for the support of superannuated clerks and bookkeepers and other public job holders?

Why not pension carpenters, plumbers, farm hands and hired girls?

The Remedy.

What then is the remedy?

Shall we abolish the civil service and restore the spoils system?

I think not. And yet this extreme is not much worse than the other.

Make the examinations practical, cut out the frills and red tape. Give heads of departments reasonable discretion in choosing and discharging. They will not be very likely to discharge without cause so long as they are powerless to fill the places with friends or henchmen.

Above all things no man in the civil service should be

deprived of his right of citizenship. Of course he must not neglect his duties to do party work or run for office, but the mere fact of filing for nomination or attending political meetings should not be sufficient reason for discharging a faithful public servant. The poor man in the ranks should have the same right in this respect as the President, the Cabinet Minister, the Governor or the Mayor, and any civil service system that denies these rights needs amending.

Early in the session James Dwyer introduced a bill to do away with the merit system entirely, and eleven of the Hennepin delegation in the House lined up in favor of it.

Perhaps, if there had been no other way to get rid of the pedantry and other admitted evils of the system this plan should not be too severely condemned.

But there is another way.

Norton and Marwin brought forth a bill amending the civil service act—cutting out its objectionable features, and making it more rational and workable.

But Dwyer and the spoils men refused to yield, and insisted on going back to the spoils system.

Here is the line up of the Hennepin House members.

For the Dwyer Bill: Dwyer, Wilson, Dunleavy, Lennon, Nimocks, Condon, Devold, Swanson, Lydiard, Girling and Larimore.

For the Norton and Marwin Bill: Norton, Marwin, Kneeland, Sawyer, Guilford, Harrison and Hulbert.

On Friday, Feb. 19, the Minneapolis civil service question came up in the House—on the question of adopting the majority or minority report of the committee on cities.

The majority report favored the Dwyer bill to abolish the merit system in Minneapolis entirely; whereas the minority report, fathered by Thos. Kneeland, favored the Norton and Marwin amendments to improve the service by getting rid of its most objectionable features and putting it on a more fair and common sense basis.

The contest lasted for over two hours.

Kneeland, Sawyer, Marwin, Guilford, Harrison and others defended the merit system.

Dwyer, Lydiard, Girling, Lennon and Dunleavy declared the whole system vicious—"conceived in sin and born in iniquity," as Lennon put it.

It is very unfortunate that the legislature must be annoyed and burdened with such purely local matters; but as long as the people of Minneapolis fail to adopt a Home Rule Charter their local affairs will have to be thrashed out in every session of the legislature.

Many honest country members have no means of knowing the real merits of these local contests and frequently vote in a way they would not if they could know all the facts.

On the final line up the vote stood as follows.

For the Norton and Marwin plan, forty-eight:

Adams	Bjornson	Grant
Anderson	Christianson	Guilford
Bendixen	Corning	Harrison, J. M.
Bernard	Dealand	Hauser
Bjorge	Frye	Hogenson
Bjorklund	Gordon	Hompe

Hulbert	Morken	Sawyer
Indrehus	Nordgren	Searls
Johnson, M.	Norton	Southwick
Kneeland	Olien	Stenvick
Larson	Parker	Teigen, L. O.
Lattin	Peterson, A.	Thompson, A. L.
Lee	Pikop	Tollefson
Madigan	Pratt	Warner
Marwin	Putnam	Wefald
Minnette	Sanborn	Weld

For the Dwyer bill, fifty-five:

Baldwin	Knutson	Rodenberg
Barten	Kuntz	Seebach
Bessette	Larimore	Schrooten
Borgen	Lennon	Smith
Bouck	Leonard	Sorflaten
Boyd	Lydiard	Steen
Carmichael	McGrath	Stevens
Condon	McLaughlin	Stoetzel
Davis	Malmberg	Sudheimer
Devold	Miner	Swanson
Dunleavy	Nelson	Swenson
Dwyer	Nietzel	Syverson
Ferrier	Nimocks	Welch
Flinn	North	Wilkins
Gerlich	Novak	Wold
Girling	Papke	Woodfill
Haften	Pendergast	Mr. Speaker
Haislet	Pless	
Hynes, J. H.	Ribenack	

Mr. Sorflaten saw his mistake a few minutes after the thing was over, but it was too late to change his vote.

Later the Senate passed the bill introduced by Wm. A. Campbell reforming the Minneapolis system along the lines of the Norton and Marwin amendments.

So when the Dwyer bill came up in the House on Apr. 9, the situation was decidedly mixed.

The Senate had cut out the most glaring evils of the Minneapolis system; but Dwyer, Lennon and Dunleavy were determined to restore the spoils system.

The bill finally passed seventy-two to forty.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baker	Dunleavy	Konzen
Baldwin	Dwyer	Kuntz
Barten	Flinn	Larimore
Bendixen	Frye	Lennon
Bessette	Gerlich	Leonard
Boehmke	Gill	Lydiard
Borgen	Gilman	McGrath
Bouck	Girling	McLaughlin
Boyd	Greene	Madigan
Brown	Haften	Malmberg
Burrows	Harrison, H. H.	Marschalk
Carmichael	Hinds, E. R.	Moeller
Condon	Hynes, J. H.	Murphy
Davis	Johnson, M.	Nietzel
Devold	Knutson	Nimocks

North	Schrooten	Teigen, A. F.
Novak	Steen	Thornton
Papke	Stenvick	Warner
Pendergast	Stevens	Welch
Pikop	Stoetzel	Wilkins
Pless	Sudheimer	Wilson
Ribenack	Swanson	Wold
Rodenberg	Swenson	Woodfill
Seebach	Syverson	Mr. Speaker

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Hauser	Peterson, A.
Anderson	Holmes	Pratt
Bernard	Hompe	Putnam
Bjorge	Hulbert	Sanborn
Bjorklund	Indrehus	Sawyer
Bjornson	Johnson, J. T.	Searls
Christianson	Kneeland	Sorflaten
Corning	Larson	Thompson, A. L.
Dealand	Lattin	Thompson, H. O.
Erickson	Lee	Tollefson
Gordon	Marwin	Vasaly
Grant	Mueller	Weld
Guilford	Norton	
Harrison, J. M.	Olien	

The following eighteen did not vote: Dare, Ferrier, Haislet, Hogenson, Miner, Minnette, Morken, Wilson, Nordgren, Parker, Peterson, A. M. Scott, Sliter, Southwick, Spooner, L. O. Teigen, Wefald.

In the Senate the contest was more intense if possible than in the House, but less spectacular. Pauly and Dwinnell were the chief actors, and Dwinnell did make a strong impression. His keen analysis of the situation, his unmasking of the forces behind the bill, the way he scored the spoils system which they sought to re-establish, all helped defeat the bill and save the merit system.

Pauly's oratory was unavailing. He could only master twenty-six votes.

Wm. A. Campbell was in a peculiar dilemma. He had declared at two mass meetings in his district that he would vote to repeal the civil service law if it could not be amended. His amendments, which the Senate had passed were held up in the House by Dwyer and others who were determined not to amend but to repeal. He would have been justified in voting against the bill, but he stuck to the letter of his pledge and voted yes.

The bill was defeated twenty-six to thirty-four.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baldwin	Grose	Pauly
Benson	Handlan	Ries
Callahan	Healy	Steffen
Campbell, W. A.	Hegnes	Sullivan, G. H.
Collester	Hilbert	Sullivan, J. D.
Dunn, R. C.	Johnston	Turnham
Dunn, W. W.	Knopp	Van Hoven
Glotzbach	McGarry	Weis
Griggs	Nord	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams	Hanson	Putnam
Alley	Holmberg	Rustad
Andrews	Jackson	Rystrom
Blomgren	Lende	Sageng
Campbell, A. S.	Lobeck	Swenson
Carley	Nelson	Vermilya
Denegre	O'Neill	Vibert
Duxbury	Orr	Wallace
Dwinnell	Palmer	Ward
Gandrud	Peterson, E. P.	Westlake
Gillam	Peterson, F. H.	
Gjerset	Potter	

Seven senators refused to vote: Bonniwell, Buckler, Gardner, Jones, Millett, G. M. Peterson, Rockne.

Medical Legislation.

For many years the American Medical Association has been trying to secure legislation both in Congress and in the state legislatures that would shut out all healers of the sick except the regular doctors.

Early in the session of 1915 a bill was introduced by Dr. Andrews, senator from Blue Earth county and by Mr. Sawyer in the House which prohibited even the Christian Scientists and all other drugless healers from the practice of the healing art. An identical bill was introduced in several other states.

This bill aroused a most tremendous opposition. The Christian Scientists particularly were most bitter in their denunciation of the tyranny of such a law. The authors withdrew the bill and the Christian Scientists were appeased.

Later, on March 15, Senators Hilbert and Andrews introduced another bill.

A Bill.

For an act entitled, "An act requiring persons desiring to practice any system of healing, curing or relieving any human disease, ailment, abnormality or infirmity, other than the several schools or systems now recognized and regulated by law, to procure license therefor from the state board of medical examiners, and prescribing the method of granting and revoking such license and penalties for violation of any of the provisions of this act."

This bill lets out Christian Scientists and other spiritual and mental healers; but compels the chiropractors and all other so-called irregulars to come in and submit to the State Board examinations.

Now the state board of medical examiners is composed wholly of the so-called regular doctors.

Why should not the chiropractors have a board of their own to examine applicants for admission to practice, just as the regular doctors do—just as the osteopaths do—just as the dentists do—just as the veterinarians do—just as the barbers do—just as the lawyers do?

Why should not the law treat all alike, giving to each school of healing the regulation of its own members?

Why should the nature cure doctor, or the chiropractor,

or the osteopath, or the hydropath, or the healer who advises fasting, or systems of diet, or he who administers massage,—why should any of these healers be required to pass an examination prepared by doctors who may know nothing of any of these methods of ministering to the sick, and who are admittedly hostile to them?

Why should any class of healers be given any advantage over any other class?

Why can't they all be satisfied with a fair field and no favors?

How would the drug doctors like it if they had to pass an examination prepared by a board composed of osteopaths, or chiropractors, or by other healers who are utterly opposed to all drugs?

The Other Side—The People's Side.

Then again, what about the sick and suffering people? Can't the people be trusted to choose their own health advisers? May they not be supposed to know what they want; or if they do not know, can't they find out?

We are told that all these laws making it a crime for any but the drug doctors to minister to the sick, are in the interest of the people. But have the people asked for them?

Have the people thronged our legislative halls and asked for laws to protect themselves from their own mistakes in choosing their health advisers?

Nature a Careful Teacher.

How very careful nature is to protect us against any poisonous or injurious substances!

How she has developed in us a wonderful and delicate sense of taste, by which we instinctively reject whatever is likely to injure us!

Thru untold ages, in the evolution of man, those who have possessed this protecting instinct to the highest degree have escaped the poisons and lived to hand down to their offspring these powers of self defense.

