The Minnesota Tax Reform Association

Object

Lower Taxes on Our Homes and Productive Industries

More taxes from those who possess and control our great natural resources of minerals and timber, valuable city lots and unused farm ladns.

Organized in June, 1919.

Results

1. The **net profits** iron ore tax passed in 1921 and recently sustained by the United States Supreme Court.
2. The tax on mining royalties passed in 1923.
3. The Swenson forfeiture bill passed the House in 1923, but failed to come to a vote in the Senate. This bill proposes to forfeit to the state absolutely unused land and mineral reservations, where taxes are three years delinquent.

WHAT NEXT?

1. Increase the **net profits** and royalty taxes to 10% at least, as demanded by us from the start.
2. Pass the Swenson bill and thus secure for the state vast tracts of wild land fit only for forests, and also reserved mineral rights upon which very little tax has even yet been paid.
3. A general amendment to the Tax Classification laws reducing taxes on all buildings and tangible personal property, and increasing on city lots and unused lands.

This will considerably reduce taxes on our farmers' homes and industries and increase on those who secure unearned increment thru land speculation.

Our tax system should encourage, not destroy the farmer.

It should favor, not penalize, the home.

It should foster, not burden and rob all productive industry.

It should employ labor, not foster monopoly. Vacant lots and idle land employ neither labor nor capital.

For further information address

C. J. BUELL, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

1528 Laurel Ave. St. Paul, Minn.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1923

BY

C. J. BUELL

Author of

"The Minnesota Legislature of 1913, 1915, 1917, 1919, 1921"

"The Currency Question"

"Monopolies and Trusts"

READ THE CHAPTER ON TAXATION ON PAGE 47

Note—P. 41. Just should be recorded "Aye."

Address—C. J. Buell, 1528 Laurel Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

LOUIS L. COLLINS, Lieutenant Governor

W. I. NOLAN, Speaker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This is the eighth in a series of histories of the Minnesota Legislature that have been offered to the public.

Like all its predecessors, its pubulication is made possible only through the kindness and generosity of those public spirited citizens who have shared in the expense; and to them the author wishes to extend his sincere thanks.

A few people have criticized the author for expressing his personal views on matters of legislation, insisting that the book should be a colorless statement of facts only. On the other hand perhaps more people have complained that the author has too carefully refrained from expressing his personal opinion of men and measures.

THE AUTHOR'S POINT OF VIEW.

I can't write a colorless book.

I am not willing to try.

There are certain well established principles of democracy which I regard as fundamental.

Those principles are a glorious common heritage of north European races and have come down to us from the remotest times.

They are embodied in the Magna Carta, the various English reform bills, the American Declaration of Independence and the Bills of Rights to be found in the Constitutions of the Federal government and the several states.

Unlike many who would pare down and explain away these great documents that declare and guarantee personal liberty, I would like to see them expanded and broadened far beyond anything that our forefathers were able to grasp or comprehend.

I believe in less government and more liberty—not more government and less liberty.

I would, if I could, confine government to its three great fundamental functions, and prohibit it from meddling with anything else, whatever, namely:

To Administer the Common Heritage.

I. Protect **all people**—male or female—black or white—red, yellow or brown—in their natural, inherent, equal right to use the forces and materials of the physical universe which a bountiful nature has freely conferred on all; and to enjoy to the fullest extent the entire products of their labor of hand and brain.

II. To make and maintain such common ways, for the transportation of persons and property and the transmission of intelligence, as our civilization has evolved and our requirements demand. **These common ways are public matters** and no private individual or corporation should be permitted to control or monopolize them. And it matters not whether these common ways be the simplest common path from one little settlement to another or the most complete and comprehensive system of streets and alleys—conduits

and subways—elevated and surface tracks—railroads—canals —international waterways and the high seas—or the endless lanes of the boundless air—no person—no corporation—no government, even, should be permitted to claim more than an equal opportunity for their use on equal terms.

III. To protect all persons in their equal right to freedom of thought, freedom of speech and freedom of action so long as they do not encroach on the equal right of others to the same degree of freedom of thought, speech, and action.

These are the things, as the Declaration of Independence proclaims, for which governments are established among men, deriving **all** their **just** powers from the consent of the governed. And this consent must be an active affirmative consent, not a mere passive yielding to encroachment or tyranny. No passive yielding to or acquiescence in tyranny can ever give tyranny or repression a right to continue to exist. It is always and everywhere the duty of all people to **rebel** against tyranny.

The liberty and equality that our forefathers declared for—and fought for—are no mere theoretical or academic thing to be protected in a glass case and taken out and admired on the Fourth of July. They must be the ever-living, ever-inspiring motive behind all our private and public acts and utterances every day of our lives.

The ideal legislature would devote its efforts to so amending and repealing existing statutes, as to bring them into harmony with the laws of nature and the principles of liberty.

This is the true measure—the only truly democratic measure—by which to judge of the justice of a proposed enactment.

Here is where I take my stand.

The Declaration of Independence is good enough for me.

I have no apologies to make.

Let him apologize who would deny or diminish the force of these principles.

It will be noticed that I have given very little space to several matters that occupied much time during the session.

That has been done intentionally. My readers care very little about endless bickerings over unimportant matters. The things that really count are the great constructive measures that may improve the lot of the common man or woman, —that may diminish or destroy the evils that afflict the body politic,—that may help men and women to greater freedom, greater prosperity, greater happiness,—that may expand and strengthen the principle of home rule and local self government,—that may curtail or destroy monopoly and privilege and help the people to come into their own.

It is these questions that I regard as important; and so it is to matters like these that I invite the attention of my readers.

These histories of the Minnesota Legislature would never be published, if I could not use them to spread the gospel of a greater and better democracy,—a better world, a more happy people.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1923

CHAPTER I.

THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION OF 1922.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1923 was the result of a political revolution.

Probably there was never a legislature in the state containing so many new members,—perhaps never so many old members defeated.

Of the 67 Senators only 27 sat in the Senate of 1921, leaving 40 new members. Two of the old members had died. Sixteen had not filed, and 22 had been defeated at the primaries or at the November election.

Of the 131 house members of 1921 only 58 came back to the House in 1923, leaving 73 new members. Three of the former members had died; one had been elected to a judgeship, 13 had aspired to seats in the Senate, 22 had not filed for re-election; and 34 had been defeated. Of the 13 who had tried for the Senate six had been elected and seven defeated.

What had caused this unheard of change in membership? The number actually defeated does not tell the whole story. Many did not dare to file for re-election.

The legislature of 1921 passed a number of very unpopular measures—the Street Railway bill was one, the Political Convention bill was another. But about the most fatal thing of all was the Senate vote against the two iron ore tax bills—the bill to tax mining royalties and the tonnage tax.

Thirty-four senators voted against the tax on mining royalties. Only 13 of these came back. Four of these 13 are from St. Louis county. They all stood pat tho the people of St. Louis county voted by more than five thousand majority in favor of iron ore taxation?

Forty senators voted for the Brooks-Coleman Street Railway bill. Only 15 will sit in the Senate of 1923. Several were among those who did not dare file for re-election and 16 were defeated.

Thirty-eight senators voted for the Pre-primary Convention bill. Only ten came back. Fourteen were defeated.

Forty-one senators voted for the most objectionable State Police bill ever proposed in any American legislature. Only 13 came back, and 17 were defeated for re-election.

The slaughter in the House was about the same in proportion. Only 25 voted against the net value iron ore tax and six of them were defeated.

Sixty-nine House members voted for the Street Railway bill. Two were elected to the Senate, and three defeated, while only 26 were re-elected to the House, 27 being defeated, for House or Senate.

Surely the voters are learning.

WOMEN MEMBERS

As this is the first legislature of Minnesota with women members, it may be proper to devote a few paragraphs to the four women who had been elected in November, 1922, to the House. No woman was elected to the Senate.

Perhaps the best way to get a fair appreciation of these four women, is to reproduce the brief biography prepared by them for the Blue Book and then publish an interview with each, permitting her to state her own views relative to legislation.

Myrtle Cain is a young woman of about 26 years and represents a strong labor district. The other women are in middle life. Mrs. Paige and Mrs. Hough come from the 4th and 8th wards of Minneapolis and their constituents are largely well to do business and professional people. Mrs. Kempfer is a farmer's wife and comes from Ottertail county —one of the best farming counties in the state.

In alphabetical order I am letting each speak for herself.

Myrtle A. Cain, 650 Jackson street N. E., Minneapolis, was born in Minneapolis and attended school there and later St. Anthony's Convent of Minneapolis. She is an organizer for women for the American Federation of Labor and is president of the Women's Trades Union of Minneapolis, and has been a member of the executive board since its organization. She is a member of and on the board of the Women's party, Minnesota branch.

"My every act and vote was based on my firm belief in the doctrine of equal rights and no favor proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed in our Bills of Rights.

Our present statutes violate that principle and deny equal rights and liberties.

That is why I favored the repeal of the Espionage Act, the criminal syndicalism law and tried to abrogate all the remaining common law disabilities of women, as well as the bills to restore to socalled illegitimate children these inherent rights now denied them.

Outside the law these equal rights are now denied, therefore the anti-masking bill, which has been much misunderstood.

I am opposed to all special favors to any class or sex; therefore I opposed and helped to defeat the bill to require the Governor to appoint a woman on the Industrial Commission, especially as the present law permits him to appoint one or more women if he is so inclined; that's why I helped kill the Lawyers' Compulsory Trades Union Bill; why I joined with Mr. Stockwell and others to amend and repeal our unjust tax laws and restore to the people more of the unearned increment to whom it morally belongs; to save to the people our remaining water resources; to repeal the Street Railway Bill and to require all public service corpora-

tions to open their books for inspection by the proper officers in every city and village they serve.

Justice should be easy to obtain; therefore, I introduced and helped to pass the two bills that extend the scope of our conciliation courts and provide the necessary help to that end.

Public officials should represent the ideas and the aspiration of their constituents; so I introduced the Proportional Representation Bill and favored the Initiative and Referendum.

Labor is now crushed, exploited and denied a fair and equal chance.

Until monopoly and privilege are destroyed and equality restored I shall favor all remedial labor measures that aim to better the conditions of the working people, though I regard such measures as no final solution of their problems.

Again, I say, my position is equal right and no favor.

MYRTLE A. CAIN."

Mrs. Sue M. Dickey Hough was born at Lancaster, Pa., where her grandfather and uncle, John Dickey and Oliver Dickey served in House and Senate of Pennsylvania and later in Congress. Five uncles in Civil War and one uncle, Major Charles Dickey, was at Fort Snelling fighting Indians before she was born. Six cousins in the World War, two making the supreme sacrifice. Mrs. Hough went to Minneapolis as a baby. Central High School graduate. Later finishing school in East and then studied law. In Chicago four years.

The bills in which I was interested were as varied as my several committees.

I selected Taxes and Tax Laws, having made a study of taxes for some years and being particularly interested in the reduction of same. Motor Vehicles was a pet committee for I had campaigned to adjust the inequalities in our present law. Public Utilities was one which dealt with many vital measures; the Crime Committee was another pet of mine. Our crime wave had increased so rapidly that I was most desirous of getting a revolver bill passed. Markets and Marketing dealing with the farmers' problems with which I was familiar as I sold a great deal of farm land; and Cities Committee dealing with all legislation affecting the cities were the other committees of my choice.

My pet measures were the revolver bill and the motor tax law. The first because I felt if our boys could not so readily secure fire arms, they would not commit these crimes. The bill in no way prevented the law-abiding citizen from having a revolver, and no permit was necessary for a revolver in the home. This bill was passed in the House but killed in the Senate.

The unjust auto tax, calling for 2 per cent on original price, meant that a car worth $1,000 which originally cost $3,500 must pay a $70 tax while the same model, now dropped to $2,500, only paid a $50 tax. This was adjusted in a bill we passed and calls for the valuation to be based on the factory price list of the November preceding the year in which the tax is due.

Permanent Registration which meant a saving of $100,000 a year to the tax payers of Minneapolis was another of the bills on which I was co-author. Some of my other measures were the one that "no child shall be born in a penal institution," a bill declaring penalties for using an auto in perpetuating a crime, the carnival bill, the osteopathy bill and the appropriation for the Glen Lake Sanitorium.

Most of the bills fostered by the Federation of Women's Clubs and the League of Women Voters were passed.

SUE M. DICKEY HOUGH

Hannah J. Kempfer was born December 22, 1880, on the North Sea under the English flag. Put in a foundlings' home in March, 1881. Adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Ole Jensen of Stavanger, Norway, in March, 1881. Went to Adams, Mower County, Minn., in 1886, and to Otter Tail County in 1889. Taught school when 17, and until she was 27 years old. Married Charles T. Kempfer of Otter Tail County in 1903. Has always lived on a farm.

What this legislature needs is not more laws but the repeal of a good many of the old ones.

The statute books need to be overhauled.

We should reduce military expenses and work for peace. The victories of peace are lasting. So long as we prepare for war we are sure to reap what we sow.

When representatives get the idea that bad legislation can't be remedied by passing curative acts, but must be repealed once and for all, they will go a long way toward sweeping the debris out of the statute books, and making progress toward the establishment of fair and just laws for the state.

One of my first moves was to enlist the support of the male members in a bill to prevent the trapping of fur-bearing animals when the fur is not good.

"Pay as we go" is good business in our homes. It is equally good for the state. I am utterly opposed to bonding, with its heritage of interest and taxes for unborn generations to pay. They will have obligations of their own. We should take care of ours.

We need more farm women in the legislature.

This session has opened up to me a new world of thought, and I am more interested in public affairs than ever.

Most measures were judged on their merits and that is as it should be.

In most things we should represent the entire state rather than our own locality. HANNAH J. KEMPFER.

Mabeth Hurd Paige, 25 Dell Place, has lived in Minneapolis twenty-seven years. Educated in Massachusetts; special education in art in Boston and at the Academie Julian, Paris. Was graduated from University of Minnesota College of Law in 1900. Has been for some years a successful business manager of organization operating Hospital, Home Club for Girls and Home for the Aged. Has always believed in and worked for equal suffrage. Was for two years director for six Northwest states of the National Board of League Women Voters. Is wife of James Paige and has one child, Elizabeth, nineteen.

Quite apart from all other reasons which made me decide to try for the Legislature is the fact that I am a lifelong "suffragist" and came of suffrage ancestry.

I went to the legislature brim full of practical ideals, the collection of a lifetime, and I am leaving with some realized and with none of them shattered. I expected to find in the legislature a group of earnest citizens, honestly seeking better conditions for their constituents in particular, and for their state in general. I have been honored in being a member of a group of able and loyal citizens.

The fact that women have a distinct point of view, which comes from generations of domestic life including the rearing, and educating of children makes their legislative view point a very acceptable addition to that of men. Women and men working together ought to produce more adequate laws than either sex working alone could produce.

My ideals were toward human betterment and I realize from association with conscientious members from rural parts of the state that human welfare laws are not confined to laws relating to people but extend to laws affecting agriculture and grain and cattle and co-operative business enterprises. The bills I have sponsored have been, largely, bills relating to education, morals and health, for the better protection of dependents, delinquents and defectives. As a member of the appropriation committee I voted to cut expenses wherever possible, because I realize that the taxation burden upon our state is increasing too rapidly.

MABETH HURD PAIGE

CHAPTER II.

THE SPEAKERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION.

Don't forget that every member of the Minnesota legislature—both House and Senate—is elected without party designation.

As a legal proposition there are no Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Farmer-Labor, or any other partisans.

As a matter of fact, of course, practically every Senator and House member is more or less affiliated with one or another of these parties; but as a member of the legislature he has no right to be a partisan of any kind.

However, it does not follow that citizens are barred from putting forth candidates representing certain public policies and doing all in their power to elect such candidates and secure the enactment of such statutes as they favor.

The only point is that, when elected, they are morally bound to consider all questions, and vote on all proposed bills, on the MERITS of the MEASURES—not mere partisan considerations.

It therefore follows that any general conference to consider questions of organization, speakership, proposed legislation, or committees should include ALL members elected.

This principle was ignored by Mr. Nimocks and others when they called a conference for Nov. 21, to consider the question of the speakership.

Several members were not invited, and the inference was natural that their presence was not desired.

As a result, those not invited held a conference of their own and laid plans to prevent the first group from controlling the election of speaker and the organization of the House.

A further result was to arouse a factional spirit on both sides and to create unjust and unwarranted prejudice in the minds of each faction against the other.

All this is very unfortunate and tends to lessen the chances for wise legislation.

However, it all turned out much better than many expected.

Men and women are always wiser, when they come face to face with realities than when they are sloshing around in visionary theories.

Out of it all came the election of Mr. Nolan as speaker with 90 votes to 37 for Mr. Iverson—one for Barnes and one for Bendixen. Neither Nolan nor Iverson voted.

The following, showing the detailed results of the speakership contest, can be found on pages 6 and 7 of the House Journal for Jan. 2.

Mr. W. I. Nolan was placed in nomination by Mr. F. A. Green.

Mr. L. A. Barnes was placed in nomination by himself.

Mr. John B. Gislason seconded the nomination of Mr. Nolan.

Mr. C. M. Iverson was placed in nomination by Mr. F. T. Starkey.

Mr. A. C. Welch seconded the nomination of Mr. Iverson.

Mr. S. A. Stockwell seconded the nomination of Mr. Iverson.