Nearly all children revolt at the taste of drugs and poisons of all kinds. Not until later in life do we acquire the unnatural taste for hurtful things.

Where should be the burden of proof?

Should not the drug doctors be called upon to prove their case? Are not the presumptions against them, rather than against those who discard drugs and depend upon natural methods to heal the sick and suffering?

Are not the probabilities in favor of those who seek to remove causes, rather than of those who suppress symptoms?

Isn't it natural that we should object to taking poisonous drugs into our stomachs, or permitting the injection of foul and filthy substances into our blood streams?

The osteopath and the chiropractor seek to put our bones into their natural and proper places, so they will not press upon our blood vessels and nerves, and thus interfere with their proper functioning. They practice the delicate art of manipulating our muscles and the organs of our body, thus stimulating them to greater activity and helping to throw off the poisons that have been produced by the destruction of cells and from improper food and drink.

The dietitian teaches us what foods are wholesome and what are injurious. He shows us how such poisons as alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs affect our various organs and their functions, and warns us against their use.

Man is the only animal that doesn't know enough to stop eating and keep still when he doesn't feel well. But we are learning, and some day we shall be wise enough to refuse to eat when we ought to fast,—refuse to work when we ought to rest,—refuse to stimulate our system with alcohol and other poisons when they are calling and calling for quiet and repose.

The nature cure doctor teaches us the importance of sunshine, fresh air, pure water and wholesome food,—of well ventilated dwellings, offices and workrooms,—and shows us how to live in all respects in harmony with the physical laws of our beings.

The spiritual and mental healers inspire us with hope and trust, show us the influence of the mind upon the body, and lead us along the paths of pure and wholesome living, physically, mentally, morally and spiritually.

Why then should laws be passed subjecting these people to fines, penalties and imprisonment for no other reason than because they treat disease without drugs, advise their patients how to conserve their vital forces, and to so live that health, strength and length of days shall be theirs?

Surely no laws should be passed giving any class of healers a monopoly, nor depriving the people in any way of their natural and inherent right to choose their own health advisers as well as their own spiritual ministers.

Very many old school doctors realize all this. They accept these new and better methods and use them in their practice. Many of them scorn to ask law-created favors and oppose all such legislation.

But all people are selfish, and doctors are no exception. Many of them are so filled with the idea that their methods are the only ones, that they are willing and eager to compel all to follow in their path, and make it a crime to depart therefrom.

Hence come these restrictive and tyrannical medical laws.

But the people are learning wisdom, and their representatives are reflecting this knowledge.

It is becoming harder and harder to put on to the statute books laws of this kind.

Altho this particular bill was reported out of the Senate committee unanimously, it soon lost caste and finally Dr. Hilbert himself moved its indefinite postponement.

Thus ended all attempts to strengthen the hold of the regular medical doctors on the business of ministering to the sick and suffering.

The Chiropractors Bill.

Early in the session Mr. Southwick introduced a bill to create a board of examiners for chiropractors, the same as the regular doctors have their board, and the osteopaths theirs.

This looks very reasonable, but many members did not think so; for there was a determined fight made against the bill by Marwin, Kneeland and Lydiard.

Southwick, Hompe, Parker, Malmberg, Davis, Ferrier, Pless, Minnette and H. H. Harrison all spoke for the bill, and several of them gave instances within their own knowledge, of cases, given up by regular doctors, that had been helped or cured by chiropractors.

All this did not avail, for the bill could only secure sixty-two votes.

This leaves the chiropractors right where they are now. They can all go on with the practice of their profession, but they are wholly unregulated.

Perhaps it would be just as well if all doctors were left free to practice, each in his own way, subject to responsibility for the results of his work. Perhaps fewer people would be killed by drugs, poisons, serums, vaccine, antitoxin and "successful" surgical operation.

I don't suppose the doctors of any school will like this chapter; but this is about the way it appears to one ordinary layman who has spent some time in the study of the structure and functions of the human body and the action of drugs thereon; the importance of healthful exercise, proper food, pure water, fresh air, good thoughts and a happy disposition.

Education.

The question of education is always a very important one, but it seldom comes up in such form as to give a very clear idea as to the general tendency of the members.

In 1915 there were two phases of this question presented.

First, admitting the necessity for economy, where shall the cut be made?

The sentiment of the legislature was overwhelming that if any department had to suffer the University must be forced to cut down expenses. The common schools must be sustained. This point was brought out strongly when the House, on motion of Mr. Christianson, voted to add an extra million dollars to the appropriation for rural schools.

This was cut out in the Senate, and the rural schools lost this additional amount.

Centralizing the School System.

For some years the state department of education has been advocating a system of centralization for the country schools of the state that would take away from the people of the local districts practically all control of their local schools and invest it in a county board of education for each county. This board, to be elected by the whole people of the county, was to have general charge of all schools in the county, the hiring and discharging of all teachers, the prescribing of courses of study, the building of all school houses, and the county superintendent of schools was to be appointed by this board, instead of being elected by the people as now.

Here was a very ambitious scheme of centralization in the country school system, which met with almost universal disapproval from the members of both houses especially those from the rural districts. The system was denounced as undemocratic, imperialistic and destructive of local interest and pride in the little school by the roadside.

The idea was so unpopular that it was quickly abandoned.

The Grain Question.

For many years the farmers of the northwest have complained of unfair treatment at the hands of the old line elevator companies all thru the country districts, and from the terminal elevators and Chamber of Commerce at the city of Minneapolis.

The different elevator companies combined to keep the price of grain down at the primary markets; and when the farmers organized and built their own elevators, a systematic campaign was waged to destroy them and drive them out of business. The line elevator companies would offer a price above the market, until the farmers' elevator was bankrupt, and then down would go the price and the farmers would be robbed.

The farmers also complained of the weighing and inspecting systems at the terminal markets.

The grain inspectors are personally friendly with the elevator men and the millers and it is no more than human that they should be influenced by such friendship. In fact it is almost impossible not to be so influenced. The effect has been to grade low when the grain comes in—a little lower than the true grade; and then when the grain is sold out of the elevators it will grade considerably higher.

It is an undisputed fact that much more high grade grain goes out than comes in.

Of course much of this is due to mixing and cleaning at the terminal elevators; but the farmers claim that this will not account for all of the difference.

Again it was charged that the cupola scales used by the terminal elevators to weigh the grain as it comes from the cars were sure to leak more or less and thus give short weight. But the greatest cause for complaint against the cupola scales comes from the fact that in connection with this method of weighing, a powerful fan is used to blow the dust out of the grain before the weight is taken and a considerable amount of grain is blown away with the dust. This is a clear loss to the producer and an equal gain to the elevator company.

It is almost impossible for any one to engage in the grain business unless he can become a member of the Chamber of Commerce, and the price of such membership is exorbitantly high.

Another complaint was that licensed grain dealers sold their own grain to fill the best orders and sold grain consigned to them to fill the poorer orders, this giving their customers the worst of the bargain.

Futures.

Is there any harm in buying or selling grain or anything else for future delivery?

Does even betting and gambling have any effect on the price of grain?

Very many people think so; others think not. We frequently hear it said, "The gamblers fix the price of grain and rob the producers of millions."

On the other hand it is claimed that the grain gamblers,

like stock gamblers or any others who take that kind of risks, hurt no one but themselves.

"Selling grain that does not exist hammers the price down;" this is a common remark.

Reliable testimony shows that there are three hundred times more futures sold than could be covered by the actual grain in the market.

But doesn't buying grain that doesn't exist shove the price up?

Or is this the true explanation: The man who sells grain that he doesn't own, thinks, the price will go down and he can buy cheaper any time before the day of delivery. So he bets on his belief. If his judgment is good he wins.

The man who buys grain that he doesn't ever expect to receive really believes that the price will go up and that he can sell at a profit. If the price does go up, he wins his bet; if it goes down he loses:

Do these transactions in any way affect the price of grain, except as each side by false rumors may try to influence the market? and haven't the bulls and bears each an equal chance to put the market up or down?

Well, however this may be, bills were introduced to correct all these evils.

I. A bill by Mr. Welch to require every certificate of inspection to "set forth the test weight per bushel of the grain so inspected."

II. A bill by Mr. Johnson to provide for the weighing of all grain on track scales, and to abolish entirely the system of cupola scales now in use.

III. A bill by Mr. Knutson to impose a tax on all sales for future delivery in which contracts were not filled and delivered. This bill passed the House but was lost in the Senate.

IV. A bill by Magnus Johnson to prohibit unfair discrimination in the sale or purchase of grain.

V. A bill by Magnus Johnson to prohibit licensed grain dealers from selling their grain in competition with grain consigned to them.

VI. A bill to open the Chamber of Commerce and Duluth Board of Trade to all comers on payment of \$1000 for membership and to prevent memberships ever being more than that price, also to force the Chamber to make its deliberations public, to give the railway and warehouse commission access to these proceedings, and to prevent the expulsion of any member except as the result of a court decree.

VII. A bill by A. F. Teigen to prohibit all sales for future delivery, unless the seller actually owned and had the goods on hand at the time of the sale and at a designation.

This bill was very hotly contested and would have passed the House without doubt if it could have been so amended as to satisfy members that it would not prohibit hedging.

The price of grain is always lower just after the harvest. The reason for this is so simple as to need no explanation. Many grain growers have no means of housing their grain and hence must throw it on the market immediately.

The country elevators must accept grain for storage. Their capacity is soon filled and they must sell this stored

grain that they do not own, in order to make room for other grain as it comes in.

The price is almost sure to go up, and the owners of this grain may come in at any time and demand settlement.

If the elevator owners are prohibited by law from "hedging," that is, buying an option on grain for future delivery to cover the grain that they have been forced to sell and ship out, they would be obliged to stop receiving grain as soon as their elevator was full; and the farmers would be obliged to store their own grain.

All millers sell flour for future delivery, would this bill prohibit such sales?

Creameries and cheese factories contract to sell their products for future delivery—products which they do not then own—would this bill prohibit such sales?

The author of the bill said "No," but many members were not satisfied and voted against the bill.

There is no particular significance in the vote on this bill. Most of the actual farmers voted for it, several St. Paul members were for it expecting in return votes for the boxing bill, and they got some of them.

None of these bills passed both houses. They simply indicate a wide spread dissatisfaction with our system of handling grain.

CHAPTER XI.

A NON-PARTISAN LEGISLATURE.

The Minnesota legislature of 1915 is probably the first and only non-partisan legislature that ever met in any state in the Union.

No member of this legislature was elected because he was a Republican, a Democrat, a Prohibitionist, a Socialist or a Progressive.

His party politics had probably very much less to do with his election than the church he belonged to.

Each candidate had to make his canvass for votes on his personal character and fitness and upon the things he stood for.

Of the one hundred and thirty members of the house, about thirty have voted the democratic ticket with more or less regularity, tho several of them would not admit to a very strong party feeling.

Two are Prohibitionists, two are Socialists. There are probably several who voted for Roosevelt, and a number of very independent Republicans, several of whom are great admirers of President Wilson, and probably voted for him.

In the Senate it is much the same. Out of sixty-seven members one has been a party Prohibitionist; one was a Socialist; one a Populist. Sixteen had been known as Democrats, tho one, at least, had never been much of a party man. The other forty-eight had usually been classed as Republicans, tho many of them had been very independent, and a considerable number had voted for Roosevelt or Wilson.

On the whole the members of both houses probably reach a higher level of intelligence, honesty, sincerity, independence and devotion to their ideals and what they regard as their duty to their constituents, than any other Legislature

that has ever met in the State. This is largely due to the fact that no one could wave the party banner and secure votes because of his real or pretended belief in Jefferson or Jackson, Lincoln or Roosevelt.

The time has passed when the crack of the party lash can make the members jump.

The people are sending a more intelligent and independent set of men here to make their laws, and they can't be blindly led.

It is a sure thing that some of the very best and ablest men in both House and Senate could not have been here under the partisan system.

Vermilya and Lobeck, Sageng and Jones in the Senate could hardly have been possible, if they had been obliged to run as Democrat, Prohibitionist, Populist and Socialist.

If those four men had been defeated, then indeed the Senate would have been reactionary.

Of course there are a few reactionaries here that probably couldn't have succeeded under a partisan system, but in most cases there is no assurance that any better men would have been elected.

However there is one thing that is quite certain. If the party system had been in force, Mr. Flowers would not have been Speaker of the House and the whole organization of that body would have been different. What the final result would have been no one can tell. The Non-partisan system will improve—more and more, fearless and independent men will be chosen. The people will learn and they will reflect that knowledge in the character of their representatives. Both the people and their representatives will be freed from party fear and superstition and forced to look every question squarely in the face, and we may reasonably expect a steady improvement.

We got the County Option Bill in spite of the bad organization of the present House, and I don't believe it would ever have passed the Senate if it hadn't been for Jones and Vermilya, defeating Pugh and Stebbins—who have always fought to a finish against county option.

Some of the city dailies and country weeklies have been charging all the sins of this legislature to the fact that it was non-partisan; but was it as bad as that of 1909, or 1911, both of which were partisan and controlled by the reactionary Republicans. It certainly saved the people over a million dollars a year in the matter of expenditures over the partisan legislation of 1913, which was controlled by the Progressive Republicans.

The real fault with the legislature of 1915 was because it was organized by an unholy alliance between the breweries and the big corporate interests. Whether such an alliance would have been possible under a partisan system no one can tell. We know it has been in the past.

The salvation of this legislature rests with the independent men in it, some of whom at least could not have been here under a party system. Daily these independent men turned down committees and overthrew the organization, until the unholy alliance was utterly powerless.

Some Laws That Passed.

Passed a county option law.

Passed "road house" bill prohibiting saloon licenses outside of cities and villages.

Provided for a budget system of making appropriation estimates before legislature meets.

Passed Minnette bill giving state railroad and warehouse commission power to regulate telephone rates and service.

Created women's reformatory as a new state institution.

Repealed the Elwell road law.

Amended Dunn road law in important particulars.

Amended workmen's compensation law as agreed to between representatives of capital and labor.

Required public service corporations to pay employees semi-monthly.

Passed enabling act permitting negotiations for a new Minneapolis street railway franchise.

Submitted initiative and referendum amendment to the voters again.

Resubmitted "revolving fund" amendment to state constitution.

Gave insurance commissioner supervision of fire insurance rating bureaus and right to change rates found unfair or discriminatory.

Passed statewide teachers' endowment and retirement fund.

Abolished "second choice" feature of primary election law.

Amended presidential preference primary law to give direct vote on candidates for president.

Revised schedule for state aid to public schools.

Created game and fish commissioner with full power over department, superseding former commission of five.

Submitted amendment increasing supreme court to seven members.

Passed a stringent law governing the sale of narcotics.

Abolished fees for inspection of weights and measures by state.

Amended Cashman distance tariff law, making Twin Cities one terminal.

Created an interim commission on efficiency and economy.

Reduced the state tax levy.

Appropriated \$17,910,000 for various purposes.

Eliminated supreme court from new historical society building and permitted selection of new site.

Legalized 10-round boxing contests under supervision of a state athletic commission.

What the Legislature Spent.

Compilation by the state auditor shows the following total for 1915 appropriations, covering the two years ending July 31, 1917:

State departments	\$5,523,796
Charitable institutions	4,783,533
Educational institutions	7,124,760

Miscellaneous	477,911
---------------------	---------

Total	\$17,910,000
-------------	--------------

Total of 1913 session.....	19,094,168
----------------------------	------------

Total of 1914 session.....	17,662,308
----------------------------	------------

Estimated receipts from special taxes for the next two years are \$14,180,000, leaving \$3,730,000 to be raised by the general property tax. The maximum levy fixed to raise this is 1.4 mills, compared with 2.3 mills in 1913. The state will raise \$1,800,000 a year for its revenue fund from real and personal property tax the next two years, compared with \$3,100,000 a year provided in 1913.

CHAPTER XII.

THE RECORDS OF THE MEMBERS.

The way a man votes on important bills is a pretty fair method of judging of his fitness as a legislator; but not a perfect measure of that fitness.

In the legislature of 1915 were many men who were elected on one side or the other of the question of county option.

These men are worthy of credit in so far as they kept their pledges and met the expectations of their constituents; but the man who violates his pledges and misrepresents his constituents is worthy of the most severe condemnation; and what shall we say of the man who votes for a bill because he does not dare do otherwise, but works on the quiet against it and does all he can to kill it?

The true test of a man's honesty, independence and real democracy, comes when he is confronted with some new and unexpected question that goes to the roots of our institutions.

If he is a true democrat he will line up right. If he is a plutocrat, an aristocrat or a champion of privilege, he is pretty sure to get on the wrong side.

I have not used the word "progressive" in characterizing members. It has ceased to mean much.

IN THE SENATE.

The following are perhaps the best tests:

I. County Option—to submit to the people of each county the question "Shall the Sale of Liquor be Prohibited within the County."

II. Road house bill—Here the test came on the amendment to permit the County Board to license on recommendation of the Town Board, the Sheriff and the County Attorney.

III. The vote on both Constitutional and Statutory Prohibition is here included, though neither can be regarded as a vital test, for neither was much of an issue before the people; yet there is the fundamental question "Shall an evil be legalized or prohibited?"

IV. The same question is involved in both the boxing bill and the Mayo proposition: "Shall the State enter into partnership with private enterprises—especially those of doubtful merit or morality?"

V. The question of Easier Amendment of the Consti-

tution, as presented by the Sullivan amendment to the Initiative and Referendum bill.

VI. Equal Suffrage—Shall the voters of the state be allowed to determine whether or not women may have the ballot?

VII. Repeal of the Elwell road law; yet in the three large cities the question had not been given much discussion.

VIII. The Civil Service Repeal bill involves an important principle.

IX. The Semi-Monthly Pay Day hinged upon the right of men to get their pay from Public Service Corporations within a reasonable time after they had earned it.

X. The Street Railway bill has been included, though whether it is a very dangerous measure, now depends upon the city council and the voters of Minneapolis. The company was eager to have it.

XI. The patronage deal and election of president pro tem. are here included. They are worth considering.

CHARLES E. ADAMS, Lake, Cook and East end of Duluth.—Lawyer; for Sullivan for president pro tem., but supported county option; was against prohibition, but voted to prohibit all road houses; was against equal suffrage, though his vote was expected to be for it; voted against easy amendment of the Constitution, but was for the initiative and referendum on final passage; for the semi-monthly pay day and opposed the repeal of the civil service; voted for the boxing bill, but against the Mayo affiliation; for street railway franchise; against repeal of the Elwell road law.

J. T. ALLEY, Buffalo, Wright Co.—Lawyer; member of the House in 1901 and Senator 1903-5; opposed the patronage deal; voted for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option; constitutional prohibition and against all road houses, but voted against prohibition by statute; for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; opposed the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation, and the repeal of the civil service; for street railway franchise.

JOHN W. ANDREWS, Mankato, Blue Earth Co.—Physician and Surgeon; member of the American Medical Association; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option, and prohibition, and against all road houses; for equal suffrage, civil service, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum; opposed Mayo affiliation, but voted for the boxing bill, the street railway bill, and against repeal of the Elwell road law; against semi-monthly pay day.

JOHN H. BALDWIN, Frazee, Becker Co.—Lawyer; for many years a prominent Republican politician; from a wholly dry district; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, and all temperance laws, except that he voted for the anti-road house bill on final passage; against equal suffrage and easy amendment of the constitution, but was for initiative and referendum on final passage; against civil service, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for street railway bill and boxing bill, but opposed Mayo affiliation.

HENRY N. BENSON, St. Peter, Nicollet and Sibley Co's.—Lawyer; Senator in 1911-13; opposed the patronage deal, candidate of the progressive forces for president pro tem.; for county option, constitutional prohibition, and against all road houses, but opposed prohibition by statute; for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, repeal of Elwell road law, semi-monthly pay day; favored street railway franchise, repeal of civil service, and Mayo affiliation, but was against the boxing bill.

THEODORE C. BLOMGREN, Cambridge, Isanti and Anoka Co.'s—Banker; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option, anti road house bill and statutory prohibition, but against constitutional prohibition; for equal suffrage and initiative and referendum, but against easy amendment of the constitution and the semi-monthly pay day; for repeal of Elwell Road law, and against both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; voted for the street railway bill.

H. H. BONNIWELL, Hutchinson, McLeod Co.—Lawyer and blooded stock farmer; comes from a district strongly opposed to equal suffrage and county option; was for Benson for president pro tem., refused to go into the patronage deal; against county option, equal suffrage and prohibition, but for the anti road house bill; for initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; favored the boxing bill, but opposed Mayo affiliation; against street railway bill, and did not vote on civil service repeal, regarding it as a Minneapolis matter; made a strong fight for the rural schools, and against imperialism in education.

R. T. BUCKLER, Crookston, Polk Co.—Farmer and large land owner; for Sullivan for president pro tem., and against county option, and prohibition by statute, but was for the anti road house bill and for constitutional prohibition; against equal suffrage and easier amendment of the constitution, but for initiative and referendum; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the street railway bill, boxing bill and Mayo affiliation; refused to vote on the repeal of civil service, regarding it a Minneapolis local matter.

J. G. CALLAHAN, represents a district comprising both sides of the river from the steel arch bridge north to Minneapolis city limits.—Lawyer; for Sullivan for president pro tem., and against county option, and all the temperance laws; for initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day and against the Mayo affiliation; but was for the boxing bill, street railway bill, and repeal of civil service; against repeal of the Elwell road law, and easier amendment of the constitution.