The question being taken on the election of Speaker, and the roll being called, the following members voted for Mr. Nolan:

Bendixen,	Girling,	Lang,	Pearson,
Berg,	Gislason,	Lewer,	Quinn,
Bernard,	Grandstrand,	Lightner,	Rodenberg,
Blum,	Green,	Long, F. D.,	Rohne,
Christianson,	Haugland,	Long, P. J.,	Scallon,
Cole,	Herried,	MacLean,	Shonyo,
Cullum,	Hitchcock,	Masek,	Spooner,
Curtis,	Hompe,	Mauritz,	Stevens,
Dahle,	Horton,	Mayman,	Strandemo,
Darby,	Hough,	McKnight,	Sweitzer,
Davis, C. R.,	Howard,	McNelly,	Swenson, O.A.,
Deans,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Merritt,	Taylor,
DeLury,	Hurlburt, D.,	Moen,	Teigen,
Dilley,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Murphy,	Thomas,
Duemke,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Naylor,	Thompson,
Emerson,	Johnson, E.,	Neuman,	Therrien,
Escher,	Johnson, J. A.,	Nimocks,	Veigel,
Fabel,	Johnson, J. G.,	Noonan,	Waldal,
Farmer,	Kelly,	Norton,	Walworth,
Fisk,	Kinneberg,	Odegard,	Washburn,
Forestell,	Knudson,	Oren,	Wilkinson,
Fowler,	Kolshorn,	Paige	
Gehan,	Lammers,	Pattison,	

Those who voted for Mr. Iverson were:

Anderson, A.,	Geister,	Olson,	Starkey,
Anderson, G.A.,	Johnshoy,	Peterson, C.A.,	Stein,
Anderson, S.P.,	Kempfer,	Peterson, L.,	Stockwell,
Benson,	Kleffman,	Pratt,	Swenson, E.,
Bowers,	Kramer,	Salmonson,	Thorkelson,
Cain,	Lagerstedt,	Samec,	Trovaten,
Davis, R.,	Larson,	Skaiem,	Welch,
Day,	Lockhart,	Smith,	
Enstrom,	Nellermoe,	Spelbrink,	
Flahaven,	Nelson,	Spindler,	

Nolan, 90; Iverson, 37; Barnes, 1; Bendixen, 1.

Barnes voted for Mr. Barnes.

Finstuen voted for Mr. Bendixen.

Mr. Nolan having received a majority of all the votes cast, he was declared duly elected Speaker of the House.

Oscar Arneson was then elected chief clerk by a unanimous vote, making his tenth election to that office.

This is a well-deserved recognition of Mr. Arneson's ability and efficiency, good judgment and fairness.

For the fourth time Mr. Charles Ryberg was appointed reading clerk. With a very strong clear voice and distinct enunciation, combined with remarkable powers of endurance, Mr. Ryberg makes an ideal reading clerk.

The Committees.

When Speaker Nolan announced his committees there was great surprise in some quarters. It was a pleasant sur-

prise and augured well for good feeling and team work.

Instead of ignoring the defeated faction, Mr. Nolan showed himself to be a pretty good forgetter, and gave his opponents five chairmanships and far better committee assignments than is usual after a contest.

In fact it is customary for the defeated faction to get nothing, but here every member was placed where he desired to be, as far as possible, and given committee work that he was fitted for.

Some of the committees did not turn out as well as expected. That on Public Utilities proved quite reactionary in spite of its very progressive chairman, Mr. Bernard. Some of the new members proved far from progressive.

The Automobile Committee, too, should have given more attention to the Borrison tablet earlier in the session. It would do more to prevent theft of cars than all the punishments ever devised.

All temporary feelings of faction and hostility very soon died out, and the session on the whole was fruitful of probably more conscientious team work and honest effort for the common good, than any previous session of the Minnesota legislature.

The first time the House went into Committee of the Whole, Speaker Nolan called his defeated opponent, Mr. Iverson, to the chair. This act of courtesy tended further to promote good feeling.

It is generally conceded that Mr. Nolan is probably quite as capable and efficient as a presiding officer as anyone who has ever occupied the Speaker's chair. His manner is easy and good natured, his voice is clear and forceful, and his rulings are definite, certain and fair.

As the session progressed many signs of good feeling appeared, which would have been impossible in 1919 or 1921.

Hostility, suspicion, partisan feeling was little in evidence.

On motion of Mr. Welch, Senator-elect Shipstead was invited to address the House. He was escorted to the Speaker's desk by a special committee of which Mr. Hompe, the old Civil War veteran, was the conspicuous figure. He was heartily welcomed by Speaker Nolan, who had strongly opposed his election.

The invitation called for a recess of thirty minutes for the Senator to speak, but he took less than ten; but in that short address he got very close to the basic ideals on which our forefathers founded this nation.

It was very much the kind of a talk that Jefferson or Lincoln might have given, had one of them returned to discuss present day problems.

Later in the session Miss Miriam West was heard on relief work in Russia. Even two years ago the prejudice against Russia was so great that this would hardly have been possible.

She had been invited on motion of Mr. Starkey, a labor member.

Feb. 21 occurred the most bitter fight of the session.

The Leach high dam bill had been killed by a vote of just two to one; the tax on mining royalties had been passed 104 to 16; and the House had under consideration the report of the rules committee to pay employes who had performed services before the opening of the session and to reimburse members who had served on the committee to draft farm legislation.

This committee had been appointed by Mr. Nolan who was expected to be speaker, though not yet elected, and had drafted the rural credits bill and other measures.

The committee was composed of one member from each Congressional district, and it was charged that all were of the "old guard" faction.

The proposal to pay back to these men the money they had spent in connection with this work met with strong opposition, led by Representative Stockwell, who insisted that all such unofficial work was gratuitous and a pernicious meddling with the regular work of the session.

No speaker had been elected. The members had not been sworn in. They had a perfect right to consult, to do any work they pleased, to frame proposed bills; but they had no right to ask the state to compensate them for their expenses.

Many other members had spent much time preparing bills. They, too, had served the state according to their light and their ideas of what laws should be enacted, but they had asked for no refunding of their expenses, and no one would think of paying them if they had asked it.

Mr. Starkey declared it was a very dangerous precedent to establish. We, whom you call radicals,—we, whom you regard as dangerous citizens, are very likely to control the next legislature. Would you like to have us follow your example and ask the state to reimburse us for our expenses incurred before we were sworn in—before we had taken the oath of office—before we were legislators at all, in any true sense? Wouldn't you object and wouldn't you be right in objecting? Let us not do this thing. It is sure to come back to plague us later on.

It was in connection with this controversy that Carl Iverson refused to vote. He held out for about fifteen minutes in spite of threats of members to have him arrested or otherwise punished.

Mr. Iverson finally arose and explained that he regarded the claim as wholly unwarranted, illegal, and a most dangerous precedent to establish.

The amount involved was small, only $238.11, all to go to the committee on farm legislation.

Only a few had voted against paying the employees. They were wholly innocent. They believed themselves legally employed. But the house members themselves—that was different.

The vote to pay them for money expended was close—only two more than enough to pass.

Those who voted in the affirmative were 68:

Bendixen,	Bernard,	Cole,	Curtis,
Berg,	Christianson,	Cullum,	Dahle,

Darby,	Hough,	Long, P. J.,	Pearson,
Deans,	Hulbert, C. E.,	MacLean,	Quinn,
DeLury,	Hurlburt, D.,	Masek,	Rodenberg,
Dilley,	Iverson,	Mayman,	Rohne,
Duemke,	Jacobson, J.N.,	McKnight,	Scallon,
Emerson,	Johnson, J. A.,	McNelly,	Smith,
Escher,	Kelly,	Merritt,	Stevens,
Forestell,	Kinneberg,	Murphy,	Strandemo,
Gehan,	Knudsen,	Naylor,	Sweitzer,
Girling,	Kolshorn,	Nimocks,	Taylor
Gislason,	Lammers,	Noonan,	Thomas,
Grandstrand,	Lang,	Norton,	Thompson,
Haughland,	Lewer,	Odegard,	Therrien,
Hitchcock,	Lightner,	Oren,	Veigel,
Hompe,	Long, F. D.,	Paige,	Washburn.

Those who voted in the negative were 45:

Anderson, A.,	Flahaven,	Nellermoe,	Spooner,
Anderson, G.A.,	Fowler,	Nelson,	Starkey,
Anderson, S.P.,	Geister,	Olson,	Stein,
Barnes,	Howard,	Pattison,	Stockwell,
Benson,	Johnshoy,	Peterson, C.A.,	Swenson, O.A.,
Bowers,	Kempfer,	Peterson, L.,	Teigen,
Cain,	Kleffman,	Pratt,	Thorkelson,
Davis, C. R.,	Kramer,	Salmonson,	Trovatten,
Davis, R.,	Lagerstedt,	Samec,	Welch.
Day,	Lockhart,	Skaiem,	
Enstrom,	Mauritz,	Spelbrink,	
Finstuen,	Moen,	Spindler,	

THE SENATE ORGANIZATION

Before the Legislature met Senator Putnam, a typical leader of the socalled "old guard," had called a conference of Senators together to apportion the Senate patronage and otherwise steer things.

The "old guard" had put everything over about as it pleased.

But, as time went on, the more progressive element became more certain of its footing and then on February 16, came the election of a President, pro tem, to preside in the absence of the Lieutenant-Governor.

Just the day before, the "old guard" had prevented an investigation of the regents by the narrow margin of two votes, and they felt safe, but a little shaky.

Putnam nominated Rockne—"Old guard."

Larson nominated Orr—Progressive.

Devold nominated Nordlin—Farmer-Labor.

Nordlin declined and supported Orr.

It now became plain that Orr would have a good majority, and that the "old guard" would be pretty badly defeated.

Somebody has said: "It's a wise guy that knows when he is licked."

At any rate, John Sullivan now withdrew the name of Mr. Rockne and moved to make the election of Orr unanimous.

And it was so—and there was no roll call and so no one really knew what the lineup would have been.

CHAPTER III.
THE THREE ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT

Of the three great divisions of the duties and functions of government—the first, is by far, the most important, but it usually receives the least consideration.

The first and most important function of government is to secure to each his equal, inherent right to use the earth and enjoy the products of his own hands and brain.

If this duty were faithfully performed there would be far less in the way of restrictive, repressive, regulatory and punitive legislation needed.

Legislatures are not wholly in fault—possibly very little in fault.

Landlordism has been the greatest curse of all the ages.

In fact landlordism, with its accompanying train of social evils, has been the all sufficent cause of the decline and fall of every civilization from the beginning of history.

This is amply attested by the historians themselves, and could readily be predicted beforehand by any economist.

But landlordism is the inevitable result of two factors.

The first of these factors is the private, personal, individual possession of land.

This, of course, is necessary and right, unless you propose to establish a system of Communism which denies all personal rights to possess and use land,—unless you propose to establish a gigantic system of government ownership of all the land of the country, and government regulation of its occupancy and use.

Now men and women lived on this earth long before GOVERNMENT existed.

It therefore follows that men and women must have used land before there was any GOVERNMENT to GRANT or REGULATE its tenure or use.

It also follows that all men have an EQUAL, NATURAL right to possess and use land, regardless of government.

It is the only way men can live on earth.

If you deny this natural right, then you must deny that men have any right on earth at all.

The land—including, as it does, all the materials and forces of the physical universe outside of man himself—is the only storehouse out of which man, by his labor, can possibly draw the materials for his sustenance.

In fact his very body is literally made of "the dust of the earth"; and to the dust it must finally return.

The possession and use of land, therefore, becomes the only original and primary source of all employment—the only possible source of all life even.

Without the use of the physical universe no man could live; for he would have no place on which to stand.

Without the air to breathe he could live but a passing moment.

Without the soil from which to raise his food he must starve.

Without clothing he must freeze or burn.

Without houses—shelter—he is at the mercy of the elements.

Land then—in the economic sense—is the one thing that every person must use every moment of his life.

The PERSONAL possession of land, then, is man's first inherent right, and consequently the **EVILS** of landlordism must be found somewhere else.

AND THE CAUSE OF LANDLORDISM IS NOT FAR AWAY.

In fact it is so near that few of us can see it at all.

LANDLORDISM, with all its evils, is the inevitable product of our **SYSTEM OF TAXATION.**

The man who holds land to use it, whether for a farm or a home, a mine or a quarry, a lumber camp or a fishing station, a store or a factory, or any other useful purpose, is burdened and penalized by direct and indirect taxes, as if he were committing a crime.

Another man, holding an equally desirable piece of land out of use—keeping labor and capital away—preventing production—is let off with so light a burden of taxation, that its normal increase in value is more than the taxes.

And don't forget that the VALUE of land is either due to its inherent quality—its natural richness—or to the increased demand due to an increasing population—usually both.

At any rate the value of mere land is seldom due to anything the owner of the site has done.

The VALUE of mere land is always due to the presence, the needs, the intelligence of the whole people who constitute the social unit and must have it to use.

It therefore follows that the VALUE of land belongs to the people—the whole people—who have created it; and, it is the duty of Legislatures to so frame the tax laws that this publicly created value will go into the common treasury to meet common needs—and not into the pockets of favored land grabbers and forestallers.

This would then leave the user of the land free to pay ONLY the land value to the public treasury, and keep the products of his labor for his own use, untouched by taxation.

Incidentally unused land would be FREE—ABSOLUTELY FREE—to the first comer who wanted to use it.

And it would continue to be free even from any land tax until further settlement had taken up all available land of equal desirability.

Think of the enormous saving to the producer, if land were free and his contribution to the public were only the annual VALUE or RENT of the bare land!

It is capable of demonstration that the farmers' contribution to the public, direct and indirect, would be only about a fifth what it now is.

And the city home owners' contribution would be in about the same proportion—far less than now.

But the business of the land grabber would be gone.

Landlordism would have departed from the earth, and the WORKER would come into his own.

All this is simple and easy to understand.

In fact wherever ordinary taxes on production and the products of production have been abolished and land values taken for public use, just these results have followed.

And other beneficial results have also followed.

No class of CAPITALISTS, socalled, has been developed, and all large enterprises have been undertaken by co-operative societies.

In fact co-operative societies have grown and flourished to some extent, even where the curse of landlordism still lingers; but they have become strong and successful just in proportion as land monopoly has become weak or has disappeared entirely.

Look at Denmark since she taxed and forced out the great land proprietors.

Look at Ireland since the landlords were bought out and the people given the land on even a little easier terms, but with security of tenure.

AT FAIRHOPE, ALABAMA

Every permanent resident owns his own home or farm, usually free from debt. There is no tenant class, because there is no landlord class.

The banker is a useful servant of the people—a common bookkeeper—not much a money lender and a forecloser of mortgages.

The people are not victims of rush and worry, and they have more time for thoughtful study and social intercourse.

There are no very rich nor very poor—hence very little crime.

If the people don't like the public school they organize a co-operative school of their own, as witness the Quakers' co-operative school, and the Organic School at Fairhope, Alabama, where for 27 years and more, landlordism has never had a foothold—where no one has been able to make a dollar out of the mere possession of land without using it,—where all LAND VALUES have gone into the public's treasury every year, and the people have had no taxes at all to pay.

Fairhope, on a small scale, and with many handicaps, is rather a remarkable illustration of the beneficial results that flow from the absence of LANDLORDISM.

Many other similar experiments have shown similar results.

But the most ambitious experiment of all is now going on in Australia, where the new federal district and capital of the Australian commonwealth is being developed on this same basis—no landlordism—no profit from the mere holding of land.

This federal district is a territory 30 miles square—larger than any southern Minnesota county—and it is sure to be a very valuable object lesson to the progressive people of the world.

When you buy a home in one of these landlordless communities, you pay for the house and improvements, but there is no price to pay for the lot.

When you buy a farm, you pay nothing for the land. You pay only for the buildings and other improvements.

You save for all time the interest on the purchase price of the city lot or the farm land, and you never pay any taxes.

Your only contribution to the government is the annual rent of the bare land.

PUBLIC WAYS

Let us next consider the second vital function of government—the making and maintaining of public ways for the transport of persons and property and the transmission of intelligence.

Of course these public ways have always been made and kept up either by the government directly or by other agencies created by the government for this purpose.

Here comes in the public service corporation—a creature of government—set up by the government to do things that the government would otherwise have to do.

The government, national, state or local, must either build and run railroads, canals and pipe lines, telegraph and telephone systems, electric light and power, and water, sewer, paving, walks, conduits, tunnels, etc., or turn the work over to public service corporations created for the purpose of taking over and performing these inherent duties and functions of government.

I do not intend, in this introductory chapter, to discuss the respective merits of these two plans, whether it is better for governments to do these things directly, or indirectly through the public service corporation.

Many books have been written on that subject and many more will be.

What I wish to hammer down is that this function of government can't be escaped.

It must be done somehow.

And the people will benefit or suffer just as it is done well or ill.

THE POLICE POWER

The third inevitable function of government is the POLICE POWER, socalled; that is, the regulation of the affairs of men in such a way that each may enjoy the greatest possible freedom consistent with the equal freedom of his fellows.

And here I desire to emphasize again my former statement—that if the first and second functions of government are performed with justice and efficiency there will be very little need for the police power—very little need to restrict and regulate the acts of men and women.

If the first two are not performed justly and efficiently then there will be no end to the apparent need for restriction and regulation, but restriction and regulation will do no good. They will be pretty sure to make things worse.

It is simply amazing to what extent the police power has been invoked during recent years.

It is something that our forefathers never would have tolerated for a moment; and for fifty years or more after the founding of the federal government, the people were, to a very large extent, free from the sort of espionage that has now become common.