A. S. CAMPBELL, Austin, Mower and Dodge Counties.—Flour miller; for Sullivan for president pro tem., and against county option, all temperance measures, and easy amendment of the constitution; favored the street railway bill, the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; for initiative and referendum, repeal of Elwell road law, and for semi-monthly pay day, and against repeal of the civil service; voted against equal suffrage, (See chapter on Equal Suffrage).

WM. A. CAMPBELL, 11 and 12 Wards, Minneapolis.—Traveling salesman. Member of the House in 1909-11-13; opposed the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem., and for all temperance measures except statutory prohibition, for equal suffrage, easy amendment of constitution, initiative and referendum, repeal of Elwell law, semi-monthly pay day, and against the street railway bill; for repeal of civil service, after his efforts to amend the law had failed; for the boxing bill, but against the Mayo affiliation; tried to extend state insurance to county buildings, but was outvoted.

JAMES A. CARLEY, Plainview, Wabasha Co.—Lawyer, former County Attorney, member of the House in 1909; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, and all temperance laws, but was for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, repeal of the Elwell road law, and against repeal of the civil service; for street railway bill, and against semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and against Mayo affiliation; author of the resolution establishing an efficiency and economy committee to report to the next legislature.

E. B. COLLESTER, Waseca, Waseca and Steele Counties.—Lawyer. Member of Senate in 1895-7—and in 1903-5; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, and all temperance laws except the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage, repeal of Elwell road law, and semi-monthly pay day; for repeal of civil service, the street railway bill and the Mayo affiliation, but opposed the boxing bill; voted for easy amendment to the constitution and initiative and referendum.

JAS. D. DENEGRE, Fourth and Seventh Wards, St. Paul.—Lawyer, elected unopposed, Senator in 1911-13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, and prohibition, but voted for the anti-road house bill; the only member of the senate labor committee to oppose the bill requiring public service corporations to pay their employees semi-monthly; for equal suffrage and initiative and referendum, and against repeal of civil service; for the street railway bill, the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation, and against easy amendment of the constitution and repeal of the Elwell law.

R. C. DUNN, Princeton, Mille Lacs, Sherburne and Kanabec Counties.—Owner Princeton Union and former State Auditor, member of the House in 1911 and 13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; supported county option, the anti-road house bill and equal suffrage; opposed initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution, and semi-monthly pay day; voted for repeal of civil service, for the street railway bill, the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; was excused from voting on Elwell road law.

W. W. DUNN, Second and Third Wards of St. Paul and Ramsey Co. east of Rice St.—Lawyer, Vice President and Attorney for the Hamm Brewing Co., elected unopposed, has been in House or Senate since 1896; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; voted for the semi-monthly pay day; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, and repeal of Elwell law.

favored repeal of civil service, the street railway bill, the boxing bill and opposed the Mayo affiliation.

F. A. DUXBURY, Caledonia, Houston and Fillmore Counties.—Lawyer, Senator 1911-13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; voted for county option and the anti-road house bill, but opposed prohibition, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, easy amendment to the constitution, and semi-monthly pay day; against repeal of civil service and the boxing bill, but for the Mayo affiliation and the street railway bill.

WM. S. DWINNEL, Fourth Ward, Minneapolis.—Lawyer, member American Bar Association, officer and director of various corporations, Senator in 1911-13; for Benson for president pro tem., and for county option and all temperance laws except prohibition; for equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution, semi-monthly pay day; opposed the repeal of the Elwell law, and favored street railway bill; favored the Mayo affiliation, but made a strong fight against the boxing bill and repeal of civil service.

P. A. GANDRUD, Sunburg, Kandiyohi and Swift Counties.—Merchant and Banker, opposed the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution and repeal of Elwell road law; against repeal of civil service; for street railway bill and against semi-monthly pay day; opposed the boxing bill, voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

GEO. H. GARDNER, Brainerd, Crow Wing and Morrison Counties.—For Sullivan for president pro tem., against county option, against forcing licensed saloons on dry territory, if county should vote wet; a faithful supporter of all reasonable labor laws; author of the semi-monthly pay day bill; against prohibition but for the anti-road house bill; for equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution, and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but against the Mayo affiliation and the street railway bill; refused to vote on repeal of civil service, regarding it a local Minneapolis question.

C. W. GILLAM, Windom, Cottonwood and Jackson Counties.—Banker and merchant, opposed the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution, repeal of Elwell Road law; favored semi-monthly pay day bill, but was absent and did not vote; opposed the repeal of civil service, the street railway bill, the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation.

OLUF GJERSET, Montivedeo, Chippewa and Lac Qui Parle Counties.—Lawyer; opposed the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, but opposed easy amendment of the constitution; favored repeal of the Elwell road law; opposed repeal of Civil service and both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; voted for the street railway bill and against semi-monthly pay day.

FRANK L. GLOTZBACH, Faribault, Rice Co.—Druggist; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; opposed all temperance

laws, equal suffrage and easy amendment of the constitution, but voted for initiative and referendum; favored repeal of civil service and the street railway bill, and opposed semi-monthly pay day; voted for the boxing bill, but against the Mayo affiliation; voted to repeal Elwell road law.

O. H. GRIGGS, Virginia, N. E. Dist. of St. Louis Co.—Lawyer, former owner of Light and Power Co.; elected unopposed; opposed the patronage deal, but voted for Sullivan for president pro tem.; voted for county option, but opposed all other temperance laws; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day, initiative and referendum, but was against easy amendment of the constitution and repeal of the Elwell road law; favored repeal of civil service, the street railway bill, the boxing bill and opposed the Mayo affiliation; senate leader in favor of the boxing bill.

THOS. J. GROSE, Seventh and Thirteenth Wards, Minneapolis.—District Manager Brotherhood of American Yeoman; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws except the anti-road house bill; opposed equal suffrage, the repeal of the Elwell road law and easy amendment of the constitution, but voted for initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day; favored repeal of civil service, the street railway bill, the boxing bill and opposed the Mayo affiliation.

JAS. HANDLAN, Eighth and Twelfth Wards, St. Paul.—Meat dealer, member of the House 1909 and Senator 1911-13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, repeal of Elwell road law, and easy amendment of the constitution, but did vote finally for initiative and referendum, and favored semi-monthly pay day; favored repeal of civil service, the street railway and the boxing bill and opposed the Mayo affiliation.

A. L. HANSON, Ada, Norman and Mahnomen Counties.—Senator 1911-13, Banker, elected unopposed; opposed the patronage deal, and was for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, semi-monthly pay day, repeal of the Elwell road law, initiative and referendum; opposed the street railway bill, the boxing bill, the Mayo affiliation and repeal of the civil service.

JOHN A. HEALY, Hibbing, N. W. part of St. Louis Co.—Hotel Keeper; was a supporter of Sullivan for president pro tem., but was not present and could not be found to vote. Against county option, and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day, and repeal of the Elwell road law; voted for the street railway bill, the boxing bill the Mayo affiliation and the repeal of the civil service.

N. S. HEGNES, Argyle, Kittson, Roseau and Marshall Counties.—Banker; opposed the patronage deal, but was for Sullivan for president pro tem.; was for county option and all temperance laws, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum; but opposed equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day, and repeal of Elwell road law; favored repeal of civil service, the street railway bill and the Mayo affiliation, but opposed the boxing bill.

PIERRE A. HILBERT, Melrose, West end of Stearns Co.—Physician; elected unopposed; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; opposed all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day, easy amendment of the constitution, but voted for initiative and referendum and to repeal the Elwell road law; was for the street railway bill, the boxing bill, repeal of the civil service and opposed the Mayo affiliation.

N. J. HOLMBERG, Renville, Renville Co.—Farmer, member of the House 1907-9-11-13; against the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; voted for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, but was against semi-monthly pay day; was for the street railway bill, but against both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation and also against repeal of the civil service.

JOSEPH A. JACKSON, N. E. part of St. Paul.—Lawyer, member of the House in 1899-1901-2; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; against equal suffrage but favored initiative and referendum, easy amendment of the constitution and semi-monthly pay day; opposed street railway bill, civil service repeal and Mayo affiliation, but voted for the boxing bill.

JAMES JOHNSTON, Bertha, Todd and Wadena Counties.—Farmer and stock raiser, member of the Senate 1907-9-11-13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; opposed all temperance laws, equal suffrage, and easy amendment of the constitution, but voted for initiative and referendum, the repeal of the Elwell road law and the semi-monthly pay day; favored the street railway bill, the boxing bill, the Mayo affiliation and the civil service repeal.

RICHARD JONES, central portion of Duluth.—Lawyer, youngest man in the Senate; on a radically progressive platform he defeated Pugh, the oldest man in the last four sessions; refused to enter the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, semi-monthly pay day, initiative and referendum, but opposed repeal of the Elwell road law; favored both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation, but was against the street railway bill and did not vote on civil service repeal.

SAMUEL M. KNOPP, Winona, Winona Co.—Farmer, member of the House in 1913; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; opposed all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum; but favored the semi-monthly pay day bill and repeal of Elwell road law; against the street railway, but for civil service repeal; for the boxing bill, but against the Mayo affiliation.

OLAI A. LENDE, Canby, Yellow Medicine and Lyon Counties.—Lawyer; member of the Senate 1911-13; opposed the patronage deal and was for Benson for president pro tem.; was for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and

referendum, repeal of Elwell road law; against the street railway bill and repeal of civil service; against the boxing bill, but for the Mayo affiliation; did not vote on the semi-monthly pay day bill, had been excused and was absent.

E. E. LOBECK, Alexandria, Douglas and Pope Counties.—Farmer, leader of the prohibition forces; refused to enter the patronage deal and for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option, author of the state-wide prohibition bill; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day, repeal of Elwell road law; against street railway bill, boxing bill, Mayo affiliation and civil service repeal.

P. H. MCGARRY, Walker, Cass and Itaska Counties.—Member of the House in 1909-1913, proprietor of a summer resort at Walker, original owner of Walker town site; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, all temperance laws, equal suffrage, Elwell road law repeal, easy amendment of the constitution, but favored initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day; for the street railway bill, civil service repeal, the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation.

JAMES M. MILLETT, Hastings, Dakota Co.—Lawyer, formerly County Attorney; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; opposed all temperance laws and equal suffrage, but favored easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the street railway bill, and semi-monthly pay day, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for the boxing bill, and against Mayo affiliation.