The last fifty years have seen the police power grow and expand until there is hardly a relation in life that has not been brought under its baleful influence.

But there are signs of revolt appearing,—hopeful signs —that showed very plainly in the session of 1923.

The next chapter will show many things.

CHAPTER IV.
THE CRAZE FOR LICENSING AND REGULATION

A great evil has grown up in the land.

It matters little what the evil is.

There will usually be two opposing and contradictory views as to the remedy.

One group of people—one group of legislators—will say:

"Let us study this evil.

"Let us search out its underlying causes.

"Let us then find a way to remove those causes, and the evil will die a natural death and disappear.

"This is the **ONLY** permanent cure."

Another group of people—another group of legislators will answer:

"No, we can't remove the causes! So let us REGULATE this thing. Let us LICENSE it and CONTROL it.

"Let us require each person or corporation who is engaging in this evil practice to pay a license fee of $100—$1,000—or some lessor or greater amount, and subject them to governmental supervision and regulation; then we can make them be good.

"Then if they fail to be good we can take their license away from them; we can outlaw them.

The first group reply:

"Can you make a wrong right by legalizing it—by licensing it—by selling an indulgence to do wrong for more or less pieces of silver or gold.

"Murder is wrong. Robbery is wrong. Blackmail is wrong. To bear false witness is wrong. To covet is wrong.

"Did Moses from Sinai send down a communication to the murderers and robbers, to the blackmailers and the liars, that if they would pay for a license and submit to governmental regulation they might go on in safety and protection with their nefarious crimes?

"Did Jesus, in the garden or on the mount, notify the evil doers of his day to come in, pay a fee, get a license, submit to inspection and regulation, and then go on unmolested in the perpetration of their evil deeds?

"Among all the world's great prophets and seers, can you find one who has taught that by licensing a wrong you can make it right?

"Can you find one who has not demanded that the evil be dug up by the roots—that the cause be found and removed?

"CAN YOU FIND ONE?"

So the controversy goes on from year to year, from generation to generation.

The root causes are not found.

The roots of the evil are not dug up.

Legalizing, licensing, inspecting, regulating—with more jobs for politicians and more tax burdens for the people to bear—and the evils grow and flourish. They grow stronger and stronger, until they finally control and corrupt and destroy society.

The Loan Shark Evil

Early in the session of 1923 a very small and comparatively insignificant question arose that well illustrates

these two points of view. It split the lower House of the Legislature into two nearly equal factions.

At times there are many very poor people.

They have little or none of this world's goods.

They are in poverty and distress.

Their needs are pressing and they seek to borrow.

They can offer poor security or none, and the lender stands to lose much of what he lends.

Hence certain lenders have adopted a policy of loaning to these people at a heavy charge to cover insurance against loss.

This is a violation of the USURY LAW and the borrower, of course, must pay the cost of evading the statute.

Thereupon many good people become very indignant. They call these lenders by hard names—Loan Sharks—Usurers—Parasites—Blood Suckers—they do not seem to remember that all their victims are voluntary victims—and that they go to these BAD people of their own free will and accord and seek to borrow.

Of course, if these tender-hearted philanthropists who feel so sorry for the poor, would look a little deeper they would find that most of the poor are the victims of other bad statutes that might be amended or repealed with very great benefit to the submerged masses.

But this course would require some hard thinking, and many people get a headache when they think.

So a bill was prepared—H. F. 76—and introduced by Bernard, Nolan and Masek.

This bill made no attempt to find the cause of the evil and uproot it.

It simply provided for a system of licensing these lenders—fee $100—and subjecting them to careful inspection by the Superintendent of Banks. Then they might lend not more than $300 to any one applicant at 3½ per cent a month on all unpaid balances until the full amount should be paid.

The discussion of this bill took place in the House on the afternoon of January 24.

Mr. Sweitzer, chairman of the Welfare Committee, briefly explained the bill and made a plea for its passage, claiming that a similar law was operating well in eighteen or twenty states, and had greatly reduced the Loan Shark evil.

Nellermoe, a labor member from Minneapolis, followed with a long and exhaustive analysis of the bill, claiming that it could only increase the evil, that it could not help the poor man who had no security to offer—that it would furnish a strong temptation to certain bankers to turn over to these licensed usurers many who might have good security to offer, and thus intensify rather than relieve the evil; that the bill nowhere protected the innocent wife and family of an unscrupulous husband; and that it provided for no sure and adequate system of inspection by the bank examiner.

Pratt declared that the State Federation of Labor had endorsed the principle of this bill, and Washburn contended that the labor people should have the bill if they wanted it.

Iverson, after saying that the bill could have very little to do with him or the people of his county, asked how the

Legislature could consistently pass a bill of this kind, legalizing 42% interest, when they were proposing to reduce the LEGAL rate of interest for the regular bankers and lenders from 10% down to 8%.

The roll call showed 68 votes for the bill and 56 against it, with the following members excused and absent: Barnes, Bendixen, Nelson, Odegard, Trovatten and Walworth, and S. P. Anderson absent without official excuse, attending a meeting of rural telephone companies.

Several labor men voted for the bill under protest, saying that they were opposed to it but had been pledged to its support and must keep their pledges.

The 68 who voted in the affirmative were:

Benson,	Girling,	Lightner,	Oren,
Bernard,	Grandstrand,	Lockhart,	Paige,
Blum,	Green,	Long, F. D.,	Pattison,
Cole,	Herried,	Long, P. J.,	Pearson,
Cullum,	Hitchcock,	MacLean,	Peterson, C.A.,
Curtis,	Hough,	Masek,	Pratt,
Dahle,	Horton,	Mauritz,	Rodenberg,
Darby,	Howard,	Mayman,	Samec,
Davis, C. R.	Hulbert, C. E.,	McKnight,	Scallon,
DeLury,	Hurlburt, D.,	McNelly,	Strandemo,
Duemke,	Johnson, E.,	Merritt,	Sweitzer,
Fabel,	Johnson, J. A.,	Moen,	Taylor,
Finstuen,	Kempfer,	Murphy,	Thomas,
Fisk,	Kleffman,	Naylor,	Veigel,
Forestell,	Lammers,	Nimocks,	Waldal,
Fowler,	Lang,	Noonan,	Washburn,
Gehan,	Lewer,	Norton,	Mr. Speaker.

The 56 who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, A.,	Flahaven,	Kolshorn,	Spindler,
Anderson,G.A.,	Geister,	Lagerstedt,	Spooner,
Berg,	Gislason,	Larson,	Starkey,
Bowers,	Haugland,	Nellermoe,	Stein,
Cain,	Hompe,	Neuman,	Stevens,
Christianson,	Iverson,	Olson,	Stockwell,
Davis, R.,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Peterson, L.,	Swenson, E.,
Day,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Quinn,	Swenson, O.A.,
Deans,	Johnshoy,	Rohne,	Teigen,
Dilley,	Johnson, J. G.,	Salmonson,	Thompson,
Emerson,	Kelly,	Shonyo,	Therrien,
Enstrom,	Kinneberg,	Skaiem,	Thorkelson,
Escher,	Knudsen,	Smith,	Welch,
Farmer,	Kramer,	Spelbrink,	Wilkinson.

In the Senate

It soon became plain that many Senators had reached about the same conclusion that Iverson had voiced in the House.

They would find it hard to explain why they should legalize 42% to certain lenders when they had voted to reduce the legal rate for banks from 10% to 8%.

The backers of the bill in the Senate were Jackson of St. Paul, and Child of Minneapolis.

They kept postponing consideration of the bill until it finally came to a vote on the afternoon of February 20th, and was badly defeated.

The contest lasted from 2 o'clock until nearly 7, and a great many words were wasted both for and against.

Mr. Child made a long and powerful defense of the bill and was ably supported by Jackson, Sweet, Denegre, Morin, Orr, Diesen, John D. Sullivan and Lennon.

Their line of argument was similar to that advanced by the advocates in the House.

It had been adopted and was working well in 18 or 20 states, so far as information could be obtained.

It had lowered the rate of interest to very many poor people.

It had practically driven out the "Loan Sharks."

Every labor organization favored it.

All welfare societies have endorsed it.

The Russell Sage Foundation is behind such a bill in every state.

All these claims were strongly denied by the opponents, especially Carley and Nordlin, who made some **STARTLING REVELATIONS.**

Carley showed that these legalized 42 per cent associations were far from being philanthropists. That they were backed by very shrewd business men and had become enormously rich and powerful out of their profits.

Nordlin started out by saying that he represented the strongest labor district in the state, and then proceeded to confirm Carley's contentions. He read advertisements, prospectuses, lists of stockholders and officers of these organized associations and declared they had already formed a gigantic trust to control all the better class of small loans where the security was good and the profits enormous; but that they had in no way benefited the very poor who had no security and who were therefore just as much the victims of the Loan Sharks as ever.

The Senate voted down the proposal to make the law apply only to the large cities, and then killed the bill by a vote of 42 to 24—Senator Rosenmeier being excused and absent.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Conroy,	Jackson,	Putnam,
Bessette,	Denegre,	Lennon,	Rockne,
Boylan,	Diesen,	MacKenzie.	Stevens,
Brooks,	Dwyer,	Morin,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Cameron,	Furlow,	Orr,	Sweet,
Child,	Gemmill,	Peterson, N.,	Turnham.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahles,	Gillam,	Lund,	Serline,
Arens,	Haagenson,	Madigan,	Sletten,
Bonniwell,	Hansen,	Millett,	Solberg,
Bridgeman,	Hausler,	Nelson, W.	Sorenson,
Buckler,	Illsley,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Carley,	Johnson,	Nordlin,	Thoe,
Cashel,	Just,	Pederson,	Thwing,
Cliff,	Kelson,	Peterson, E.P.,	Wahlund,
Devold,	Landby,	Ribenack,	Zamboni.
Fickling,	Larson,	Romberg,	
Frisch,	Lee,	Schmechel,	

A great many kind hearted, honest people are very willing to do anything for the poor, but to get off their backs and give them a chance to help themselves.

The history of all the ages shows, if it shows anything, that such legislation as this only soothes and puts to sleep, while the social evils go on till the nation is destroyed.

Less law and more opportunity—less restriction and more liberty—less licensing and regulating evils, and more radical removal of the causes that produce the evils—this is the only way to restore the people to general prosperity so they will need no benevolent aid.

Charity was never a substitute for justice, and trimming off a few of the flowers and fruits of a wrong system can never take the place of the digger who uproots the noxious weed.

The Effect of Usury Laws

There has always been very grave question whether usury laws ever keep the rate of interest down.

On the contrary, many of our ablest writers and statesmen contend that such laws can have no other effect but to keep the rate of interest higher than it otherwise would be.

If the legal rate of interest is fixed at a LOWER rate than the normal commercial rate, then the borrower, before he can borrow, must pay the cost of evading the law.

It will thus cost him considerably more to get the money he needs.

If the legal rate is somewhat higher than the normal commercial rate, it will have no effect on the heavy borrower with good security. He is always able to borrow at the lowest possible rate, often much below the legal rate.

But the poor man, the unsophisticated—the ignorant—even though he have the best of security—will be likely to regard the legal rate as proper and make no attempt to borrow for less.

Don't forget that the law can in no way compel anyone to lend his money at all if he doesn't wish to; and he won't lend unless he is pretty sure of two things:

First—That he will get his money back.

Second—That he will get a rate of interest that will be satisfactory.

We are told that the State of Massachusetts has had no usury law at all for about 75 years. But it is a well known fact that Massachusetts has had, and now has, the lowest rate of interest of any state in the Union.

There being no laws to interfere in any way with free contract between borrower and lender money has gone into that state in large amounts and the result has been as stated above—the lowest rate in the nation—with the further result that all industry has been encouraged and stimulated until the whole state is almost one great factory town.

If you say this is bad—that one great factory town is not a desirable thing—the reply is that the faults and evils are not the result of low interest, but that land speculation, landlordism and monopoly, are the causes of the terrible social evils that curse Massachusetts as well as all the rest of the country, even the newest and most sparsely settled.

REGULATING WAREHOUSES

Nimocks, Dilley and Pearson had a bill regulating and licensing all sorts of warehousemen.

Grain and cold storage are already licensed and regulated, but they were not satisfied.

Whoever knew these regulators to be satisfied?

Is there anything they would not try to regulate?

They don't seem to have much confidence in the natural laws of trade.

Can't they sense the idea that TRADE—legitimate trade and industry—should be free and let alone?

At any rate the House did not take very kindly to this bill. It was killed 34 to 50.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Barnes,	Gislason,	Mayman,	Scallon,
Bernard,	Green,	McKnight,	Shonyo,
Christianson,	Haugland,	Merritt,	Sweitzer,
Cullum,	Hurlburt, D.,	Naylor,	Thompson,
Dahle,	Johnson, E.,	Nimocks,	Therrien,
Duemke,	Kinneberg,	Noonan,	Veigel,
Fabel,	Kleffman,	Rodenberg,	Waldal.
Farmer,	Lightner,	Rohne,	
Forestell,	Mauritz,	Samec,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,G.A.,	Grandstrand,	Lagerstedt,	Pratt,
Anderson,S.P.,	Herreid,	Lammers,	Quinn,
Bendixen,	Hompe,	Lang,	Skaiem,
Benson,	Horton,	Larson,	Starkey,
Bowers,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Lockhart,	Stein,
Cain,	Iverson,	Long, F. D.,	Stevens,
Darby,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Moen,	Strandemo,
Davis, C. R.,	Johnshoy,	Murphy,	Thomas,
Finstuen,	Johnson, J. A.,	Nellermoe,	Thorkelson,
Flahaven,	Johnson, J. G.,	Nelson,	Trovatten,
Fowler,	Kempfer,	Neuman,	Walworth.
Geister,	Kramer,	Olson,	
Girling,	Kolshorn,	Peterson, L.,	

47 did not vote.

THE BASIC SCIENCE BILL

The craze for regulation and meddling was brought to a rather ludicrous disaster in the case of the socalled "Basic Sciences" bill.

Mr. Pearson, of St. Paul, had introduced H. F. 145, said to have been sponsored by the regular medical doctors and also charged to be an attempt to put the Chiropractors and Osteopaths out of business.

The bill established a new board of three commissioners with offices at the State University, who were empowered and directed to prepare uniform examinations for all candidates who desired to practice the healing art, except spiritual and mental healers, dentists and optometrists.

At a public hearing, largely attended, the Chiropractors had most vigorously protested against the bill, claiming that they had their own standards for admission to their profession and that their requirements were quite as high as those provided for in the bill.

They didn't want any hostile outsiders regulating them and their work. They had proved themselves rather more efficient and successful in healing the sick than had the regulars who were trying to set up this standard.

In the committee on Public Health and Hospitals, out of 17 members only two votes could be had to favor the bill,—the chairman, Dr. Cole of Fergus Falls, and Mr. Naylor of Owatonna.

The committee reported the bill for indefinite postponement, which is rather a clumsy and roundabout way of saying that they favored killing the bill very dead.

Mr. Pearson made a valiant fight to save his bill from immediate slaughter, and tried to get it on general orders. The House wouldn't have it so.

He got 27 votes with 82 against it and 22 not voting.

Those who voted in the affirmative to give the bill another chance were:

Blum,	Hitchcock,	Long, P. J.,	Rodenberg,
Cole,	Jacobson, J.N.,	MacLean,	Shonyo,
Cullum,	Johnson, J. G.,	McKnight,	Stein,
Curtis,	Kinneberg,	Oren,	Stevens,
Davis, R.,	Kleffman,	Paige,	Taylor,
Fabel,	Larson,	Pattison,	Therrien,
Green,	Lightner,	Pearson,	

As illustrating this craze for licensing and regulating everybody and everything, the following from one of our daily newspapers is quite suggestive:

Business Regulations

"Legislators seem to be 'running to seed' in the matter of proposals to license and regulate various businesses. One day last week the following bills were introduced:

"By Dilley—Licensing and regulating owners and operators of devices for indicating the weight of persons (penny-in-the-slot machines).

"By Thomas, Hurlburt and Barnes—Licensing and regulating persons engaged in the business of guiding campers, hunters and fishermen.

"By Rodenberg—Licensing and regulating masseurs, hair-dressers and manicures.

"By J. N. Jacobson—Licensing and regulating persons engaged in the adjustment of fire insurance claims.

"By Rodenberg—Licensing persons owning and operating measuring devices for gasoline or gasoline substitutes.

"This is only one day's grist of licensing bills and does not include others heretofore introduced in this session. When it is considered that each one of these bills, if it became law, would mean a lot of extra clerks and inspectors in state offices, the effect on the taxpayers' pocketbook can be appreciated.

On Slot Machines

"Representative Dilley, who already had put in a bill to regulate penny-in-the-slot machines, has now introduced a more comprehensive measure, providing that the state weights and measures department shall license and regulate all slot and vending machines.

To cap the climax a bill to license and regulate the sale

of fire arms contained a provision that if one person murdered another with an unlicensed revolver, the penalty was to be much heavier than if his revolver had been licensed.

Doesn't this come pretty near the point of licensing and regulating robbery and murder?

All this seems very ridiculous and stupid, but it is the perfectly natural result of trying to correct the evils of society by pruning and trimming the vicious tree rather than by digging it up by the roots, as the old prophets advised, and casting it into the fire.

A Lawyer's Trades Union

Shall we have a law compelling everybody to join a trades union?

If he neglects or refuses, shall he be prohibited from earning a living at his chosen occupation?

Some lawyers seem to think so.