SAMUEL B. NELSON, Luverne, Rock and Nobles Counties.—Leading merchant of Rock Co. for many years, one of the Minnesota delegation that nominated Woodrow Wilson for president; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and the anti-road house bill, but against prohibition; against equal suffrage and easy amendment of the constitution, but for initiative and referendum and repeal of the Elwell road law; against street railway bill, but also against semi-monthly pay day; against civil service repeal and the boxing bill; voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

LEONARD H. NORD, International Falls, Koochiching and Beltrami Counties.—Head of the Enger-Nord Realty Co. of Minneapolis, International Falls and Fort Francis, Ontario; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, repeal of Elwell law and easy amendment of the constitution, but for initiative and referendum; for street railway bill, civil service repeal, and the boxing bill; against Mayo affiliation; was absent and did not vote on semi-monthly pay day, but was supposed to favor the bill.

D. P. O'NEIL, Thief River Falls, Pennington, Red Lake and Clearwater Counties.—Farmer, first elected to the legislature by the Farmers' Alliance in 1892 from Big Stone County, member of the house 1893-1899-1911-13, refused the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and the anti-road house bill, but against prohibition;

for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day, repeal of Elwell road law, easy amendment of constitution, initiative and referendum; against repeal of civil service, but for street railway bill and boxing bill; against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

CHARLES N. ORR, Tenth and Eleventh Wards, St. Paul.—Lawyer, had an excellent record for two terms in the House; for Benson for president pro tem., for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum but against semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against street railway bill, civil service repeal and boxing bill; voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

FRANK L. PALMER, Southeast part of Minneapolis.—Real estate dealer, had an excellent record for two terms in the house; for Benson for president pro tem., for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, but opposed repeal of the Elwell road law; against street railway bill, civil service repeal, and the boxing bill; voted against the bill to prohibit Mayo affiliation.

JOHN W. PAULY, Northwest part of Minneapolis.—Cigar manufacturer, member of the Senate in 1911-13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, Elwell road law repeal, easy amendment of the constitution, but for initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day; for street railway bill, civil service repeal and boxing bill, but opposed Mayo affiliation.

E. P. PETERSON, Litchfield, Meeker Co.—Lawyer, had an excellent record for four years in the Senate; refused to enter the patronage combine; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, repeal of Elwell road law, and semi-monthly pay day; for the street railway bill, but against civil service repeal; against the boxing bill, but also against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

F. H. PETERSON, Moorhead, Clay and Wilkin Counties.—Lawyer, had an excellent record in the Senate in 1907 and 1909; refused to enter the patronage combine; for Benson for president pro tem.; leader of the county option forces; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, Elwell road law repeal and semi-monthly pay day bill; against street railway bill, civil service repeal and the boxing bill; voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

GEO. M. PETERSON, Western part of Duluth.—Agent for Retail Merchants' Association, and particularly interested in bills proposed by the Retail Grocers' Association; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, prohibition, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution and Elwell road law repeal, but voted for initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day; for the street railway bill and the boxing bill, but opposed the Mayo affiliation; did not vote on the anti-road house bill nor on civil service repeal.

L. E. POTTER, Springfield, Brown and Redwood Counties.—Farmer; refused the patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem., for county option and all temperance laws, except statutory prohibition, for equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law; for easy amendment of the constitution, but against semi-monthly pay day; against the street railway bill, the boxing bill and civil service repeal; voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

FRANK E. PUTNAM, Blue Earth, Faribault Co.—Lawyer; elected unopposed; serving his fourth term in the Senate; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum; for the street railway bill but against civil service repeal; against the boxing bill but voted against prohibiting the Mayo affiliation; against semi-monthly pay day and did not vote on repeal of Elwell law; the very capable chairman of judiciary committee.

JOHN B. RIES, Shakopee, Scott and Carver Counties.—Bottling business; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day, but voted for repeal of Elwell road law; for the street railway bill, civil service repeal, boxing bill and against Mayo affiliation.

A. J. ROCKNE, Zumbrota, Goodhue Co.—Lawyer, member of the House 1903-5-7-9, in the Senate 1911-13; for Benson for president pro tem.; against county option; for the anti-road house bill and constitutional prohibition, but opposed statutory prohibition; against equal suffrage but for semi-monthly pay day, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law; against the street railway bill, and the boxing bill; voted against the bill prohibiting the Mayo affiliation and did not vote on the civil service repeal. As chairman of the Finance Committee Mr. Rockne is largely responsible for saving over a million of dollars in the appropriations.

EDWARD RUSTAD, Wheaton, Traverse, Big Stone, Grant and Stevens Counties.—Elected unopposed; lawyer, member of the Senate 1911-13; refused patronage deal; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition, for equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law, but was against the semi-monthly pay day; for the street railway bill, but against the boxing bill, the Mayo affiliation and civil service repeal.

J. A. RYSTROM, North Branch, Chisago and Pine Counties.—Manager North Branch Milling Company; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum and repeal of the Elwell road law, but opposed the semi-monthly pay day; against street railway bill, civil service repeal, boxing bill and Mayo affiliation.

OLE O. SAGENG, Dalton, Otter Tail Co.—Farmer; member of the Senate since 1906; leader against patronage combine; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option

and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the street railway bill, civil service repeal and boxing bill; one of the authors of the bill prohibiting the Mayo affiliation, but withdrew his support of the bill when the regents passed a resolution to the effect that they would make no permanent affiliation.

JOHN STEFFEN, Pipestone, Pipestone, Murray and Lincoln Counties.—Farmer; for Sullivan for president pro tem; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, but voted for the semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, boxing bill and Mayo affiliation, but against the street railway bill.

GEORGE H. SULLIVAN, Stillwater, Washington Co.—Lawyer; member of the Senate since 1908; leader of the patronage deal, and successful candidate of the combine for president pro tem.; was against county option of any kind, and all other temperance laws; against equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution and semi-monthly pay day, but did vote for initiative and referendum after he had succeeded in spoiling it; for repeal of Elwell road law; voted for the street railway bill and civil service repeal, but opposed both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation.

JOHN D. SULLIVAN, Benton Co., City of St. Cloud and East end of Stearns Co.—Lawyer; member of the Senate 1911-13; elected unopposed from a very wet district; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, yet led the fight for an amendment to force liquor onto all parts of a county if it voted wet; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, and semi-monthly pay day, but voted for initiative and referendum and repeal of the Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but against both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; did not vote on the street railway bill.

C. L. SWENSON, Albert Lea, Freeborn Co.—Banker; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against county option, but voted for anti-road house bill; opposed equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and easy amendment of the constitution, but voted for initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law; for the street railway bill, but opposed civil service repeal and both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation.

GEORGE A. TURNHAM, Long Lake, Hennepin Co.—Road and bridge contractor; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law, but favored the street railway bill, civil service repeal, the boxing bill and opposed the Mayo affiliation.

PETER VAN HOVEN, Fifth and Sixth Wards, St. Paul.—Meat packer; member of the Senate 1911-13; for several years member of St. Paul board of public works; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage,

easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law; but was for the semi-monthly pay day; for the street railway bill, civil service repeal, boxing bill, and against the Mayo affiliation.

J. I. VERMILYA, Dover, Olmstead Co.—Farmer; refused patronage combine; for Benson for president pro tem.; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, easy amendment of the constitution, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day, and leader of the forces for the repeal of the Elwell road law; against the street railway bill, civil service repeal and the boxing bill; voted against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

FRED D. VIBERT, Cloquet, Carlton and Aitkin Counties.—Editor "Pine Knot"; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; for county option and the anti-road house bill, and equal suffrage; against prohibition, easy amendment of the constitution, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the street railway bill, but opposed civil service repeal; for both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; for initiative and referendum.

CARL L. WALLACE, Eighth Ward, Minneapolis.—Lawyer and real estate dealer; member of the House 1899-1901-1905-1909 and Senate 1911-13; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; for county option, anti-road house bill and equal suffrage, but opposed prohibition, semi-monthly pay day, repeal of the Elwell road law and easy amendment of the constitution, but did vote for initiative and referendum; for the street railway bill, but against civil service repeal and the boxing bill, also against the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

ALBERT L. WARD, Fairmount, Martin and Cottonwood Counties.—Banker; elected unopposed; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; supported county option, but opposed prohibition and the anti-road house bill; opposed equal suffrage and easy amendment of the constitution; favored the semi-monthly pay day, Elwell road law repeal and initiative and referendum; for the street railway bill, but against civil service repeal; fought the boxing bill most bitterly, but refused to support the bill to prohibit the Mayo affiliation.

HARRY F. WEIS, Le Sueur, Le Sueur Co.—Banker; member of the Senate since 1906; delegate to national Democratic convention in 1912; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and easy amendment of the constitution, but for initiative and referendum; for the street railway bill and civil service repeal; against both the boxing bill and the Mayo affiliation; did not vote on the repeal of the Elwell law.

E. J. WESTLAKE, Fifth and Sixth Wards, Minneapolis.—Insurance; member of House 1913; for Sullivan for president pro tem.; against equal suffrage and all temperance legislation; fathered the bill to increase passenger rates, and was always lined up on the side of the special interests; against semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell law; against easy amendment of the constitution, but voted for the initiative and referendum; for the street railway bill, but against civil service repeal; for the boxing bill and Mayo affiliation.

IN THE HOUSE.

Some of the questions came up in different form.

I. County option and prohibition were practically the same as in the Senate.

II. The test on the road house bill was over the question whether it should come to a vote at all. Those who fought all day to prevent this can hardly be called friends of the bill, even tho they did vote for it on final passage.

III. The boxing bill was the same in the House, but the Mayo affiliation was not tied up with it there as it was in the Senate.

IV. Here the initiative and referendum bill presented a plain, simple issue between a good bill or none at all. Only twelve reactionaries said none at all.

V. Civil service repeal, the Elwell road law repeal, the street railway bill and the semi-monthly pay day presented about the same problems in both houses.

VI. The question of equal suffrage in the House was quite different—not to submit it to the voters, but to empower women to vote for presidential electors and at the presidential preference primary.

VII. The speakership was perhaps as good a test as any.

ELMER E. ADAMS, Fergus Falls, Otter Tail Co.—Banker; for twenty-eight years editor Fergus Falls Journal; engaged also in flour milling and jobbing business; member of the House 1905-7-9; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, state-wide prohibition and the abolition of all road houses; for woman's suffrage and against repeal of civil service; for the boxing bill and against semi-monthly pay day; excused and absent when Elwell road law repeal was voted on; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill; a member who always had to be shown.

A. V. ANDERSON, Goodhue, Goodhue Co.—Farmer; member of the House in 1911; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, prohibition and the abolition of road houses, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and repeal of civil service; for the Guilford amendments to the street railway bill and against the bill.

S. D. BAKER, Chatfield, Fillmore Co.—Farmer; member of the House in 1911; for Flowers for speaker, tho elected on a temperance platform; against county option, tho his campaign cards contained the words "I am for county option"; for prohibition, but did not vote on the road house bill; against equal suffrage, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for repeal of civil service, but did not vote on the boxing bill; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

C. H. BALDWIN, Beaver Creek, Rock Co.—Farmer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill, equal suffrage and repeal of Elwell road law; not voting on semi-monthly pay day; for

the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the street railway bill.