Friday afternoon, March 23rd, the House passed a bill introduced by the Judiciary Committee to organize the State Bar and regulate the legal profession, which required all lawyers to become members of the State Bar and pay a fee, otherwise they can't practice in any court of the State.

Before passage, the bill was amended so no lawyer could be disbarred for neglect or refusal to pay the fee, but all other regulations were left just as strict and unreasonable as before.

This lawyer's bill was passed Friday afternoon, March 23rd, amid a good deal of disturbance and not much close attention.

By Sunday a good sized insurrection had started among independent lawyers.

This culminated Monday morning in a largely attended meeting at the Minneapolis Elks Club.

A committee came to the Capitol to see what could be done.

The Senate Judiciary Committee was invaded and a vigorous protest lodged against the bill.

In the House Myrtle Cain was chosen to make the attempt to get the bill back from the Senate for reconsideration.

Many House members who had voted for the bill were now thoroughly awake to its far-reaching malign influence and Miss Cain's motion to recall was passed by a large majority; but the bill was locked in the office of the Secretary of the Senate and the Secretary himself had gone to supper.

So the bill could not be actually got by the House, and therefore could not be reconsidered, as the next day would be too late to reconsider.

Where was the bill? What was its status?

Every one now began to study this bill to create a compulsory lawyer's "Soviet." To force all lawyers to join, and to submit to regulation by the commission of eleven created by the bill.

And the more it was studied the fewer friends it had.

The seventeen who voted against it Friday were very proud of the fact, and many who had voted for it were doing penance and asking forgiveness.

Here are the 17 who voted **No.**

Anderson, A.,	Deans,	Nellermoe,	Swenson, E.,
Anderson, G.A.,	Geister,	Olson,	Veigel.
Barnes,	Horton,	Peterson, L.,	
Bowers,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Smith,	
Davis, R.,	Kramer,	Spelbrink,	

I shall not give you the names of the 93 who voted YES. Many of them should be forgiven, and there were several (21 in fact) who didn't vote, among them Stockwell, who seldom gets caught napping.

The very title of the bill, if carefully studied should condemn it. It reads:

"A bill for an act to provide for the organization and government of the state bar, including the creation, election and organization of commissioners of the state bar, and the vesting of such board with disciplinary powers over attorneys at law and providing the procedure to be followed in disciplinary cases and providing the payment of a state license fee by attorneys at law."

Just why should there be a law-created commission to regulate and discipline lawyers any more than carpenters, grocers, bricklayers, printers, or any other trade or profession?

And this is not the worst of it. The bill provided:

"In all cases in which the evidence in the opinion of the majority of the board justified such a course, they shall take such disciplinary action by public or private reprimand, suspension from the practice of law, or the exclusion or disbarment therefrom, as the case shall in their judgment warrant."

And still more and worse yet the bill also provided that the board might "receive gifts and bequests designed to promote the objects for which it is created." "Where would these gifts come from?" demanded the opponents of the bill.

"Where, but, from the rich and powerful who hoped to influence the board to get rid of radical and too independent lawyers."

OBJECTIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT LAWYERS

1. That there has been no discussion of the bill by the bar at large and the provisions of the bill are too important to permit enactment into law without a referendum among the bar of the state.
2. That the bill permits such corporation to receive gifts and that this will result in the subsidizing of the bar.
3. That, under the terms of the act, a committee of eleven lawyers are given by statute executive, legislative and judicial authority and may delegate such power.
4. That the purpose of the bill is undemocratic and un-American in providing a closed corporation and an enforced membership therein.
5. That by its terms the bill permits star chamber proceedings and enables the commissioners created thereby to try a lawyer in private and condemn him in public.

The lawyers of Minneapolis took a vote on this bill with the result that 93 were favorable and 225 opposed.

The next chapter presents a strong contrast to this one.

CHAPTER V.

EQUAL RIGHTS AND PERSONAL LIBERTY

"We hold these truths to be self evident:

"That all men are created equal;

"That they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights;

"That among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

If the Declaration of Independence is right—if these principles are correct—then government is an agency, exercising delegated powers.

Now, no agent can possibly possess the right to do anything that his principal could not do.

Hence no government can possess any RIGHT to do what no citizen himself could do, physically, morally nor justly.

If the government, as agent, attempted to do what the citizen, as principal, could not do, its act is an act of usurpation of power and void for want of authority.

If this principle were strictly adhered to many present day acts of government must needs be declared void; and yet no really necessary function of government would be needed.

Governments cannot GRANT rights or liberty.

They are created to protect pre-existing rights and liberties.

Therefore, legislatures are to be judged by this test:

To what extent were existing legislative tyranny or encroachment diminished or abolished.

In the light of these principles let us consider certain proposed statutes of the legislature of 1923.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO WOMEN

All through the ages women have been deprived of their inherent, natural rights and made subservient to man.

With equal suffrage, most of these encroachments have been removed; but some still remain.

At the same time some protective legislation for the general welfare has been enacted.

To remove all these remaining disabilities and at the same time retain all existing protection, a bill was drawn and introduced by Representatives Myrtle Cain, Bendixen, Barnes, Stockwell, Berg, Starkey and Nellermoe.

This bill aroused a vast amount of discussion and unlimited lobbying.

Despite the fact that the bill, in the plainest and simplest of language, contained the following words: "Provided that nothing in this act shall be construed as modifying, repealing or nullifying any statute heretofore enacted for the protection of persons in the interest of public welfare." In spite of these plain words—many women of wealth and social standing swarmed the Capitol trying to defeat the bill.

When asked to point out specific objections they could

only say they were afraid that the courts would rule against all protective legislation.

That this persistent lobbying and the inclination of men to avoid responsibility had been effective was brought out with great force on the afternoon of March 8th.

The committee on General Legislation had reported this bill out without recommendation, thinking it would have a fair chance to be heard on its merits on the floor of the House and then voted up or down.

When the committee report was read Representative Kempfer moved as a substitute for the committee report that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

This was a great surprise for the friends of the bill, and Mr. Bendixen and Trovatten spent less than a minute each in urging that the bill have a fair hearing on general orders, but that no time be wasted on it now.

But, a greater surprise was in store, when Mr. Finstuen immediately moved the previous question, thus shutting off all debate.

The previous question was carried and the roll call showed 79 for killing the bill immediately and 29 for giving it a fair hearing.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, A.,	Gehan,	Larson,	Rohne,
Benson,	Geister,	Lewer,	Salmonson,
Bernard,	Gislason,	Lightner,	Samec,
Blum,	Grandstrand,	Long, F. D.,	Smith,
Cole,	Green,	MacLean,	Spelbrink,
Cullum,	Hompe,	Mayman,	Strandemo,
Curtis,	Horton,	McKnight,	Sweitzer,
Dahle,	Howard,	McNelly,	Swenson, O.A.,
Darby,	Hulburt, C. E.,	Merritt,	Taylor,
Davis, C. R.,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Moen,	Teigen,
DeLury,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Naylor,	Thomas,
Duemke,	Johnshoy,	Neuman,	Thompson,
Emerson,	Johnson, E.,	Noonan,	Therrien,
Escher,	Johnson, J. A.,	Odegard,	Thorkelson,
Fabel,	Johnson, J. G.,	Oren,	Veigel,
Farmer,	Kempfer,	Paige,	Waldal,
Finstuen,	Knudsen,	Pattison,	Walworth,
Fisk,	Kramer,	Pearson,	Wilkinson,
Forestell,	Lammers,	Peterson, C.A.,	Mr. Speaker.
Fowler,	Lang,	Quinn,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, G.A.,	Enstrom,	Lagerstedt,	Stein,
Barnes,	Flahaven,	Lockhart,	Stevens,
Bendixen,	Girling,	Mauritz,	Stockwell,
Berg,	Hitchcock,	Nellermoe,	Trovatten,
Cain,	Hurlburt, D.,	Nelson,	Welch.
Davis, R.,	Iverson,	Olson,	
Day,	Kinneberg,	Skaiem,	
Dilley,	Kleffman,	Spindler,	

If the opponents of this bill had really wanted to be fair, they would either have let it go on general orders where it could have had a full and fair consideration, or Representative Kempfer would have protested against the previous question.

This is the first time in years that any such gag rule has been applied. It recalls the old days when "anything to win" was the order of the day.

A WOMAN ON THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

House File 176 was introduced by Mrs. Paige, MacLean, Duemke and Myrtle Cain.

The bill proposed to so amend the law creating the Industrial Commission as to require the Governor to appoint a woman as one of the members.

After looking up the law creating the Commission, and finding that it contains nothing to prevent the Governor from appointing one or even more women to its membership, Miss Cain decided not to support the bill, declaring that she wanted no legal FAVOR for women—just equal rights with men.

The bill, however, passed the House 68 to 50—just two more than the required number.

There was really not much opposition to the bill on the ground that it offered a sop to women instead of treating them as man's equal; but when it reached the Senate Myrtle Cain and Mrs. Kingsley appeared before the Welfare Committee and urged its defeat on the ground that women should have no special laws in their favor.

"Leave the matter with the Governor, where it now rests. Let him appoint a woman or not, as he sees fit."

The Senate Committee voted 11 to 3 against the bill.

The members of the Committee concurring in the majority report for indefinite postponement of the bill are:

Sullivan, J. D., Chairman	Lennon
Stevens	Denegre
MacKenzie	Rosenmeier
Rockne	Boylan
Millett	Putnam
Peterson	

A minority recommends the passage of the bill, which minority recommendation is concurred in by Senators:

Child Gillam Johnson

Child, Chairman of the Committee, tried to save the bill, but the Senate defeated him, 51 to 13.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Carley,	Gillam,	Landby,	Sletten,	Zamboni.
Child,	Hansen,	Millett,	Sweet,	
Diesen,	Johnson,	Romberg,	Turnham,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Fickling,	Lund,	Rockne,
Ahles,	Frisch,	MacKenzie,	Rosenmeier,
Arens,	Furlow,	Madigan,	Schmechel,
Bessette,	Gemmill,	Morin,	Serline,
Bonniwell,	Haagenson,	Nelson, W.,	Solberg,
Boylan,	Hausler,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sorenson,
Bridgeman,	Illsley,	Nordlin,	Stevens,
Brooks,	Jackson,	Orr,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Buckler,	Just,	Pederson,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Cameron,	Kelson,	Peterson, E.P.,	Thoe,
Cashel,	Larson,	Peterson, N.,	Thwing,
Denegre,	Lee,	Putnam,	Wahlund.
Devold,	Lennon,	Ribenack,	

I have used these bills as illustrating the two opposing views as to the position of women before the law.

The Federation of Women's Clubs, the League of Women Voters, Welfare Leagues and other well established organizations of women have worked with men for many years to secure, here a little and there a little, statutes in favor of women.

Sometimes it was to remove a disability; sometimes to secure a favor or special privilege.

They had been quite successful and had so changed the laws that women in Minnesota come about as near to enjoying all the rights that men enjoy as in any state, except Wisconsin, where the Woman's Equal Rights Bill became law two years ago.

On the other hand Myrtle Cain, Mrs. Colvin, Mrs. Moller, Mrs. Kingsley, and others of the Woman's Party, declared for equal rights before the law, but no favors.

They frankly admitted the biological differences between men and women, but insisted that such differences are not proper subjects for legislation. All they asked was equality before the law, and an equal opportunity to make the best of themselves unhampered by legal disabilities, unembarrassed by being petted and coddled by special legalized privileges.

It is quite plain that the two points of view are diametrically opposed; but each group may be given credit for equal sincerity.

It is just the difference between benevolent governmental paternalism and democracy—benevolent regulation as against equal rights and an equal chance.

THE ANTI-KLAN BILL

Of all the more than twenty-five hundred bills introduced into the two Houses of the 1923 Legislature, the one that was most widely commented on and that brought the author most conspicuously into the public prints in all parts of the country, was undoubtedly Myrtle Cain's bill to prohibit the wearing of masks and disguises in public places.

The author's picture was printed and the bill discussed from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Gulf.

The bill was brief and to the point.

The wearing of masks or other disguises to conceal identity was made a misdemeanor with suitable punishment.

People have a right to be protected from masked mobs who take the law into their own hands and commit the most heinous crimes under the guise of enforcing public morality—their own pet variety of morality.

After the bill passed the House, under suspension of the rules with only two votes against it, the Senate Committee on General Legislation had a public hearing on Wednesday, April 4th, at which appeared G. F. Clark, who claimed to represent the K. K. K. of Oregon, and declared that if this bill was passed he would see to it that all parochial schools were abolished in Minnesota as they had been in Oregon.

The next day the Senate suspended the rules and passed the bill without a single no vote.

It is quite important that this bill be understood.

It is in no sense an encroachment on any personal right or liberty.

It can't be classed with ordinary meddlesome or regulatory legislation.

It should rather be regarded as preventive.

Masked mobs who ride by night, by the very masks and regalia which conceal their identity, thereby proclaim themselves cowards, lawbreakers and criminals.

Their whole career has been one continuous succession of acts of violence, repression, assault and murder, under the guise of morality and patriotism.

Outside the law they presume to set up standards of conduct and belief utterly at variance with American ideals of political and religious freedom.

They boast that they are PRO-WHITE, PRO-PROTESTANT, PRO-GENTILE, PRO-AMERICAN, which can mean nothing else but that they are anti-Negro, anti any other color but white, anti-Catholic, anti-Jew or any other religions but Protestant, and ANTI foreigner.

They flout and deny the very essence of true Americanism that denies all distinction of race, color, creed or sex in its fundamental law and proclaims that "ALL men are created equal" before the law and in their rights to a place on earth and an equal chance to earn and enjoy.

Let there be the greatest possible opportunity for differences of opinion on all subjects, political, religious, industrial, social, and all others; but let those opinions be advocated in the open, not behind masks and disguises.

Let the advocates of any idea come into the open like men and meet their opponents in the arena of free discussion; not sneak behind masks that conceal their identity while they enforce their views with bludgeons, torture, murder and burnings at the stake.

KILLING WOODCHUCKS STOCKWELL GETS A FEW

For some time the representatives of the great public service corporations have been very active denouncing tax exempt securities.

"Rich men buy these bonds and thus escape all taxation."

They demand that all bonds shall be taxed,—school bonds, road bonds, town, county, village, city, state and national bonds—all must be taxed, they say.

"Then public bonding will be checked,—the drift toward publicly owned utilities will be ended,—and we can more easily finance our privately owned utilities."

Their campaign had been very successful.

Chambers of commerce, commercial clubs, city councils, the National Tax Conference, State Legislatures and even one branch of Congress had passed resolutions denouncing tax exempt securities, and proposing a constitutional amendment to tax all public bonds.

The Minnesota Senate had passed such a resolution, unanimously, and sent it over to the House, where it lay in the tax committee.

Stockwell was a member of that committee.

He prepared and introduced a counter resolution, clearly pointing out:

First—just what influences were behind this movement to tax all public bonds.

Second—how, if public bonds were taxed, it would inevitably increase the rate of interest that the people must pay.

Third—That the same rich men would buy these bonds as before, and would really make a bigger profit than ever.

Fourth—It would greatly hamper all public activities by making it more difficult to finance them.

Fifth—It would tighten the grip of the public service corporations, and make them more powerful than ever.

Well, this resolution set members to thinking, and the Senate resolution against tax-exempt securities died in the House Tax Committee.

Stockwell had killed the woodchuck.

Public bonds are a curse, and will probably bankrupt many cities and states before the people wake up and stop it; but the remedy is not to subject such bonds to taxation.

THE REMEDY IS TO PAY AS WE GO

Every needed public improvement creates a value, usually far greater than its cost.

Those values should be assessed to pay the cost just as we do now for sewers, water, streets, paving, etc.

Then bonds will not be needed.

The City of San Francisco has recently built a very expensive addition to its publicly owned street railway system and assessed the entire cost against benefited lot owners, who came forward and urged the extension and offered to be assessed.

Carfare in San Francisco is 5 cents, no more.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE BLUE BOOK

The Blue Book for 1923 was compiled by Jack Hammond, connected with the finance department of the Pioneer Press and Dispatch.

For some reason the compiler left out of the book the Declaration of Independence.

Just why has not been learned.

The Declaration of Independence is a very radical, revolutionary and dangerous document in the eyes of some, and many of our very rich would like to have us forget it.

Many who tody to privilege, though poor, feel the same way.

"The YOUNG and the IMMATURE should not be given such strong mental stimulant."

Is that why the Declaration was kept out of the Legislature Blue Book? To protect the Legislature?

STOCKWELL WANTS TO KNOW

Stockwell introduced a resolution of inquiry.

He wanted to know WHY the Declaration was left out.

It probably won't be left out next time.

Slightly amended the House passed Stockwell's resolution.

Some Military Woodchucks

A certain bill referred to the Philippine "INSURRECTION" wars.

Stockwell moved to strike out the word "insurrection" in the interest of historical accuracy, and it was done, no member objecting.

Senator Furlow had introduced and passed two military bills.

These bills came up in the House Tuesday, April 10th, on special order.

The first was Senate File 1089, which attempted to permit the "armory commission, the armory board, or the armory officer in charge" to increase the fund for the maintenance of each unit of the National Guard from $250 dollars annually to $750 annually, and require every county auditor to levy the amount on the taxpayers of the county.

Stockwell protested and the bill was killed, 20 for and 80 against.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Cullum,	Johnson, E.,	Merritt,	Scallon,
Deans,	Lightner,	Murphy,	Skaiem,
Dilley,	Long, P. J.,	Paige,	Sweitzer,
Fabel,	MacLean,	Pattison,	Therrien,
Green,	Mayman,	Pearson,	Washburn,
Hulbert, C. E.,	McKnight,	Rodenberg,	Mr. Speaker.

The other bill, S. F. 1090, would have greatly increased the number of armories that could be built each year.

The House stood by Stockwell and killed the bill with only 12 for and 64 against.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Dilley,	MacLean,	Murphy,	Rodenberg,
Lightner,	Mayman,	Paige,	Stevens,
Lockhart,	McKnight,	Pearson,	Washburn.

The real militarists were not so many, when they had to go on record.

ENSTROM KILLS A VERY OLD WOODCHUCK

For many years the Booth Packing Co. has enjoyed a practical monopoly of the commercial fishing on Lake of the Woods and the International waters.

The method was simple, but effective.

Large numbers of individual fishermen were employed by the company to take out fishing permits, and then transfer these permits to the Booth Company, who thus could monopolize all the desirable shore locations and keep out competitors.

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION

Enstrom, who represents the people of Roseau County rather than the Booth Company, secured the passage of a little amendment to the law forbidding any transfer of permits.

What will the Booth Company do now?

Possibly they will have to take their chance on an equality with other fishermen.

A BANKERS' WOODCHUCK

Pearson and McKnight had introduced a bill, H. F. 431, raising the minimum capitalization of new banks which would have to be paid in before they could start business.

Iverson and Wilkinson said it would freeze out the smaller banks, and encourage branch banking in the larger

cities, instead of the smaller independent neighborhod banks.

The House killed it very dead, 29 for, 67 against.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Christianson,	Gislason,	Larson,	Quinn,
Curtis,	Green,	Lewer,	Teigen,
Dahle,	Hitchcock,	Lightner,	Thomas,
Emerson,	Johnson, E.,	McKnight,	Washburn,
Escher,	Johnson, J. A.,	Murphy,	Mr. Speaker.
Fabel,	Knudsen,	Noonan,	
Fisk,	Lagerstedt,	Odegard,	
Forestell,	Lammers,	Pearson,	

I have not given the negative vote in any of these cases. It included about all the rest of the House.

A HIDDEN STATE CONSTABULARY

In 1921 the Senate passed a most vicious State Constabulary bill, but the House killed it very dead.

Of the 41 Senators who voted for the bill only 13 are now members of the Senate, 18 were defeated, 10 were not candidates.

Senate File 1066 was a bill to regulate traffic on the state highways.

Section 37 of the bill looked suspicious.

Nordlin, Devold, Schmechel and Morin all declared that under that section the Highway Commission could establish a complete state constabulary.

The Senate seemed to agree. They cut out Section 37 by a vote of 34 to 16, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Dwyer,	Kelson,	Peterson, E.P.,
Bonniwell,	Fickling,	Landby,	Rosenmeier,
Boylan,	Furlow,	Lee,	Sletten,
Bridgeman,	Haagenson,	Lennon,	Solberg,
Buckler,	Hansen,	Lund,	Thwing,
Carley,	Hausler,	Morin,	Wahlund,
Child,	Illsley,	Nelson, J. W.,	Zamboni.
Devold,	Jackson,	Nordlin,	
Diesen,	Just,	Pederson,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Cameron,	Johnson,	Putnam,
Ahles,	Denegre,	Larson,	Serline,
Bessette,	Gemmill,	Madigan,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Brooks,	Gillam,	Peterson, N.,	Turnham.

I have put these "woodchucks" into this chapter on Personal Rights and Equal Liberty because, like all "woodchucks" in legislation everywhere, they seek to secure some special favor or advantage for one or a few to the disadvantage of the great common mass of the people. A large book could be filled with legislation of this kind. Very little of it succeeded in 1923.

THE "ILLEGITIMACY" BILLS

Under this same head of restoring or protecting personal rights and constitutional liberties, I wish to consider three bills relating to so called "illegitimate" children.

I say "so called," for the reason that under the laws

of nature there can be no such thing as "illegitimate" children.

All children come into the world according to the same great benign natural law and Nature gives them all an equal welcome.

It is only when we study the statutes of man that we find unjust favors for some children and unjust discrimination against others.

THE FATHER'S DUTY

Every father should be responsible for his own acts in helping to bring children into the world.

In order to establish this responsibility and require all fathers to join in the support of their children, "illegitimate" as well as legitimate;—in order to make the statutes of man conform to the divine laws of Nature,—three bills were prepared by the Salvation Army and introduced by the four women members of the House.

The first bill, H. F. 210, so amended the present law as to provide for inheritance to and from illegitimate children the same as though they were legitimate. Passed 68 to 33.

The second bill, H. F. 236, authorized the illegitimate child to take the surname of its father, where the court should so decree—passed 68 to 41.

The third bill amended the probate court law so as to include illegitimate children—passed 70 to 36.

Here is the roll call on H. F. 210.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,G.A.,	Escher,	Mayman,	Skaiem,
Anderson,S.P.,	Finstuen,	McKnight,	Spelbrink,
Barnes,	Hompe,	Merritt,	Spindler,
Bendixen,	Horton,	Moen,	Starkey,
Benson,	Howard,	Murphy,	Stockwell,
Bernard,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Nellermoe,	Strandemo,
Bowers,	Hurlburt, D.,	Nelson,	Taylor,
Cain,	Johnshoy,	Noonan,	Teigen,
Cullum,	Johnson, E.,	Norton,	Thomas,
Curtis,	Kempfer,	Odegard,	Thompson,
Dahle,	Kleffman,	Olson,	Therrien,
Davis, R.,	Kramer,	Paige,	Thorkelson,
Day,	Lammers,	Peterson, L.,	Trovatten,
Deans,	Lockhart,	Pratt,	Washburn,
DeLury,	Long, P. J.,	Salmonson,	Welch,
Duemke,	MacLean,	Samec,	Wilkinson,
Enstrom,	Mauritz,	Scallon,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, A.,	Geister,	Lightner,	Rohne,
Blum,	Girling,	Masek,	Shonyo,
Christianson,	Gislason,	McNelly,	Smith,
Davis, C. R.,	Grandstrand,	Naylor,	Stein,
Dilley,	Haugland,	Neuman,	Sweitzer,
Emerson,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Nimocks,	Swenson, O.A.,
Fabel,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Pearson,	Veigel,
Farmer,	Johnson, J. A.,	Peterson, C.A.,	Waldal.
Flahaven,	Kolshorn,	Rodenberg,	

The lineups on the other bills were about the same.

THE RIGHTS OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

If teachers and instructors in the U. of M. and our public schools are to enjoy academic freedom, they must be secure against arbitrary dismissal.

It had been claimed that there was no academic freedom in the University of Minnesota,—that professors and instructors had been dismissed without cause,—and that a spirit of todying and sycophancy was growing and permeating the academic atmosphere.

Nellermoe introduced H. F. 143, which provided that before dismissal any teacher or instructor should have a hearing before a committee of teachers in his own department.

This committee was to make a thorough investigation and file a copy of its report with the Board of Regents, with the President of the University and with the accused.

The House killed the bill, 62 to 61.

Those who voted to kill the bill were:

Bendixen,	Grandstrand,	Lewer,	Pattison,
Christianson,	Green,	Lightner,	Pearson,
Cole,	Haugland,	Long, P. J.,	Rodenberg,
Curtis,	Hitchcock,	MacLean,	Rohne,
Dahle,	Hompe,	McKnight,	Scallon,
Dilley,	Hough,	McNelly,	Shonyo,
Duemke,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Merritt,	Stevens,
Emerson,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Moen,	Strandemo,
Escher,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Naylor,	Swenson, O.A.,
Fabel,	Johnson, E.,	Neuman,	Taylor,
Farmer,	Johnson, J. A.,	Nimocks,	Teigen,
Fisk,	Kelly,	Noonan,	Thomas,
Forestell,	Knudsen,	Norton,	Washburn,
Fowler,	Kolshorn,	Odegard,	Wilkinson.
Gehan,	Lammers,	Oren,	
Girling,	Lang,	Paige,	

Those who voted in the negative for a fair trial were:

Anderson, A.,	Enstrom,	Larson,	Spindler,
Anderson,G.A.,	Finstuen,	Lockhart,	Spooner,
Anderson,S.P.,	Flahaven,	Long, F. D.,	Starkey,
Barnes,	Geister,	Mauritz,	Stein,
Benson,	Herreid,	Mayman,	Stockwell,
Berg,	Horton,	Nellermoe,	Swenson, E.,
Bernard,	Howard,	Nelson,	Thompson,
Blum,	Hurlburt, D.,	Olson,	Therrien,
Bowers,	Iverson,	Peterson, C.A.,	Thorkelson,
Cain,	Johnshoy,	Peterson, L.,	Trovatten,
Darby,	Johnson, J. G.,	Pratt,	Veigel,
Davis, C. R.,	Kempfer,	Quinn,	Waldal,
Davis, R.,	Kinneberg,	Salmonson,	Welch.
Day,	Kleffman,	Samec,	
Deans,	Kramer,	Skaiem,	
DeLury,	Lagerstedt,	Spelbrink,	

It is my opinion that if this test had occurred later in the session it would not have been killed.

Surely the proposal is fair. No teacher should be arbitrarily dismissed without a hearing.

Public School teachers enjoy that right. Why not a professor or an instructor at the University?

"FOREIGN" DAMAGE SUITS

Minnesota is a good state in which to try personal injury cases against railroad corporations. Our courts have the reputation of granting heavy damages to injured victims of corporate carelessness. As a natural result, injured persons bring actions in our courts where possible. As a further result a group of very able lawyers in the state have come to be known as successful prosecutors of such cases.

Many very large verdicts have been secured, not only for citizens of Minnesota, but for citizens of other states as well.

All court cases cost money, not only to those who bring these actions and defend them, but also they are an expense to the public.

As a result of this public expense, many people have insisted that all cases against "foreign" railroads, where the cause of action arises outside of Minnesota should be barred out of our courts—should be compelled to bring the action in the state where the accident or other cause of action occurred.

This they claim would save the state of Minnesota a vast amount of expense.

BUT

This matter is not nearly so simple as that. Many citizens of Minnesota go outside the state to work; many others go to Florida or California for the winter; still others are traveling on business in all parts of the country.

Shall all these people—citizens of our state—be denied the right to bring actions in our courts, in case they are injured outside the state in the regular course of their work, or their business, or their pleasures at some winter resort, if the careless corporation have no place of business here?

Must these citizens be forced to go to the trouble and expense of taking all their witnesses to the place where the cause of action arose, and trying out the issues there?

This would have to be done, citizens of Minnesota would have to be shut out of their own courts, if citizens of other states were shut out.

You can't deny to a citizen of Texas, Maine, or Florida, or any other states, any right which you don't deny to your own citizens.

In matters like this, these United States are one country, not 48 separate countries. The constitution of the U. S. takes care of that.

So the more this matter was thought over and talked over, the less chance there was for the passage of S. F. 1082, introduced by Putnam, and entitled, "An act prohibiting the bringing of actions in the courts of this state against 'foreign' railroad corporations upon causes of action not arising in this state, except in certain cases."

This bill was hotly contested in the Senate on the last day of the session, and defeated by the following vote, 22 for, 34 against:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Gillam,	Madigan,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Ahles,	Hansen,	Orr,	Sweet,
Brooks,	Jackson,	Peterson, E. P.,	Thoe,
Cameron,	Johnson,	Putnam,	Turnham.
Denegre,	Larson,	Serline,	
Furlow,	MacKenzie,	Sorenson,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Arens,	Dwyer,	Lund,	Schmechel,
Bessette,	Fickling,	Morin,	Sletten,
Bonniwell,	Frisch,	Nelson, J. W.,	Solberg,
Boylan,	Hausler,	Nordlin,	Stevens,
Buckler,	Illsley,	Pederson,	Thwing,
Carley,	Just,	Peterson, N.,	Wahlund.
Cashel,	Kelson,	Ribenack,	
Diesen,	Landby,	Romberg,	
Devold,	Lee,	Rosenmeier,	

Twelve did not vote—Bridgeman, Child, Cliff, Conroy, Gemmill, Haagenson, Lennon, Millett, W. Nelson, Rockne, J. D. Sullivan, and Zamboni.

Cliff, Conroy, and W. Nelson were sick, and Gemmill was excused. The others had been present that day.

The Farmer-Labor forces were a unit against the bill and were helped by a number of others.

It had been made quite plain that if this bill were to pass, the greatest sufferers would be poor men who could not stand the expense of a suit far away from home.

It was also shown that a large percentage of these cases —started in our courts—never came to trial, but were settled; and therefore the expense to the state was very little.

There appeared to be considerable force to the contention of the opponents of the bill that it was a railroad measure ——that it had been proposed and pushed by the railroads in order to protect themselves from verdicts for heavy damages.

There can be no doubt that "foreign" railroads would stand to gain very much by the passage of bills of this kind in as many states as possible; and it is generally believed that the campaign for such legislation is nation wide.

I have included this subject in this chapter on Equal Rights and Personal Liberty because it seems to me to be a plain case of an attempt on the part of the railroads to use the laudable feeling of the people against unnecessary expense, to befog the real question, and to make selfish gain for themselves at the expense of their victims.

To protect the inherent equal rights of the individual citizen is the supreme reason for government at all in a democracy like ours; and when those rights are denied, government fails and becomes tyranny.

CHAPTER VI.
CRIMES, CRIMINALS AND PUNISHMENT

Why do some people steal from other people?

Largely because we have made it difficult to earn a living honestly.

Most people much prefer to get along honestly than to steal.

It is safer and more respectable; but when jobs are scarce and wages low there is a strong temptation to take what belongs to others.

When jobs are plenty and wages high, it is then easier to get a living honestly than to steal it! consequently there is not much of this kind of crime going on.

All this applies only to the poorer and more ignorant thieves.

The shrewd, keen, rich thieves manage it differently.

They usually get laws passed by Congress, Legislatures or City Councils so they can steal legally. They are not so likely to get into trouble.

These laws that permit some to get what does not belong to them, usually take the form of land grants, tariff protection, franchises, unjust tax laws, and other forms of legal privilege.

Of course, whatever any class of people are able to get through these different forms of special privilege, by just that much the great common mass of unprivileged people are robbed of what rightfully belongs to them—robbed legally.

It would seem, therefore, that Legislators should bend their energies to the removal of the causes that lead to crime, rather than to the punishment of the criminals who are to a very large extent the victims of bad laws.

HOWEVER

Not much was attempted along this line, but both Houses were flooded with bills to increase penalties and intensify punishment.

How slowly we learn.

If history teaches anything, it is that mere punishment has never been a remedy for crimes, and that removal of causes has always resulted in less crime.

THE INDIANA AUTOMOBILE LAW

The State of Indiana has adopted a simple device, based on the principle of the travelers' check, which is attached to all automobiles.

No person can sell an automobile in that state without signing his name in the presence of witneses, and his signature, of course, must correspond to the signature of the owner on this device.

Anyone attempting to sell a stolen automobile is certain of detection, hence few stolen autos.

This little identification plate, with the owner's name in his own hand writing, is more effective against auto stealing, than all the penalties and punishments ever enacted.

For two sessions now the committee of the Minnesota Legislature on automobiles have been urged to consider this device; but for some reason have failed to show interest. Instead they have gone on multiplying statutes and increasing penalties.

HOW SLOWLY WE LEARN!

I have said that a great mass of bills came in to increase punishment for crime and some of them even went so far as to deprive people of ancient rights and liberties that have been regarded as fundamentals for many hundreds of years.

One bill would deprive a prisoner of his right to a separate trial, in cases where several had been jointly indicted for the same offense.

Another limited the scope of the writ of Habeas Corpus so that persons arrested on suspicion and held without charge would find it much more difficult to secure a writ and get a hearing.

It was charged against this bill that a perfectly innocent poor man might be held in jail a very long time and no chance to be heard.

Mr. DeLury made a very strong speech against this bill and was ably helped by Nellermoe, Erling Swenson, Stockwell, Starkey, Lockhart and C. A. Peterson.

Pattison and Moen defended the bill.

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 29:

Christianson,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Moen,	Sweitzer,
Cole,	Johnson, J. A.,	Naylor,	Taylor,
Curtis,	Lightner,	Odegard,	Teigen,
Dahle,	Long, P. J.	Paige,	Thompson,
Forestell,	MacLean,	Pattison,	Wilkinson.
Hompe,	Mayman,	Pearson,	
Horton,	McKnight,	Scallon,	
Hulbert, C. E.,	McNelly,	Strandemo,	

Here is the roll call on the bill to try prisoners wholesale instead of individually.

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 56:

Anderson, A.,	Gislason,	Lightner,	Shonyo,
Anderson, S.P.,	Grandstrand,	Long, P. J.,	Spindler,
Bendixen,	Green,	MacLean,	Strandemo,
Benson,	Herreid,	Mayman,	Sweitzer,
Bernard,	Horton,	McKnight,	Swenson, O.A.,
Christianson,	Hough,	McNelly,	Taylor,
Cole,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Moen,	Teigen,
Cullum,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Naylor,	Thompson,
Deans,	Johnson, E.,	Noonan,	Thorkelson,
Emerson,	Johnson, J. A.	Odegard,	Wilkinson,
Escher,	Johnson, J. G.,	Oren,	
Farmer,	Kempfer,	Paige,	Mr. Speaker.
Finstuen,	Knudsen,	Pattison,	
Fowler,	Larson,	Rohne,	
Girling,	Lewer,	Scallon,	

These two roll calls are significant.