JOSEPH BARTEN, Belle Plaine, Scott Co.—Farmer; elected from a district strongly opposed to county option and equal suffrage; member of the House in 1913; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition; did not vote on the road house bill, but voted to prevent its coming to a vote; against equal suffrage, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but against the street railway bill; did not vote on the boxing bill.

C. M. BENDIXEN, Morgan, Redwood Co.—Farmer; member of the House in 1907-9-13; for Gordon for speaker; author of a bill forbidding railroads from charging more than 2 cents a mile for passenger fares; for semi-monthly pay day; for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage and repeal of Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but against the boxing bill; for the Guilford amendments, but did not vote on final passage of street railway bill; one of the sponsors for initiative and referendum bill.

WILLIAM L. BERNARD, Duluth.—Wood dealer; for several years a member of the city council, where he stood unflinchingly for the rights of the people and against the corporations, especially in the contest for a municipal light plant; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, the abolition of road houses and the prohibition amendment; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; did not vote on the boxing bill, but against repeal of the civil service; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

FRED BESSETTE, Gheen, St. Louis Co.—District ranger in Minnesota Forest Service; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and all temperance laws; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

H. O. BJORGE, Lake Park, Becker Co.—Lawyer and farmer; member of the House in 1905-7; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; sponsor for initiative and referendum bill; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

ALBIN E. BJORKLUND, Payne Avenue District, St. Paul.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws except prohibition; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and the street railway bill, but against civil service repeal; for one Guilford amendment to the street railway bill, but did not vote on the second.

G. B. BJORNSON, Minneota, Lyon Co.—Editor Minneota Mascot; at first a prominent candidate of the progressives for speaker, but withdrew in favor of Gordon; member of the House in 1913; for county option, anti-road house bill, con-

stitutional prohibition, equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law, but against semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

GUS BOEHMKE, Hollard, Pipestone Co.—Banker; supported Gordon for speaker in spite of tremendous pressure; for county option and the anti-road house bill, but against prohibition and equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; did not vote on the street railway bill nor the Guilford amendments.

ANTON BORGEN, Duluth.—Retired property owner; member of the House in 1909-11-13; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and temperance laws, but did not vote on prohibition nor equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, the street railway bill and civil service repeal; for the first Guilford amendment to the street railway bill, but opposed to the second.

CHARLES W. BOUCK, Royalton, Morrison Co.—Merchant and large land owner; member of the House in 1911-13; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and repeal of the Elwell road law, but for semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

JOHN H. BOYD, Crookston, Polk Co.—Lawyer and land dealer; for Flowers for speaker; author of bill to abolish mortgage registration tax; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, the street railway bill and civil service repeal; for the first Guilford amendment to the street railway bill, but against the second; tried to prevent the road house bill from coming to a vote.

FRED F. BROWN, Dayton's Bluff District, St. Paul.—Employed by Cook Construction Co.; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but did not vote on the anti-road house bill nor equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

GEORGE W. BURROWS, Breckenridge, Wilkin Co.—Real estate and farm loans, bank director, etc.; member of the House in 1913; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, for the abolition of road houses; did not vote on prohibition; favored equal suffrage, but was absent when the vote was taken; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments, but voted for the street railway bill on final passage.

ROBERT CARMICHAEL, Farmington, Dakota Co.—Farmer; elected on platform against county option and equal suffrage; for Flowers for speaker; against prohibition, but

voted for the anti-road house bill, tho he tried to prevent a vote on it; against equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; did not vote on the street railway bill.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON, Dawson, Lac qui Parle Co.—Editor and lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; author of bill to abolish the oil inspection department; author of a bill to prohibit the cashing of checks in saloons; for county option, constitutional prohibition, anti-road house bill, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and repeal of civil service; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

EDWARD CONDON, Fourth Ward, Minneapolis.—Lawyer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law, but for semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

LEAVITT CORNING, Seventh Ward, St. Paul.—Head of the Corning Advertising Agency; for several years member of the city council, where he made a very good record as champion of the rights of the people as against the public service corporations; for Gordon from the start; for county option, all temperance laws and equal suffrage, but against semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill; author of a bill to require any person attacking a candidate for office in any publication to sign his name thereto.

FARLEY A. DARE, Walker, Cass Co.—Editor Pilot; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the abolition of road houses, but against prohibition; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but opposed to repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

LEVI M. DAVIS, Osakis, Todd Co.—Lawyer; for Flowers for speaker, tho he refused to be pledged to anyone until the last; against county option, because he favored prohibition; for abolition of road-side saloons; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but against the boxing bill; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill; a persistent hunter and killer of "woodchucks" and a "watch dog of the treasury."

G. W. DEALAND, Worthington, Nobles Co.—Farmer and former school teacher; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law, but against semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments, but for the street railway bill on final passage.

ANDREW O. DEVOLD, Minneapolis.—A Socialist who insisted on injecting his party affiliation into every question wherever possible; for Flowers for speaker at first, but finally nominated and voted for Woodfill, another Socialist, who had been pledged to Gordon; against county option, for abolition of road-side saloons, but did not vote on prohibition; for equal suffrage, but was absent when the vote was taken; for semi-monthly pay day and against the street railway bill; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; did not vote on the Elwell road law repeal; for both Guilford amendments to the street railway bill.

RICHARD DUNLEAVY, First Ward, Minneapolis.—For twenty years an employe of the city as foreman; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law, but for semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill; author of a bill to prohibit the importation of "gunmen."

JAMES DWYER, Third Ward, Minneapolis.—Ice business and for twelve years a member of the city council; member of the House in 1913; introduced a bill to abolish the civil service system of Minneapolis and also a bill to do away with the city purchasing department; a Flowers man from the start; against all temperance laws except the anti-road house bill, and tried hard to prevent this from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law, but for semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

J. H. ERICKSON, Clinton, Big Stone Co.—Banker; his first act was to repudiate his written pledge to Gordon and support Flowers for speaker (see chapter on the speakership); was made chairman of the committee on banks and banking; for county option, against prohibition, but did not vote on the road house bill; against equal suffrage, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the street railway bill; for the first Guilford amendment, but against the second.

JAMES FERRIER, St. Charles, Winona Co.—Farmer and blooded stock raiser; member of the House in 1913; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill, tho tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; did not vote on equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

GEORGE M. FLYNN, Medford, Steele Co.—Farmer; supported Gordon for speaker; for county option and other temperance laws, except prohibition by statute; for equal suffrage and the repeal of the Elwell road law, but against semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal;

against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

H. H. FLOWERS, Cleveland, LeSueur Co.—Banker and land owner; (see chapter on the speakership contest); member of the House in 1913; against county option and prohibition, but for the abolition of road-side saloons; did not vote on equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day nor repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments, but for the street railway bill on final passage.

P. H. FRYE, Willmar, Kandiyohi Co.—Lawyer, farmer, member of co-operative elevator company and store; member of the House in 1913; supported Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

JOHN G. GERLICK, Mankato, Blue Earth Co.—Farmer and raiser of blooded hogs; supported Flowers for speaker; opposed county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day, but was for the repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

JOHN H. GILL, Virginia, St. Louis Co.—Steam shovel engineer; supported Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and the Elwell road law repeal; for the boxing bill, the street railway bill, and civil service repeal; for the first Guilford amendment but against the second.

CHARLES A. GILMAN, St. Cloud, Stearns Co.—Lawyer; oldest member of the House (83); once lieutenant governor; for Flowers for speaker; opposed county option and all temperance laws; author of a resolution to investigate the gross earnings system of taxing corporations; against equal suffrage, initiative and referendum, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

THOMAS H. GIRLING, Robbinsdale, Hennepin Co.—Printing business; member of the House in 1903; a very active supporter of Flowers for speaker, chairman of the rules committee, and taxes and tax laws; against county option and prohibition, but for the abolition of road-side saloons, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage and initiative and referendum, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

SAM Y. GORDON, Ortonville, Traverse Co.—Editor Inter-Lake Tribune; ex-lieutenant governor; candidate of the progressive element for speaker; (see chapter on the speakership); for county option and all temperance laws; author of the famous "Seven Sisters" for the reform of the state

administration; for equal suffrage and repeal of Elwell road law, but did not vote on semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for both the Guilford amendments but for the street railway bill on final passage.

GEORGE W. GRANT, Windom, Cottonwood Co.—For Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but did not vote on repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

THOMAS J. GREENE, Ninth Ward, St. Paul.—Served four years as a deputy clerk of court; two years as deputy sheriff; four terms in the legislature; did not take a position on the speakership until the day before the meeting of the House to choose a speaker, then came out for Flowers; against county option and prohibition; did not vote on the road house bill; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and repeal of civil service; against the Guilford amendments to the street railway bill, but did not vote on final passage of the bill.

PAUL GUILFORD, Thirteenth Ward, Minneapolis.—Lawyer; active member of Saturday Lunch Club and other progressive organizations; a supporter of Gordon for speaker from the start; for county option and all temperance laws, except prohibition by statute; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; tried to improve the street railway bill by amending it, but was voted down on the one of most importance; voted against the bill.

AUGUST HAFFTEN, Buffalo, Wright Co.—For many years holder of county offices; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but did not vote on the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but was for civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

H. W. HAISLET, St. James, Watonwan Co.—Editor; supported Flowers for speaker; was appointed chairman of committee on legislative expenses; against county option and prohibition, but did not vote on the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

H. H. HARRISON, Stillwater, Washington Co.—Civil Engineer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, spoke for prohibition, but was absent when the vote was taken on the prohibition amendment; against prohibition by statute, but for the abolition of the road-side saloons; for equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day and did not vote on repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

JOHN M. HARRISON, Eighth Ward, Minneapolis.—In-

surance, with Coklin-Zonne Co.; for Flowers for speaker; chairman of insurance committee; for county option and the abolition of road-side saloons, but against prohibition; fathered the bill to limit taxation on the iron ranges in the interest of the mine owners; for equal suffrage, but against initiative and referendum and Elwell road law repeal; for semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

ALBERT HAUSER, Sleepy Eye, Brown Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws except prohibition by statute; for equal suffrage and repeal of Elwell road law, but against semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

E. R. HINDS, Hubbard, Hubbard Co.—For Flowers for speaker; chairman public domain committee; against county option, but for prohibition and the anti-road house bill; did not vote on equal suffrage nor semi-monthly pay day; against repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

TOBIAS HOGENSON, Stewartville, Olmstead Co.—Banker; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the anti-roadhouse bill, but against prohibition, equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day; for the Elwell law repeal; against the boxing bill and did not vote on civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

HENRY HOLMES, Big Lake, Sherburne Co.—Farmer and Congregational minister; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the anti-road house bill, for constitutional prohibition but against statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage, civil service, semi-monthly pay day, repeal of Elwell law, and against the boxing bill; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill; author of the teachers' endowment and retirement fund.