Fifty-six were willing to deprive a prisoner of his right to a separate trial; but only 29 were ready to tamper with the right of Habeas Corpus.

How prone we are to regard lightly the rights of the poor, the unpopular, the despised.

How we forget that our own liberties are not safe unless we zealously protect the liberties of the most lowly!

RESTORING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

But the most determined onslaught on humane policies in the treatment of the victims of our "CIVILIZATION" was the attempt to restore capital punishment in certain cases.

Several bills for capital punishment were introduced, but the one that seemed most likely to pass—the mildest one of all was S. F. 20, introduced by John D. Sullivan of St. Cloud.

This bill occupied the time of the Senate all the afternoon of February 28.

Nordlin led the opposition.

"I am not a sentimentalist nor a mollycoddle.

"I have been urged by two clergymen of my district—clergymen of two very strong churches, representing the two main divisions of the Christian religion—to support this bill; but I don't believe the Creator ever intended that men should adopt the cruel and barbarous doctrine of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. No, the Creator is the personification of mercy."

This crime wave that Senators talk about is no mystery.

It is the natural aftermath of every war.

History shows it to have followed the Civil War.

History again shows us a crime wave after the Mexican War, which largely spent itself in the gold rush to California and the wild and barbarous condition of that state for ten years or more.

Hanging may be to some extent a deterrent, but capital punishment never has succeeded.

Juries will not convict.

Three hundred and two murders in Chicago, four convictions and one of them afterward proved innocent.

Certainty of capture and conviction is far better, and more will be convicted without capital punishment than with it.

Jackson and Sweet made speeches against the bill, quoting statistics to show that it is not capital punishment, but certainty that the law will be enforced, that is a deterrent of crime.

It was also pointed out that the bill now, as amended, changed the burden of proof. Every man is innocent until PROVED guilty; but you make his guilt presumptive and require him to bring evidence to prove his innocence.

Furlow defended the ex-service men against the charge of being criminally minded, tho it had not appeared that any speaker had made such a charge.

Solberg now took the floor and made a powerful plea for the defeat of the bill.

"I had hoped that we had advanced beyond this stage of development, and I believe we have.

"Saul was zealous in his persecutions of the Christians, but he was mistaken. He repented.

"You can no more deter crime by hanging criminals than you can win people for heaven by shaking them over the pit of fire and brimstone.

"The government has no right to take what it cannot restore.

"Don't follow the old law. Follow the teachings of Jesus.

"You have many times hung innocent people. If you could restore the victim to life by hanging the murderer, it might be well; but you can't.

Murder is no less murder when deliberately committed by the state, than when committed by the individual; and the guilt falls on all of us."

George Sullivan explained that he could not vote for the bill now that it made Stillwater the single slaughter house for the whole state. I have never had much use for capital punishment anyway. I voted years ago to abolish it.

The vote on the bill, as amended, was then taken, with the result that it was badly defeated.

Those who voted in the affirmative were 26:

Adams,	Conroy,	Johnson,	Serline,
Ahles,	Denegre,	Millett,	Sorenson,
Boylan,	Dwyer,	Nelson, W.,	Stevens,
Brooks,	Fickling,	Peterson, N.,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Cameron,	Frisch,	Putnam,	Thoe.
Cashel,	Haagenson,	Rockne,	
Cliff,	Illsley,	Rosenmeier,	

Those who voted in the negative were 41:

Arens,	Gillam,	MacKenzie,	Sletten,
Bessette,	Hansen,	Madigan,	Solberg,
Bonniwell,	Hausler,	Morin,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Bridgeman,	Jackson,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sweet,
Buckler,	Just,	Nordlin,	Thwing,
Carley,	Kelson,	Orr,	Turnham,
Child,	Landby,	Pederson,	Wahlund,
Diesen,	Larson,	Peterson, E.P.,	Zamboni.
Devold,	Lee,	Ribenack,	
Furlow,	Lennon,	Romberg,	
Gemmill,	Lund,	Schmechel,	

All Farmer-Labor Senators voted against the bill excepting Peterson of Wadena.

The remnant of the "Old Guard" was for it, except George Sullivan.

A few who are sometimes mildly progressive were for it, but most of those were against it.

Thus was the House saved the necessity of voting on this bill; but it was freely declared that the negative majority would have been quite as great as in the Senate had the bill come to a vote.

The emphatic defeat of this bill in the Senate caused the abandonment of all other bills to restore capital punishment.

This was the mildest and least blood-thirsty of all the bills, and the one that would command the most support.

TO ABOLISH THE BOARD OF PAROLE

Mr. Hompe had a bill to do away with the indeterminate sentence and so put an end to the work of the Parole Board. No prisoner would then have much hope of getting out until his term had expired.

This bill was strongly opposed at public hearings by the prison authorities, and by Stockwell, Paige, Fowler, Dahle,

and others on the floor of the House Saturday morning, March 24, and was badly beaten.

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 27:

Cullum,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Lammers,	Peterson, C.A.,
Deans,	Johnson, E.,	Larson,	Rohne,
Duemke,	Johnson, J. A.,	Lightner,	Scallon,
Grandstrand,	Kelly,	Mayman,	Smith,
Hompe,	Kinneberg,	McNelly,	Taylor,
Hough,	Knudsen,	Nelson,	Wilkinson.
Howard,	Kolshorn,	Odegard,	

Those who voted in the negative were, 84:

Anderson,G.A.,	Finstuen,	Long, F. D.,	Shonyo,
Anderson,S.P.,	Flahaven,	Long, P. J.,	Skaiem,
Barnes,	Fowler,	MacLean,	Spelbrink,
Bendixen,	Geister,	Masek,	Spindler,
Berg,	Girling,	Mauritz,	Starkey,
Bernard,	Gislason,	McKnight,	Stein,
Blum,	Green,	Merritt,	Stevens,
Bowers,	Haugland,	Moen,	Stockwell,
Cain,	Herreid,	Naylor.	Strandemo,
Christianson,	Horton,	Nellermoe,	Sweitzer,
Cole,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Neuman,	Swenson, O.A.,
Curtis,	Hurlburt, D.,	Noonan,	Teigen,
Dahle,	Iverson,	Olson,	Thomas,
Davis, R.,	Johnshoy,	Oren,	Thompson,
Day,	Johnson, J. G.,	Paige,	Therrien,
DeLury,	Kempfer,	Pearson,	Thorkelson,
Dilley,	Kleffman,	Peterson, L.,	Trovatten,
Emerson,	Kramer,	Quinn,	Walworth,
Enstrom,	Lagerstedt,	Rodenberg,	Washburn,
Escher,	Lewer,	Salmonson,	Welch,
Farmer,	Lockhart,	Samec,	Mr. Speaker.

Thus again defeat came to those whose remedy for crime is repression and punishment.

The Governor's Crime Prevention Commission brought in a large number of very drastic measures, some of which have been described above, but no one of them passed both Houses.

They were on the wrong track.

Wouldn't it be better to have a commission to look into the economic and industrial causes of crime, and to what extent crime is promoted by unjust statutes?

Perhaps if we could repeal a lot of bad laws it would do more to end crime than all the drastic penalties ever invented.

May it not be that we are on the wrong track with regard to our whole system of punishment?

Might it not be better if we were to require reparation to the injured; and when the damage had been repaired, then the "criminal" be freed from further obligation?

Is it not true that the innocent wife and children of a murderer, for example, are the ones who are really punished under our present system, while the innocent dependents of the victim are not in any way compensated for their loss?

Why not try compensation in place of vengeance?

CHAPTER VII.—TAXATION

In Chapter II. I have pointed out how our present system of taxation is the real underlying cause of landlordism.

And all concede that landlordism, in all its varied forms and ramifications, is the primary cause of practically all the evils that curse society.

It therefore follows that the first and most important thing to do, if we are to save our civilization from destruction, is to reform our system of taxation.

IN CIVILIZED SOCIETY PUBLIC REVENUE IS NECESSARY.

Also, as civilized society develops, there arises and grows a value that this very progress of society creates and maintains.

That socially-created value attaches to LAND and to nothing else.

Imagine a perfectly wild and empty tract of land around the head of navigation on the Mississippi river.

This should not be so difficult to imagine, for there are men now living who can remember when that was practically true.

The Falls of St. Anthony poured their waters over the precipice in an untenanted wildness.

At that time the land upon which now stand the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul had no value.

It had no value because there were no people here.

No one wanted it.

No one would pay anything for it.

But the land around the Falls of St. Anthony is the natural site of a great industrial and commercial center.

People began to locate here and go to work.

Their work produced WEALTH. Houses, shops, stores, food, clothing, and all the other needs of life are the product of their WORK of production and exchange.

All this wealth is the product of individual and associated labor and belongs naturally and morally to the individual men and women who have produced it.

If you have plowed and planted and harvested, then the crop is yours—it belongs to no one else.

If you have built a house, then the house is yours. No one else has any moral right to it, nor to any part of its value, except as you may agree.

If you have brought into this little growing community a stock of goods of any kind, that stock of goods is yours and all the laws of God and man will protect you in its ownership, except as against the assessor.

BUT

All the while this little community has been settling here and going about its daily work, another kind of VALUE has been arising—this is the VALUE of the LAND on which the town is located.

This value is NOT directly the product of individual or co-operative effort.

This is an entirely different kind of value.

It is the result of community growth and development

Every new family settling here increases this LAND value.

Every improvement made—every street opened—every sidewalk laid—every dwelling or public building erected—provided it is needed—all these things increase the value of the land on which this community is living and growing.

From all this it would seem to follow that this publicly created value was intended in the very nature of things to meet public needs, that it morally belongs to all the people and should be taken and used to pay for the administration of the common affairs of the community.

If it is not so taken and used it will, of course, remain in the possession of the fortunate lot owners.

They will become rich, and taxes will have to be levied on the food, clothing, houses and other buildings, and on the processes and products of industry.

Then will follow all the disastrous results of high priced lots and land and low wages—of vacant lots and unemployed labor.

This is what our wrong system of taxation has brought us to.

Let me repeat and emphasize: Practically every social evil can be traced, directly or indirectly, to our crooked and dishonest system of taxation.

What did the Legislature of 1923 do to correct this?

Not much but something—far more was attempted than succeeded.

Girling's Bill

Girling and Stevens secured the passage of a bill, H. F. 60, through the House, exempting **$200** worth of **household** goods to each head of a **household** in place of the present exemption of **$100** to each head of a **family.**

This would considerably help many poor people.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,G.A.,	Grandstrand,	Merritt,	Spooner,
Barnes,	Hough,	Murphy,	Starkey,
Bendixen,	Howard,	Nellermoe,	Stevens,
Berg,	Hurlburt, D.,	Neuman,	Stockwell,
Bernard,	Johnson, E.,	Nimocks,	Strandemo,
Blum,	Kempfer,	Noonan,	Sweitzer,
Bowers,	Kleffman,	Norton,	Swenson, E.,
Cullum,	Kramer,	Odegard,	Taylor,
Davis, R.,	Lagerstedt,	Oren,	Thomas,
DeLury,	Lang,	Paige,	Therrien,
Dilley,	Lockhart,	Peterson, C.A.,	Veigel,
Duemke,	Long, F. D.,	Peterson, L.,	Waldal,
Fabel,	Long, P. J.,	Pratt,	Washburn,
Finstuen,	MacLean,	Rodenberg,	Wilkinson,
Fowler,	Masek,	Salmonson,	Mr. Speaker.
Gehan,	Mauritz,	Samec,	
Girling,	Mayman,	Scallon,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, A.,	Curtis,	Escher,	Gislason,
Anderson,S.P.,	Darby,	Fisk,	Haugland,
Benson,	Davis, C. R.,	Forestell,	Herreid,
Christianson,	Day,	Geister,	Hompe,
Cole,	Enstrom,	Hitchcock,	Hulbert, C. E.,

Jacobson, J.N.,	Kolshorn,	Naylor,	Rohne,
Johnson, J. A.,	Lammers,	Nelson,	Shonyo,
Johnson J. G.,	Lewer,	Olson,	Skaiem,
Kelly,	Lightner,	Pattison,	Smith,
Kinneberg,	McKnight,	Pearson,	Teigen,
Knudsen,	McNelly,	Quinn,	Thompson.

This bill failed in the Senate.

H. F. 84 by Hompe, reducing certain farm equipment to a basis of 10% of full value passed the House with only McKnight and Smith voting NO and with no opposition in the Senate.

TAXING MINING ROYALTIES

On February 21, for the fourth time, a bill to tax mining royalties was before the House for passage, on special order.

In 1919 it passed the House 92 to 25, but lost in the Senate 33 to 34.

In 1919, special session, passed 97 to 22, but was not voted on in the Senate.

In 1921 passed in the House 103 to 14, and lost in the Senate 28 to 34.

22 of these 34 did not return—and at least 12 of them were defeated for re-election.

THE SAME BILL AGAIN

In principle the bill of 1923 was the same as all the others—just a very small tax on the net royalty received by those who were fortunate enough to hold title to these very valuable free gifts of nature,—supposedly a gift of nature to all the people—not to a favored few.

The bill had been introduced into all previous sessions by Mr. Parker. He had been elected Judge in 1921 and had died soon after.

Mr. Bendixen introduced the bill this time, and made a very brief speech in its favor and opposed any change in the rate until the Supreme Court of the United States should have decided on the validity of the net value tax on all engaged in the mining of iron ore or other ores.

The two bills should carry the same rate, claimed Mr. Bendixen, and that is 6%.

Welch, Moen and others insisted that the royalty tax might justly be higher than the tax on the net profits of the operating companies, for the reason that royalties are WHOLLY UNEARNED while a part, at least, of the net profits of the operating companies is likely to be the result of efficiency of management and economy of operation—and these should not be taxed at all if it were possible to avoid it.

Therefore, let us make this royalty tax a little higher than the tax on the profits of the operators.

Welch, in defending a royalty tax of 10% declared that he would introduce a bill to increase the net profit tax to 10%.

Bendixen urged that everything be left at 6% until we had the court decision. Then both taxes could be increased if the Legislature thought best, and he was strongly inclined to favor such an increase.

The vote on Welch's 10% amendment was 46 to 68.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, A.,	Enstrom,	Lewer,	Smith,
Anderson,G.A.,	Finstuen,	Mauritz,	Spelbrink,
Anderson,S.P.,	Flahaven,	Mayman,	Spindler,
Benson,	Geister,	Moen,	Spooner,
Berg,	Green,	Nelson,	Starkey,
Cain,	Horton,	Olson,	Stein,
Davis, C. R.,	Howard,	Peterson, L.,	Therrien,
Davis, R.,	Johnshoy,	Pratt,	Thorkelson,
Day,	Kinneberg,	Quinn,	Trovatten,
Deans,	Kramer,	Salmonson,	Welch.
DeLury,	Lagerstedt,	Samec,	
Dilley,	Larson,	Skaiem,	

Those who voted in the negative were:,

Barnes,	Grandstrand,	Lightner,	Pearson,
Bendixen,	Haugland,	Lockhart,	Peterson, C.A.,
Bernard,	Herreid,	Long, F. D.,	Rodenberg,
Christianson,	Hitchcock,	Long, P. J.,	Rohne,
Cole,	Hompe,	Masek,	Scallon,
Cullum,	Hulbert, C. E.,	McKnight,	Shonyo,
Curtis,	Hurlburt, D.,	McNelly,	Stockwell,
Dahle,	Jacobson,J.N.,	Merritt,	Strandemo,
Emerson,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Murphy,	Sweitzer,
Escher,	Johnson, E.,	Naylor,	Swenson, O.A.,
Fabel,	Kelly,	Neuman,	Taylor,
Farmer,	Kempfer,	Nimocks,	Teigen,
Forestell,	Kleffman,	Noonan,	Thomas,
Fowler,	Knudsen,	Norton,	Thompson,
Gehan,	Kolshorn,	Oren,	Veigel,
Girling,	Lammers,	Paige,	Washburn,
Gislason,	Lang,	Pattison,	Wilkinson.

Moen now moved to raise the rate to 8% and gained the votes of Blum, Gehan, Kolshorn, Lammers, Oren and Teigen. Blum had not voted on the Welch amendment.

Moen's amendment lost four, Kramer, Pratt, Starkey and Therrein, who did not vote either way. So his net gain was two, making 47 votes for 8%. Stockwell explained that he regarded even 10% as ridiculously low. The state ought to have ALL of this royalty—**100%**. These people have no moral right to any of it.

Bendixen explained that as long as any land owners were allowed to collect ground rent all should be treated alike—the mineral land owner as well as the farmer.

Where Bendixen overlooked a vital point was this:

The mineral land owner who lets his mine out on royalty does not now pay one cent of tax to the state nor to any of its municipalities for any purpose whatever; while the farmer, in most cases, is now taxed directly on his farm MORE than the normal ground rent—MORE than 100% of the normal rental of his bare land exclusive of improvements. While, if we consider the INDIRECT taxes that the farmer pays—and must pay until we can reduce or abolish such taxes—there is no comparison at all.

In fact, the farmer is the most exploited victim of our vicious tax system.

He is just coming to realize it. When he fully realizes this, something will drop.

After both attempts had failed to increase the tax the bill then passed 104 to 16.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Barnes,	Kleffman,	Merritt,	Peterson, C.A.,
Bernard,	Lockhart,	Murphy,	Scallon,
Cullum,	Long, P. J.,	Nimocks,	Thomas,
Hitchcock,	MacLean,	Norton,	Washburn.

Eleven did not vote:

Darby, Fisk, Herreid, Hough, Johnson, J. G., Noonon, Pratt, Swenson, E., Stevens, Waldal and Walworth. Walworth had been sick for several weeks, and J. G. Johnson, Fisk and Waldal had been excused. Darby, Hough, Noonan, Pratt, E. Swenson and Stevens had been present and voting at some time during the afternoon—all but Herreid would have voted yes.

IN THE SENATE

At a public hearing on March 15, all the old and worn out arguments against the bill were again marshalled and presented to the committee.

"The law would be unconstitutional."

Then why all this worry?

"You couldn't tax the non-resident who gets royalty."

But our Supreme Court has declared that royalties are interests in land.

The land lies in Minnesota.

If the non-resident refuses to pay, we can sell out his interest in the land just as we do when any other land owner fails to pay taxes levied on his land.

"It would be double taxation."

But double taxation is lawful and constitutional if so specified in the statute, or plainly inferrible from the evident intent of the statute. Sec. 132, Minn., P. 232, etc.

Well, it was rather amusing, the array of objections presented.

At any rate the committee reported the bill for passage.

It was not until April 11th that the Senate acted on this bill.

Delays are dangerous in matters of this kind, and these delays came near defeating the bill again as they had two years ago.

Lobbyists got very busy, and several Senators were fooled into voting NO.

Some of them will have some explaining to do.

Carley made a strong plea for the bill.

Thwing, Rockne and George Sullivan rehashed the old arguments against it.

The Senate then passed the bill 39 to 25.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Child,	Gemmill,	Just,
Bonniwell,	Devold,	Gillam,	Kelson,
Bridgeman,	Diesen,	Hansen,	Landby,
Buckler,	Fickling,	Hausler,	Lee,
Carley,	Frisch,	Jackson,	Lund,
Cashel,	Furlow,	Johnson,	Madigan,

Millett,	Pederson,	Serline,	Thoe,
Nelson, J. W.,	Peterson, E.P.,	Sletten,	Wahlund,
Nordlin,	Romberg,	Solberg,	Zamboni,
Orr,	Schemchel,	Sorenson,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Dwyer,	Peterson, N.,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Ahles,	Haagenson,	Putnam,	Sweet,
Bessette,	Illsley,	Ribenack,	Thwing,
Boylan,	Larson,	Rockne,	Turnham.
Brooks,	Lennon,	Rosenmeier,	
Cameron,	MacKenzie,	Stevens,	
Denegre,	Morin,	Sullivan, G.H.,	

Cliff, Conroy and Wm. Nelson were sick.

It is pretty certain that Cliff and Nelson would have voted AYE and Conroy NO.

Cameron and Lennon had voted for the bill in 1921.

Thus ends a long, drawn out contest extending over more than four years.

With the passage of this bill the iron ore tax system is logical; and it only remains for future Legislatures to increase the tax to something like a fair rate.

As Stockwell said, even 10% would be "ridiculously low."

A STATE INCOME TAX

The Governor in his message had recommended an amendment to the Constitution that would permit the Legislature to provide for a system of graduated STATE INCOME TAXES.

Two bills were introduced into the House, one by Finstuen, Kolshorn and Strandemo, and the other by Welch.

Putnam introduced a bill into the Senate which passed with four votes against it—Adams, Brooks, Denegre and Ribenack.

This bill died in the House Committee on Taxation, as did both of the House bills.

The chief argument in favor of a state income tax is that it will enable the Legislature to abolish personal property taxes, and most people would be glad to get rid of these very annoying taxes.

The opponents of state income taxes reply:

1. Personal property taxes can be abolished without establishing the even greater annoyance of income taxes.

2. When the Royalty tax and the net value ore tax get to operating, the STATE will not need the income tax—it will have revenue enough for all STATE purposes—and the income tax could hardly be used for LOCAL purposes.

3. The adoption of an income tax would have a strong tendency to direct public attention away from the plan to increase taxes on royalties and net profits of those industries that exhaust the natural resources—like mining, quarrying, lumbering, etc., and also from all proposals to place heavy taxes on city ground rents and unearned increments generally in order to check land speculation and encourage development and improvement. Unearned increment is wholly produced by the general progress and development of society and ought to belong in the public treasury—not in private pockets.

4. An income tax could not reach non-residents who now secure and enjoy most of this unearned increment in royalties, city rents and other profits, and so would largely defeat itself.

5. An income tax would not touch the vacant lot speculators of the cities nor the land grabbers of the rural districts. They could hold their lots and lands idle as long as they pleased, obstructing development and production, and making fortunes by the process.

6. The Federal income tax is enough of a nuisance without having it duplicated for state purposes especially as there are better ways to reach the great incomes. Indeed an income tax could not touch the greatest incomes—the unearned ones.

For these reasons these income tax bills were not very popular and were not pushed very hard in the House.

A FOOL TAX LAW

In the session of 1921 Nimocks secured the passage of a bill requiring all warehousemen to report the name and address of every patron and the goods of each in his warehouse on May 1st.

Prior to this, warehousemen had been taxed on the average amount of goods stored during the year.

The new law proposed to reach each owner of goods and it required the warehouseman to become a sort of spy to assist the assessor in ferreting out such owners.

Many of these owners lived outside the state and much of the goods were in transit in interstate commerce, hence not taxable in Minnesota.

The owners of such goods were put to great trouble and expense to secure abatements of this illegal taxation, and so they stopped storing goods in Minnesota warehouses.

They stopped buying butter, eggs and other produce in Minnesota and leaving them in the warehouses here, pending the time of sale and shipment.

EFFECTS OF THE LAW

No increase in revenue, but a great increase in cost of collection.

A pretty complete upsetting and destruction of a considerable part of the cold storage and warehouse business in Minnesota.

The business was driven to Chicago and other places, where no such stupid statutes were in force.

A strenuous and expensive campaign on the part of these people who are in a proper and legitimate business to get the stupid statute repealed.

Much time wasted by the committee and the Legislature over an attempt to repeal the law.

The tax committee of the House recommended repeal with only two negative votes—Darby and Haugland.

But the bill could not be reached for a vote in the House, so the fool law is still on the statute books to work its evil way for another two years at least.

Limiting the Range Towns

The Legislature of 1921 passed a bill putting a per capita limitation on the cities and villages of the state in the matter of local taxation.

Though general in character this bill limited only the range towns.

The bill passed the House 80 to 43, 18 not voting, and the Senate 42 to 17.

In this session the Representatives from the iron range introduced a bill to repeal this law of 1921.

The tax committee split on the bill the majority favored indefinite postponement, while a minority report asked that the bill be printed and placed on general orders.

This minority report was signed by Murphy, Stockwell, Welch and Pratt.

Murphy moved the substitution of the minority report, and then the eloquence began to flow.

Kleffman pleaded for a hearing before the whole House—"Let us at least have as much consideration as a criminal before a court."

Scallon defended the present law, and showed how the range towns had been extravagant. He declared he was not working for the steel corporation, but was just a "dirt miner."

Kleffman pointed out how impossible it is to make a comparison between the range towns and other cities of the same size in southern Minnesota.

"We can't assess the cost of street improvements against the abutting property as you do, but must pay it all out of general taxes; for the abutting owners have only surface rights, while the greatest part of the value—95% or more of it in many cases—is in the ore deposits below.

"We can't issue bonds as you do, for no one can tell whether we shall have any towns at all at the end of 30 years or so when the bonds would come due.

"We have to pay as we go."

Hitchcock:

"This tax limitation law is the illegitimate child of the tonnage tax.

"As soon as the tonnage tax was passed two years ago, this limitation bill was rushed through to give back to the steel corporation as much or more than the tonnage tax would take from them.

"Why shouldn't we all have the same limitation?

"The law provides that any city may levy 20 mills for local purposes.

"We have never levied that much.

"You say we are extravagant. I do not condone extravagance.

"Which is the greatest extravagance to use what we need, even up to the limit of 20 mills if necessary, to educate our children, to create our parks, to pave our streets, or for Garey and the officers of the Steel Corporation to spend six million dollars for a cruise through the Mediterranean, on the Mauritania, where Garey's two suites of rooms cost $44,000?

"The mining companies have always tried to coerce and oppress the people of the range towns. They have closed their mines in the dead of winter and thrown their workers on the streets to beg or starve.

"We had to support their men either by charity or by putting them to work on public improvements and paying them for their labor.

"And now this tax limitation law puts a club into the hands of the companies to beat us down.

"Give us 2% for local purposes as all the rest of the state enjoys. That is all we ask."

Murphy:

"In 1921, when this law was passed, I said that while general in its scope it was local in its effects.

"We are the only part of the state it effects."

Quinn:

"I have lived on the ranges. I know the mining companies drive the people into the dirt. Their mining operations leave the country full of dangerous pits, where children may fall in and get killed.

"I left the mining country to escape these dangers that beset my children."

Lockhart: "I favor home rule."

Stockwell:

"St. Paul has a per capita limitation, but she voted it herself. It was not imposed on her by the state.

"This law violates local self government.

"Of course, the state can, but should not, limit local self government.

"If we can demand of cities that they shall not spend as much as they need, then we can demand that certain cities spend more.

"The only safe rule—the only just rule—is to leave the cities free to judge for themselves."

A standing vote showed 63 to 52 in favor of the minority report.

Then the bill was ordered printed and placed on General Orders by a vote of 66 to 54.

Later a special order was set for March 2 and the matter was all thrashed out again. Kleffman, Hitchcock, Iverson and Nellermoe speaking in favor of the repeal bill and Hompe, Herreid, Moen, Bernard, Newman, Oscar Swenson and Scallon against repeal.

No new arguments were made, but Kleffman showed pretty clearly that the schools of the range towns had a far lower cost per child than most other cities of the state.

Kleffman also showed with greater force that the richest of the mines are greatly under valued. Citing one case where the company's own contention showed 30,000,000 tons of ore, and the assessments showed only 5,000,000 tons.

The debate lasted till after six o'clock and the roll call showed the repeal bill defeated.

Those who voted to repeal were, 53:

Anderson, A.,	Davis, R.,	Finstuen,	Hurlburt, D.,
Anderson,G.A.,	Day,	Fisk,	Iverson,
Barnes,	Deans,	Flahaven,	Johnshoy,
Benson,	DeLury,	Gehan,	Johnson, E.,
Berg,	Duemke,	Green,	Kinneberg,
Bowers,	Emerson,	Hitchcock,	Kleffman,
Cain,	Enstrom,	Howard,	Kramer,

Lagerstedt,	Peterson, L.,	Spelbrink,	Thorkelson,
Lockhart,	Pratt,	Spindler,	Trovatten,
Murphy,	Quinn,	Spooner,	Walworth,
Nellermoe,	Salmonson,	Starkey,	Welch,
Nelson,	Samec,	Stein,	
Olson,	Skaiem,	Stockwell,	
Pearson,	Smith,	Thomas,	

Those who voted in the negative were, 63.

Bernard,	Gislason,	Lightner,	Oren,
Blum,	Grandstrand,	Long, F. D.,	Paige,
Christianson,	Haugland,	Long, P. J.,	Rodenberg,
Cole,	Herreid,	MacLean,	Rohne,
Cullum,	Hompe,	Masek,	Scallon,
Curtis,	Hough,	Mauritz,	Shonyo,
Dahle,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Mayman,	Stevens,
Darby,	Jacobson, J.N.,	McKnight,	Strandemo,
Davis, C. R.,	Jacobson, O.P.,	McNelly,	Sweitzer,
Dilley,	Johnson, J. A.,	Merritt,	Swenson, O.A.,
Escher,	Johnson, J. G.,	Moen,	Taylor,
Fabel,	Kempfer,	Naylor,	Teigen,
Farmer,	Knudsen,	Neuman,	Therrien,
Forestell,	Kolshorn,	Nimocks,	Veigel,
Fowler,	Lammers,	Noonan,	Mr. Speaker.
Girling,	Lang,	Odegard,	

During this debate Hitchcock claimed there was a "woodchuck" in the laws of 1921.

At that time all supposed that existing indebtedness would be taken care of by levies in excess of the per capita limitation; but now we find that this cannot be done. "I shall, therefore, introduce a bill to make it plain that our bonded indebtedness, incurred prior to 1921, shall not be paid out of our limited levies."

On Friday, March 9, Mr. Hitchcock introduced such a bill, but it did not get a hearing.

THE MINNESOTA TAX REFORM ASSOCIATION

Its Beginning, Growth, Objects, Results

It was about the middle of June, 1919.

I was sitting in the office of the Mayor of Rochester, Minn., and we were lamenting the failure of the Legislature to pass an iron ore tax bill.

"This is a serious matter," said the Mayor, "something should be done to make it sure that the next Legislature does not fail. We should have some kind of an organization, and you are just the man to do it. You know every member of the Senate. You can readily get in touch with all House members to be elected in November, 1920. You know the ropes, but most important of all you know the subject of taxation thoroughly. Now why can't you take hold of this and put it through? It will cost some money—maybe $4,000 or $5,000, but that can be got. Let's see what can be done right here in Rochester, and when you go back to the cities take it up with some of the leading business men there. What do you say?"

I agreed that it ought to done and promised to look into the matter.

We made a brief canvass in Rochester and found that

most leading business and professional men favored the plan and were willing to contribute financially.

I took the matter up with a number of business and professional men in St. Paul and Minneapolis and received such encouragement that we soon had a subscription paper with the following heading:

THE MINNESOTA TAX REFORM ASSOCIATION

OBJECT

Lower Taxes on Our Homes and Productive Industries. More taxes from those who possess and control our great natural resources of minerals and timber, valuable city lots and unused farm lands.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SENATOR JOHN L. WOLD, Twin Valley, Minn.
ANGUS McLEOD, The Emporium, St. Paul.
OSCAR LAMPLAND, Cap. City Lumber Co., St. Paul.
F. R. DURANT, Editor Grain Bulletin, Minneapolis.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

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

FINANCIAL SUPPORTERS

Here followed very soon a long list of names with subscriptions ranging from $5.00 to $100.00.

A bill was drawn providing for a tax of 10% on the royalties collected by one group of iron land owners, and another bill, an exact copy of the Bendixen NET VALUE bill of 1919, only that it provided for a tax of 10% instead of 5% on the NET VALUE of the ore after deducting as far as practicable the cost of production.

We didn't want to tax the INDUSTRY of mining ore, but we did want to tax the enormous fortunes in royalties and net profits secured by those who were exhausting and destroying our great natural heritage of iron—the richest iron mines in the world.

I was confronted with two very important problems:

First—Our influential business and professional men, as well as organized labor, must be convinced that our plan was practicable and right. (The farmers were already convinced.) It would then be easy to get the needed money to carry on the work.

Second—The Senators, elected in 1918, and the House members, to be elected in 1920, must be seen and talked with—THEY MUST BE CONVINCED—for they would have the final say whether the bills should be passed or not.

For fifteen months I worked pretty steadily, explaining our plans in personal interviews, addresses to clubs, etc., and all the while raising money to meet expenses.

I had, through correspondence and personal interviews, got into touch with practically every Senator and House member who would sit in the Legislature of 1921 and felt that we were pretty sure of our ground.

During the spring of 1920 the advocates of iron ore taxation had secured the passage of resolutions by all political parties in the state favoring such taxation.

After the June Primaries it looked as if the danger point was the Senate, who were already elected, and a precarious majority of whom had voted for the Bendixen Bill

at the extra session of 1919 which bill had been vetoed by Governor Burnquist.

I then proposed to a number of large business houses that we raise a special fund to meet the expense of circulating petitions in a number of districts, urging Senators to change their position and vote for our bills at the coming session.

The money was SUBSCRIBED and petitions were circulated "favoring a tax of 10% on the ROYALTIES and NET PROFITS of those who OWN and EXPLOIT our great iron ore deposits."

Such petitions were signed by nearly every business man, including merchants, manufacturers, bankers, real estate dealers, and many professional men also, in Winona, Mankato, Faribault, Northfield, St. Cloud, and in every village of Le Sueur County.

In these districts the Senators had voted against the bills in 1919.

In some of these districts the Senators, after reading the petitions and studying the names on them, assured me they would vote for the bills.

But as we know "there's many a slip." None of the Senators in these districts voted as the petitions had asked.

In the elections of 1922 four of the five were defeated. Several other Senators who had voted against one or both of our bills were also defeated. Eleven who had voted no did not file, and eleven were defeated for re-election.

To meet the expense of the campaign of 15 months prior to the election of 1920—to cover railroad fare, hotel bills, postage, stationery, printing, etc., and compensation for time spent, we had just $3,988.

After the legislative session of 1921 had passed one of the bills with a 6% tax instead of 10%, and had defeated —in the Senate—the bill to tax royalties, I was urged to make another similar canvass of the state prior to the election of 1922.

This I did, giving about nine months' time to the work and urging also the passage of an amendment to the tax classification law reducing taxes on "the homes and productive industries of the people and increasing taxes on the UNEARNED INCREMENTS of minerals and timber, valuable city lots and unused farm lands."

To cover the cost of this work I had $3,010.50. As before explained the Legislature of 1923 passed the royalty tax, but the Classification Bill failed.

WHAT THE NEXT LEGISLATURE SHOULD DO

1. Increase the iron ore taxes to 10 per cent.
2. Pass the Swenson Bill to give the state absolute ownership of land delinquent for three years.
3. Pass the Ground Rent Tax—the New York law.
4. Pass the Hurlburt Bill so that no one can escape the tax on lots or lands on the plea that they are taxed at more than selling value, when they are only valued at the same rate as other lots in the same locality.
5. Amend the Tax Classification law so as to reduce on all buildings and personal property and increase on lots and lands, except such as are used for farming purposes.