JOHN B. HOMPE, Deer Creek, Otter Tail Co.—Merchant; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, constitutional prohibition and the anti-road house bill, but against statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law; against semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

CHARLES E. HULBERT, Eden Prairie, Hennepin Co.—Farmer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments, but for the street railway bill on final passage.

JAMES H. HYNES, Eighth Ward, St. Paul.—Undertaker; represents a workingman's district; for Flowers for speaker; author of a bill to require semi-monthly pay day by corporations; against county option and prohibition, but for the abolition of road-side saloons; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly

pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments but for the street railway bill on final passage.

EDWARD INDREHUS, Foley, Benton Co.—Farmer; district largely Polanders; was pledged against county option and equal suffrage; one of the Minnesota delegates that nominated Woodrow Wilson for president; for Flowers for speaker; voted for constitutional prohibition amendment, but against prohibition by statute; did not vote on the anti-road house bill; had been excused and was absent; for repeal of Elwell road law, but against semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill; as chairman of the game and fish committee he secured some valuable changes in the game and fish laws.

MAGNUS JOHNSON, Litchfield, Meeker Co.—Farmer; ex-president Minnesota Society of Equity; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws; strongly opposed to chamber of commerce, and author of bills to correct abuses in the handling of grain; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for repeal of civil service; for the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

J. T. JOHNSON, Fergus Falls, Otter Tail Co.—Druggist; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the anti-road house bill, but against prohibition; against presidential suffrage for women, tho he voted two years ago to submit the equal suffrage amendment; against semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for Guilford amendments, but for street railway bill on final passage.

THOMAS KNEELAND, Fifth and Sixth Wards, Minneapolis.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and anti-road house bill; for equal suffrage, tho absent and not voting; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell law; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the street railway after voting against one Guilford amendment and not voting on the other.

KNUTE KNUTSON, Benson, Swift Co.—Farmer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the anti-road house bill, against prohibition by statute, but did not vote on constitutional prohibition nor equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

P. H. KONZEN, Hallock, Kittson Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and anti-road house bill, but against prohibition and equal suffrage; did not vote on semi-monthly pay day but was for repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against the Guilford amendments.

W. J. KUNTZ, Waconia, Carver Co.—Banker; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, all temperance laws and equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell

road law; for the boxing bill and repeal of civil service; for the street railway bill after voting against one Guilford amendment and for the other.

JOHN A. LARIMORE, Seventh and Thirteenth Wards, Minneapolis.—Lawyer; for Flowers for speaker very actively; chairman judiciary committee; against county option and statutory prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; author, with Davis, of the constitutional amendment for prohibition; for equal suffrage, but against initiative and referendum; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and repeal of civil service; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments. See p. 112.

ADOLPH LARSON, Sandstone, Pine Co.—Merchant; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

GEORGE P. LATTIN, Freeborn, Freeborn Co.—Farmer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

IVER J. LEE, Glenwood, Pope Co.—Farmer, superintendent of county schools; member of the House 1909-11; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the Guilford amendments to the street railway bill, and then against the bill.

A. L. LENNON, First and Third Wards, Minneapolis; both sides of the river from steel arch bridge northward.—For Flowers for speaker, and was made chairman of the committee on cities; against county option and prohibition, but did not vote on the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage; author of public defender bill; for labor legislation; opposed to civil service; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; against Guilford amendments and for street railway bill.

HUGH LEONARD, Millville, Wabasha Co.—Farmer; elected on anti-county option platform; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition; did not vote on anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; against Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

L. A. LYDIARD, Eighth Ward, Minneapolis.—Former city clerk, now engaged in land business; has been in the House for several sessions; a consistent, persistent active leader of the reactionary forces; chairman of the Hennepin delegation; active for Flowers from the start, and was made chairman of the grain and warehouse committee, where he strongly opposed all bills aimed at the methods of the chamber of commerce; against county option, for prohibition and the

anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and repeal of Elwell road law, but for semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

T. J. M'GRATH, Sixth and Eighth Wards, St. Paul.—Lawyer; prominent labor advocate; for Flowers for speaker; chairman of labor committee; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill on final passage, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; a very able advocate of all labor legislation, including semi-monthly pay bill, improvement of compensation act, etc.; against equal suffrage, civil service and repeal of Elwell law; for the boxing bill; but against the street railway bill after voting for both Guilford amendments.

WALTER H. M'LAUGHLIN, Faribault, Rice Co.—Farmer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for anti-road house bill on final passage, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against the street railway bill after voting against both Guilford amendments.

J. E. MADIGAN, Maple Lake, Wright Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and anti-road house bill, but against prohibition; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for both the Guilford amendments to the street railway bill, but voted for the bill on final passage; always had to know just what he was voting on.

CARL G. MALMBERG, Forest Lake, Washington Co.—Banker; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for repeal of civil service, but did not vote on the boxing bill; for the street railway bill after voting against both Guilford amendments.

PAUL MARSCHALK, Warroad, Roseau Co.—Engaged in Commercial fishing on Lake of the Woods; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the anti-road house bill, against prohibition; for equal suffrage, but was absent and did not vote; for semi-monthly pay day, but did not vote on repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for street railway bill after voting against both Guilford amendments.

PAUL J. MARWIN, Ninth Ward, Minneapolis.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, civil service and semi-monthly pay day; but against repeal of Elwell road law; did not vote on the boxing bill; for both Guilford amendments and against street railway bill.

H. J. MINER, International Falls, Koochiching Co.—Printing business, had been a member of both House and

Senate in N. Dakota; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and statutory prohibition, but did not vote on constitutional amendment for prohibition and the anti-road house bill; did not vote on equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill but did not vote on repeal of civil service; for street railway bill and against one of the Guilford amendments but did not vote on the other.

FRANK E. MINNETTE, Sauk Center, Stearns Co.—Farming and general business, represents a very conservative constituency, largely Germans; toward the last of the contest decided to support Flowers for speaker; against county option, all temperance laws and equal suffrage; author of the telephone bill which became a law; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; against both Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

GEO. H. MOELLER, Fourth Ward, St. Paul.—With the Corning Advertising Agency; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage, tho he voted for it two years before, champion of the boxing bill and against civil service; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; did not vote on the street railway bill nor either Guilford amendment.

T. T. MORKEN, Crookston, Polk Co.—Lawyer and Judge of Probate; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, repeal of Elwell law and semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill but did not vote on civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments to the street railway bill, but for the bill on final passage.

ALFRED W. MUELLER, New Ulm, Brown Co.—Lawyer, defeated Albert Pfaender for the seat; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; did not vote on equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill but against civil service repeal; did not vote on the street railway bill nor on either Guilford amendment.

CHAS. T. MURPHY, Aurora, St. Louis Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill, for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day; but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

E. N. NELSON, West end of Duluth.—Sash and door manufacturer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage, for semi-monthly pay day but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for the street railway and against both Guilford amendments.

CHAS. F. NEITZEL, Bird Island, Renvelle Co.—Merchant; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for anti-road house bill, tho he tried to prevent

it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage, and semi-monthly pay day, but for the repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

FRANK E. NIMOCKS, Fourth Ward, Minneapolis.—Collection business; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage and repeal of Elwell road law, but for the semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments; author of the bill against habit-forming drugs.

ELIAS NORDGREN, Sunrise, Chisago Co.—For Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; against the street railway bill and for both Guilford amendments.

WILLIAM J. NORTH, East end Duluth.—For Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law, but did not vote on the semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

W. I. NORTON, Second Ward, Minneapolis.—University district, Lawyer and Attorney for Anti-Saloon League; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, prohibition, anti-road house bill, equal suffrage, civil service and semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and the street railway bill and for both Guilford amendments; against repeal of Elwell law.

B. G. NOVAK, Eighth Ward, St. Paul.—Retail Grocer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition but for the anti-road house bill; did not vote on equal suffrage, author of a bill to open school houses for all kinds of public meetings; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both the Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

ANDREW OLIEN, Clarkfield, Yellow Medicine Co.—Farmer and Merchant; was elected unopposed; for Gordon for speaker, for county option, prohibition and anti-road house bill; for equal suffrage, repeal of Elwell law and semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

JOHN W. PAPKE, Waseca, Waseca Co.—Elected unopposed; farmer; for Flowers for speaker; against temperance laws, against equal suffrage, tho he voted for it two years ago, against initiative and referendum, for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and repeal of civil service; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

RALPH J. PARKER, Spring Valley, Fillmore Co.—Law-

yer; for Gordon for speaker, for county option, constitutional prohibition and anti-road house bill; for equal suffrage and repeal of the Elwell road law; but against semi-monthly pay day, against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for the first Guilford amendment but against the second and for the street railway bill on final passage.

L. G. PENDERGAST, Bemidji, Beltrami Co.—Real estate business; his one supreme object was to secure a State Normal School for Bemidji and partially succeeded; for Flowers for speaker; against all temperance laws; failed to vote on equal suffrage, though known to be in favor of it; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; not voting on street railway bill.

ANTON PETERSON, Mora, Kanabec Co.—For twelve years County Auditor; for Gordon for Speaker; for county option and all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against street railway bill.

A. M. PETERSON, Coleraine, Itasca Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and the anti-road house bill; but against prohibition; against presidential suffrage for women, semi-monthly pay day and against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; against both Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

OLE A. PIKOP, Elbow Lake, Grant Co.—Farmer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, constitutional prohibition and anti-road house bill; but did not vote on presidential suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but against the boxing bill; for street railway and split on the Guilford amendments.

ERNEST C. PLESS, Gibbon, Sibley Co.—Miller; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and the anti-road-house bill, but did not vote on prohibition; did not vote on presidential suffrage for women; author of a bill to restore the death penalty in certain cases; for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

ALBERT F. PRATT, Anoka, Anoka and Isanti Counties.—Lawyer; elected unopposed; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, anti-road house bill, constitutional prohibition and equal suffrage; voted against statutory prohibition; for repeal of Elwell road law, but against semi-monthly pay day; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments but for the street railway bill on final passage. A member who had to be shown.

H. A. PUTNAM, Battle Lake, Ottertail Co.—Farmer, member of the House in 1909-11-13; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws; equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the

boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments but for the street railway bill on final passage.

E. R. RIBENACK, Central District, Duluth.—Hotel keeper; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, prohibition and equal suffrage, but favored anti-road house bill on final passage, tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; for semi-monthly pay day but against repeal of Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but not voting on the boxing bill; against both Guilford amendments and for the street railway bill.

GEO W. RODENBERG, Dayton's Bluff, St. Paul.—Insurance business; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, prohibition, equal suffrage and initiative and referendum, but voted for the anti-road house bill tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; author of bills to require all patent medicines to show contents on the label; for semi-monthly pay day; but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for street railway bill; against one Guilford amendment, but did not vote on the other.

JOHN B. SANBORN, Eleventh Ward, St. Paul.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, anti-road house bill and equal suffrage; against prohibition and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

CHAS. L. SAWYER, Fifth and Sixth Wards, Minneapolis.—Real estate; was pledged to Gordon for speaker, but at the last moment voted for Flowers; (see chapter on County Option and the Speakership) was chairman of the committee on public accounts and expenditures; promised to vote for county option but voted against it; voted for constitutional prohibition, the anti-road house bill, equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for the street railway bill, but split on the Guilford amendments; against repeal of the Elwell road law.

SPENCER J. SEARLS, Carleton Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker (see chapter on Speakership); for county option, all temperance laws and equal suffrage; but against semi-monthly pay day and did not vote on repeal of Elwell road law; introduced a bill to tax improved property at a lower rate than vacant and unimproved; for the boxing bill, but against civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments, but for street railway bill on final passage.

FRED SEEBACH, Red Wing, Goodhue Co.—Held various public offices for many years; member of the House in 1913; for Flowers for speaker; against all temperance laws; for presidential suffrage for women, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; against both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill on final passage.

JOHN SCHROOTEN, Fairmont, Martin Co.—County Treasurer for many years; for Flowers for speaker; against all temperance laws, against equal suffrage, initiative and referendum and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell

road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against the Guilford amendments.

SAMUEL C. SCOTT, Hibbing, St. Louis Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker, tho he voted for Flowers on the first ballot; (see chapter on the Speakership) against all temperance laws; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but not voting on civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

I. I. SLITER, Houston, Houston Co.—Farmer; for Flowers for Speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill; for initiative and referendum. but did not vote on suffrage for women; for the semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill; against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal.

HENRY SMITH, Lake Benton, Lincoln Co.—Farmer; for Flowers for Speaker; against all temperance laws except anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for the street railway bill but split his vote on the Guilford amendment.

GILBERT SORFLATEN, Austin, Mower Co.—Farm lands and investments; for Gordon for speaker; for all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill but against civil service repeal; against the street railway bill and for both Guilford amendments.

CLAUDE E. SOUTHWICK, Wells, Faribault Co.—Lawyer, elected unopposed; for Gordon for speaker; for all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage, but against semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

L. C. SPOONER, Morris, Stevens Co.—Lawyer and large land owner; member of the House in 1907-09-11-13; (see chapter on speakership and county option); for Flowers for speaker; voted for county option and constitutional prohibition, against statutory prohibition, was excused and absent the day the anti-road house bill was passed; against presidential suffrage for women and semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for the street railway bill, but for one Guilford amendment and did not vote on the other.

HENRY STEEN, Winona, Winona Co.—Salesman, represents a strong anti-county option district; member of the House in 1913; for Flowers for speaker; against all temperance laws and equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

OSCAR C. STENVICK, Bagley, Clearwater Co.—Lawyer; for Gordon for speaker; (see chapter on speakership); for

all temperance laws, equal suffrage, repeal of Elwell road law and semi-monthly pay day; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; against street railway bill and both Guilford amendments.

CHARLES L. STEVENS, Warren, Marshall Co.—Lawyer and Editor; for Gordon for speaker; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments but for the street railway bill on final passage.

HENRY STOETZEL, Freeport, R. F. D., Stearns Co.—Farmer and Teacher, represents a strong anti-county option district; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition; was excused and absent on the day the anti-road house bill was passed; against equal suffrage, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

GEO. C. SUDHEIMER, Midway, District North of University Ave., St. Paul.—Lawyer; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and statutory prohibition; did not vote on constitutional prohibition nor the anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage; for semi-monthly pay day, but did not vote on repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

JOHN SWANSON, Eleventh and Twelfth Wards, Minneapolis.—Grocer; for Gordon for speaker; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill but for civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

OSCAR A. SWENSON, Nicollet, R. 2, Nicollet Co.—Farmer; for Flower for speaker; against county option, statutory prohibition and presidential suffrage for women; (see chapter on county option) voted for constitutional prohibition and the anti-road house bill; against semi-monthly pay but for repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for one and against the other of the Guilford amendments to the street railway bill and for the bill on final passage.

EDW. R. SYVERSON, Ironton, Crow Wing Co.—Real Estate and Insurance; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, prohibition and equal suffrage; had been excused and was not present when the anti-road house bill passed; for semi-monthly pay day but did not vote on repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill, civil service repeal and street railway bill; favored one of the Guilford amendments, but did not vote on the other.

A. F. TEIGEN, Montevideo, Chippewa Co.—Farmer, member of co-operative exchange; for Gordon for speaker; for all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage; did not vote on semi-monthly pay day, but was for repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

LARS O. TEIGEN, Jackson, Jackson Co.—Farmer; for Gordon for speaker; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but did not vote on civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

H. O. THOMPSON, Amboy, Blue Earth Co.—Farmer; for Gordon for speaker; (see chapter on the speakership); for all temperance laws, equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against street railway bill.

A. L. THOMPSON, Mahnomen, Mahnomen Co.—Lawyer and Banker; on first ballot for Gordon, but on the second ballot voted for Flowers; for county option, against prohibition and did not vote on the anti-road house bill; for equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

J. M. THORNTON, Fifth Ward, St. Paul.—Contractor; refused to be pledged on speakership, but came out for Flowers on the day before the election of speaker; against county option and prohibition, but did not vote on anti-road house bill; against equal suffrage tho for it two years ago; for semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal, for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

THOMAS TOLLEFSON, West Concord, Dodge Co.—Farmer; supported Gordon in spite of very strong pressure to secure his vote for Flowers; for all temperance laws and equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; against the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments to the street railway bill, but voted for the bill on final passage.

LOUIS W. VASALY, Little Falls, Morrison Co.—Lawyer; represents a county largely Poles, Bohemians, and Germans, but was re-elected on a platform supporting equal suffrage and county option; member of the House in 1913; for Gordon for speaker; voted for county option and other temperance laws, except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage and semi-monthly pay day, but against repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill but opposed civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against street railway bill.

C. H. WARNER, Aitkin, Aitkin Co.—Banker, Lawyer, Real estate; member of the House in 1911-13; for Gordon for Speaker; for county option and the anti-road house bill, but against prohibition; for equal suffrage, did not vote on semi-monthly pay day and was against repeal of the Elwell law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

KNUD WEFALD, Hawley, Clay Co.—Lumber dealer; member of House in 1913; for Gordon for speaker; for county option, constitutional prohibition, the anti-road house bill, and equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; did not vote on the boxing bill nor civil

service repeal; for both Guilford amendments but for the street railway bill on final passage.

A. C. WELCH, Glencoe, McLeod Co.—Farmer and member of co-operative society from a district strongly opposed to equal suffrage and temperance laws; for Flowers for speaker; against county option and prohibition, but for the anti-road house bill tho he tried to prevent it from coming to a vote; against equal suffrage, but for semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; did not vote on street railway bill.

BERT WELD, Slayton, Murray Co.—Banker and real estate; elected unopposed; member of the House in 1913; for Gordon from the start; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, and semi-monthly pay day, but opposed repeal of Elwell law; against civil service repeal but did not vote on the boxing bill; for the street railway bill, but split his vote on the Guilford amendments.

CHAS. S. WILKINS, Wadena, Wadena Co.—Hotel keeper; for Flowers for speaker; against county option, for prohibition, did not vote on anti-road house bill nor equal suffrage; against semi-monthly pay day, but for repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for the street railway bill and against both Guilford amendments.

J. W. WILSON, Third and Tenth Wards, Minneapolis.—Member of the House 1913; for Gordon for speaker; for county option and all temperance laws except statutory prohibition; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for civil service repeal, but against the boxing bill; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

CARL WOLD, Alexandria, Douglas Co.—Editor Park Region Echo; for Gordon for speaker; an uncompromising opponent of the brewery interests; for all temperance laws, equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of the Elwell road law; against the boxing bill, but for civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

JAS. W. WOODFILL, Two Harbors, Lake Co.—A party Socialist; was at first pledged for Gordon for speaker, but obeyed the command of the Socialist committee, to vote for none but a Socialist; voted for county option and the anti-road house bill, but was against statutory prohibition, and was excused for the day and absent the day that constitutional prohibition came up; for equal suffrage, semi-monthly pay day and repeal of Elwell road law; for the boxing bill and civil service repeal; for both Guilford amendments and against the street railway bill.

Larimore's Record.

When Mr. Larimore was seeking votes he wrote two letters to the Saturday Lunch Club and one to Mr. Chadbourne, president of the United Church Clubs of Minneapolis. In these letters he outlined his position on important questions.

I have quoted from these letters and set over against the quotations his votes on the same subjects.

His Promises.

His Votes.

The Speakership.

"I am a progressive in the proper sense of that word, and I certainly shall act on all occasions, as well in the organization of the House and in the choice of a speaker, with men who are truly progressive."

He worked and voted for Flowers for speaker.

He had before this voted for Lydiard for chairman of the Hennepin delegation.

Were these men "truly progressive"?

Civil Service.

"I always have believed and still believe in civil service."

He voted for the Dwyer bill to abolish the civil service in Minneapolis.

Initiative and Referendum.

"The general principles of both the initiative and referendum I now believe in and always have."

He was one of only twelve in the House to vote against the initiative and referendum bill and made a most vigorous speech against it.

County Option.

"My attitude toward county option and any other legislation or policy intended to reduce the evils of intemperance is favorable."

He worked and voted against the county option bill.

Brewery Domination.

"My attitude toward saloon and brewery domination in the politics of the state is one of absolute hostility."

He voted for Lydiard for chairman of the Hennepin delegation, a man who was supported by every "wet" man on the delegation.

He voted for Flowers for speaker, who was openly supported by all the liquor interests of the state.

He voted against county option, and prohibition by statute, but fathered a constitutional amendment for state-wide prohibition.

Mr. Larimore was made chairman of the judiciary committee.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1913

Out of Print--Only a Few Copies Left
While They Last

Cloth, \$1.00; Paper, 50c

ADDRESS:

C. J. BUELL, 1528 Laurel Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

Heywood Mfg. Co.

General Manufacturers of

All Kinds of Paper Boxes,
Envelopes and Printed
Matter

420-428 No. Third Street Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Buell's book advocates clean politics.

We approve of clean politics,
but our line is

*"Cleaning everything but
reputations"*

We handle out-of-town cleaning, dyeing and repairing orders promptly. This is the largest exclusive dry cleaning and dyeing works west of Chicago

WE KNOW HOW
that's the reason

Minnehaha Dry Cleaning Co.
792 Grand Ave. 505 Wabasha 828 Payne Ave.
ST. PAUL, MINN.

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

YB 08466

425735

JK6167

1915

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