CHAPTER VIII.

OUR REMAINING NATURAL RESOURCES

I would like to write a whole book on this subject. Yes, a whole book could be written on the game and fish department under the efficient management of Mr. Avery. Another, and a very interesting book could be written on Mr. Cox and his forestry plans; and still another on Mr. Willard's plans for a scientific system of drainage. But so little was done by the session of 1923 that a short chapter will cover it all.

Not even the forestry department got any help to speak of, much as Mr. Cox deserves it.

Let us hope that a future Legislature and a more friendly administration may be able to work out some plan to encourage reforestation by adopting a more scientific method of taxing growing timber, so that private land owners may be encouraged to plant and protect their growing trees until they are ripe for the harvest.

The growing trees themselves should not be taxed at all until ripe and then a single stumpage tax could be made to yield the state all that the state is morally entitled to.

Such a stumpage tax should certainly be enacted, for immediate purposes when ripe timber is cut.

The land upon which timber is growing is usually of no practical value, except to raise timber, and hence should be taxed only according to its actual value—little or nothing as the case may be.

DRAINAGE

Our drainage laws have encouraged extravagant and indiscriminate ditching,—with little sense or reason, except that drainage contractors wanted to make big profits out if big projects, no matter how much the land owners or state might suffer—no matter how much the swamps might be dried up to the injury of our rivers and the steady flow of water,—no matter how many forest fires might start in the dry peet bogs, with destruction of farms and homes and loss of life.

Our northern swamps are one of our greatest natural assets and should be carefully preserved.

Erling Swenson's Bill

Erling Swenson introduced a bill to amend the laws relating to redemption from tax sales, which passed the House on the last day of the session, but failed to pass the Senate.

It would cut out absolutely those speculators who let their taxes go unpaid for several years and then come in and buy them up at one-fifth the amount due, and thus save their land. Then refuse to pay again, and redeem again at one-fifth and keep it up for many years.

Swenson's bill would make the state the absolute owner of such land if the taxes were unpaid for three years.

The state could thus acquire title to vast tracts of land fit only for growing timber.

It could also become the owner of such mineral rights as the owners refused to pay taxes on.

Swenson's bill passed 69 to 50.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, A.,	Fisk,	Lewer,	Salmonson,
Anderson, G.A.,	Flahaven,	Lockhart,	Samec,
Anderson, S.P.,	Geister,	MacLean,	Scallon,
Bendixen,	Green,	Mauritz,	Skaiem,
Benson,	Horton,	Mayman,	Smith,
Berg,	Howard,	Merritt,	Spelbrink,
Bowers,	Hurlburt, D.,	Moen,	Starkey,
Cain,	Iverson,	Nellermoe,	Stein,
Darby,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Nelson,	Stockwell,
Davis, C. R.,	Johnshoy,	Noonan,	Swenson, E.,
Davis, R.,	Johnson, E.,	Norton,	Thompson,
Day,	Kempfer,	Odegard,	Thorkelson,
Deans,	Kramer,	Olson,	Trovatten,
Dilley,	Kolshorn,	Peterson, C.A.,	Walworth,
Duemke,	Lagerstedt,	Peterson, L.,	Welch.
Enstrom,	Lammers,	Pratt,	
Fabel,	Lang,	Rodenberg,	
Farmer,	Larson,	Rohne,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Barnes,	Haugland,	Long, F. D.,	Spindler,
Bernard,	Herreid,	Long, P. J.,	Spooner,
Cole,	Hitchcock,	Masek,	Stevens,
Cullum,	Hompe,	McKnight,	Strandemo,
Curtis,	Hough,	McNelly,	Taylor,
Dahle,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Naylor,	Teigen,
DeLury,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Neuman,	Thomas,
Emerson,	Johnson, J. A.,	Oren,	Therrien,
Escher,	Johnson, J. G.,	Paige,	Veigel,
Fowler,	Kelly,	Pattison,	Waldal,
Girling,	Kleffman,	Pearson,	Washburn.
Gislason,	Knudsen,	Quinn,	
Grandstrand,	Lightner,	Shonyo,	

This bill should be pushed at the next session.

OUR VAST WATER POWER

Minnesota has a vast water power.

Much of it is still on state land and undeveloped.

It has been the policy of the state for many years to retain title to its great natural resources of minerals and timber and not dispose of them to private ownership.

Not so with the water power.

Much of it is already in private hands and more is going the same way as fast as the private companies can get possession of it.

It requires an amendment to the constitution to put the state into a position where it can protect the rights of the people by conserving and developing such power as still remains unappropriated.

To give the people a chance to amend the constitution with this end in view, Representatives Stockwell, Howard, Therrien, Kleffman, Kramer, Trovatten, Welch and Myrtle Cain, introduced a bill for a constitutional amendment.

Before the Committee on Public Utilities came attorneys for the water power interests and argued long and powerfully against the idea of letting the state go into INDUSTRY,—into "PRIVATE" industry, they said; as if the conservation of the common inheritance were not the very first duty of government.

By a vote of 7 to 5 the committee reported on the bill for indefinite postponement.

Then the friends of conservation got busy.

When the committee report came up Monday, March 5th, the minority had become a considerable majority.

The following ten members had signed a report demanding that the bill be put on general orders:

Wm. L. Bernard	Fred Lang	E. L. MacLean
J. C. Pratt	Geo. W. Rodenberg	E. O. Oren
F. A. Green	J. B. Pattison	
Myrtle Cain	B. H. Curtis	

Pearson made a plea against amending the constitution, and put himself squarely on record in favor of private and corporate ownership and development of our water resources.

Stockwell, Trovatten, Rodenberg and Spindler, ably defended the "minority" report, which really had three more names on it than the "majority."

After considerable debate the minority report was overwhelmingly adopted, only thirteen, all told, voting no. These thirteen should be remembered:

Cole,	McKnight,	Pearson,	Wilkinson.
Dilley,	McNelly,	Peterson, C.A.,	
Girling,	Naylor,	Quinn,	
Lightner,	Nimocks,	Teigen,	

Mr. Teigen, however, almost immediately said that he had made a mistake, but it was too late to get it corrected on the record.

Thus the House rebuked the very few who still stand for the policy of surrender of our natural resources into private and corporate hands.

Mr. Fowler very aptly put it the next day:

"I can't see how anyone could oppose the conservation of our water power. After Roosevelt and Pinchot had so clearly demonstrated the need for saving our waters for the people."

But this bill was not reached. Nothing was done.

THE DAM BILL

The Legislature devoted much time to consideration of the water power at the high dam on the Mississippi river between the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Mayor Leach of Minneapolis sponsored a bill that would give his city a chance to secure the power for municipal purposes.

Henry Ford had applied for the power for his large plant to be built on a tract of about 170 acres, purchased on the St. Paul side of the river at the dam.

The city of St. Paul refused to join with Minneapolis in application for the power, believing that it would be better for all concerned if Ford should get it.

Many of the country members favored Ford.

Mayor Leach's bill contained a referendum to the people of Minneapolis.

This would necessarily delay the settlement for six months or more.

The exact facts in the case are about as follows; as agreed to by both sides:

The people of the whole United States now own this dam.

The people also own the water that flows over this dam.

This is a case of public ownership already accomplished.

That question is settled.

The Federal Power Commission is trustee for the people.

It is their duty to make the best terms possible for the benefit of all the people.

1. To get the full normal annual cash rental.

2. To get the highest possible percentage of efficiency of utilization.

If Minneapolis can meet these requirements, she should have the power; for the law provides that states and municipalities shall have the preference, other things being equal. If not she should not get the power.

But Minneapolis should have an equal chance to bid.

If she is now handicapped, that handicap should be removed.

But, again, nothing should cause delay.

Minneapolis should not be permitted to block the wheels.

If she needs any legislation to give her a fair show she should have it, without a referendum.

But her bill provides for a referendum, and that will block the wheels for at least six months.

The House answered by killing the bill and leaving the field open to Ford, the General Electric Company and Minneapolis, to make the best showing possible.

Minneapolis is admittedly handicapped, but it was generally believed to be impossible for her to make good even if she could secure the power, and few believed she could secure it.

Hence the vote which killed Leach's bill, by voting down the minority report to put the bill on general orders.

Those who voted in the affirmative to save the bill:

Anderson, A.,	Duemke,	MacLean,	Pratt,
Anderson,G,A.,	Emerson,	Mayman,	Skaiem,
Anderson,S.P.,	Girling,	McKnight,	Spindler,
Barnes,	Hough,	McNelly,	Stevens,
Benson,	Howard,	Merritt,	Stockwell,
Berg,	Hurlburt, D.,	Moen,	Swenson, E.,
Bernard,	Kinneberg,	Naylor,	Swenson, O.A.,
Bowers,	Kolshorn,	Nellermoe,	Thomas.
Cain,	Lammers,	Noonan,	
Darby,	Lang,	Norton,	
Deans,	Long, P. J.,	Pattison,	

Those who voted in the negative to kill the bill:

Bendixen,	Enstrom,	Grandstrand,	Johnson, E.,
Blum,	Escher,	Green,	Johnson, J. A.,
Christianson,	Fabel,	Haugland,	Kelly,
Cole,	Farmer,	Herreid,	Kempfer,
Cullum,	Finstuen,	Hitchcock,	Kleffman,
Curtis,	Flahaven,	Hompe,	Knudsen,
Davis, C. R.,	Forestell,	Horton,	Kramer,
Davis, R.,	Fowler,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Lagerstedt,
Day,	Gehan,	Iverson,	Larson,
DeLury,	Geister,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Lewer,
Dilley,	Gislason,	Johnshoy,	Lightner,

Lockhart,	Oren,	Scallon,	Teigen,
Long, F. D.,	Paige,	Shonyo,	Therrien,
Masek,	Pearson,	Smith,	Thorkelson,
Mauritz,	Peterson, C.A.,	Spelbrink,	Trovatten,
Murphy,	Peterson, L.,	Spooner,	Veigel,
Nelson,	Quinn,	Starkey,	Washburn,
Neuman,	Rodenberg,	Stein,	Welch,
Nimocks,	Rohne,	Strandemo,	Wilkinson.
Odegard,	Salmonson,	Sweitzer,	
Olson,	Samec,	Taylor,	

After this attempt had failed the House indefinitely postponed the bill without a roll call.

Henry Ford soon afterward secured the power at the high dam, he having satisfied the Federal Power Commission that he could develop and utilize the entire power to the fullest possible extent.

WHO OWNS THE FLOWING WATERS?

Mr. Hoveland, a former Regent of the University of Minnesota, and a competent engineer, claims that the flowing waters belong to the people of the state, and cites a long list of court decisions to sustain his contention.

These decisions reach far back into the ancient times and include decrees of the old English courts.

They clearly distinguish between riparian rights and the ownership of the flowing water.

The owner of the land adjoining a flowing stream cannot be barred from his right to use the water, but he must so use it as not to obstruct its navigation; and any stream is navigable that will float a saw log.

The riparian owners cannot be prevented from building dams and using the waters,

BUT

And here is a very important "**but.**" While the courts, according to Mr. Hoveland, declare that he may **use** the flowing water, and cannot be prevented, yet the people own the water.

Therefore it follows that the user may be required to pay the owner—the people—a royalty or rent for such use.

The legislature should enact a law providing for such payment; and the amount should be a fair royalty or rent, just the same as the user would be required to pay were he renting from private owner.

WHERE THE STATE STILL OWNS THE SHORE RIGHTS

Here the problem is far simpler. The state should retain all its rights and lease to any who wish to use them and the water for any purpose.

Stockwell had a bill for this purpose, but it came in too late and did not pass.

It should pass at the next session.

CHAPTER IX.
HELPING THE FARMER

Just now everyone wants to help the farmer, and most of them think they can do it by fixing things so he can borrow more money.

Of course, if there is any way to reduce the amount of interest the farmer must pay for the money he owes it will help to some extent.

But it would be far better to reduce or cut out entirely the need to borrow.

That would be a real help.

RURAL CREDITS

Yes, of course, if a Rural Credits law can be framed so that farmers can borrow at 5% or 5½% instead of 8% or 10% it will be of considerable help and everything possible should be done to that end.

This is equally true of all other industries. Every other business should be able to borrow what is needed at the lowest possible rate of interest.

A great deal of time and attention was given to framing a good rural credits bill. All agreed to the general idea, but there was much disagreement as to details when the bill came up before the House on special order March 6th.

Mr. Dahle tried to limit the total amount that the state might lend in any year to $10,000,000, with $35,000,000 as the total that could be outstanding at any one time.

Christianson and others opposed this limitation. Their objection was clearly expressed by Thorkelson, who asked: "If the state can safely loan $10,000,000 on certain security, why can't it just as safely loan $50,000,000 on equally good security?"

It isn't the total amount loaned but the security back of each loan that protects the state.

And right here is the kernel of the whole question of rural credits, federal farm loans and every other state socialistic plan to put the state into the loaning business.

The vital thing from the point of view of the state is that the SECURITY shall be GOOD.

Now this rural credits bill permits lending up to 60% of the appraised value of the land.

Suppose such a system had been in force five years ago when the farm land boom was on?

Suppose the state had then lent up to 60% of the value of the land and 25% of the buildings, as this bill provides. What would have happened?

What proportion of the farms would the state now own?

How many farms are now worth 60% of what everyone would have sworn they were worth five years ago?

Isn't it plain that high priced land is one of the greatest curses the farmer suffers?

High priced land and indirect taxation are the fruitful parents of purchase price mortgages, tenantry, exploitation, landlordism and surfdom for the farmer.

He will never be free and prosperous until this system is changed.

Of course cheap money is good.

BUT

When indirect taxation is abolished—when the farmer's buildings, machinery, crops, animals, and everything he has to buy are free from taxation,—when he can send his produce to market at the actual cost of transportation with no taxes or tribute to watered stocks,—when he has learned to market his produce co-operatively, as he surely would when he has destroyed landlordism and other forms of exploitation, then, and only then, can the farmer hope to be free and prosperous.

STATE OWNED TERMINAL ELEVATORS

For many years the farmers have been demanding state owned terminal elevators, where their grain can be kept in storage awaiting a favorable market.

Many years ago the state bought a piece of land on the water front in Duluth and prepared to build such an elevator.

A suit was brought and the courts declared the project unconstitutional.

H. F. 209, by Iverson, Bendixen, Cullum and Berg, proposed to submit to the people the question of amending the constitution so that such state owned elevators could be erected. This bill came up for final passage Saturday morning, March 17, when many members were absent and lacked three votes of passing.

Again, on March 21, the bill was amended so as to permit only one elevator, and that at Duluth.

Washburn and Dahle spoke earnestly against putting the state into "private business," though both had voted to put the state into the farm loan business.

The Iverson amendment for only one elevator was adopted by the vote of 77 to 42, and then the bill passed 84 to 38.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, A.,	Fabel,	Lammers,	Salmonson,
Anderson,G.A.,	Finstuen,	Larson,	Samec,
Anderson,S.P.,	Fisk,	Lewer,	Rohne,
Barnes,	Flahaven,	Lockhart,	Shonyo,
Bendixen,	Gehan,	Long, F. D.,	Skaiem,
Benson,	Geister,	Masek,	Smith,
Berg,	Green,	Mauritz,	Spelbrink,
Bernard,	Haugland,	Mayman,	Spindler,
Blum,	Hompe,	Moen,	Spooner,
Bowers,	Horton,	Nellermoe,	Starkey,
Cain,	Howard,	Nelson,	Stockwell,
Cole,	Iverson,	Neuman,	Swenson, E.,
Cullum,	Johnshoy,	Odegard,	Taylor,
Davis, R.,	Kelly,	Olson,	Thompson,
Day,	Kempfer,	Oren,	Therrien,
Deans,	Kinneberg,	Pattison,	Thorkelson,
DeLury,	Kleffman,	Peterson, C.A.,	Trovatten,
Dilley,	Knudsen,	Peterson, L.,	Veigel,
Duemke,	Kramer,	Pratt,	Waldal,
Enstrom,	Kolshorn,	Quinn,	Walworth,
Escher,	Lagerstedt,	Rodenberg,	Welch,

Those who voted in the negative were:

Christianson,	Dahle,	Emerson,	Forestell,
Curtis,	Davis, C. R.,	Farmer,	Fowler,

Girling,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Merritt,	Sweitzer,
Gislason,	Johnson, J. A.,	Murphy,	Swenson, O.A.,
Grandstrand,	Johnson, J, G.,	Naylor,	Teigen,
Herreid,	Lightner,	Nimocks,	Washburn,
Hitchcock,	Long, P. J.,	Noonan,	Wilkinson,
Hough,	MacLean,	Pearson,	Mr. Speaker.
Hulbert, C. E.,	McKnight,	Scallon,	
Hurlburt, D.,	McNelly,	Strandemo,	

April 4th the Senate amended the House bill so as to enable the state to build elevators in cities of the first class, instead of one elevator in Duluth, and then passed the bill 51 to 5. The five opponents were Adams of Duluth, Denegre of St. Paul and Brooks, Cameron and Child of Minneapolis.

Eleven did not vote.

Cliff and Conroy were sick.

Nelson of Freeborn, Putnam, Gemmill, Lennon and Sweet of Minneapolis, Orr of St. Paul, George Sullivan, Ribenack and Buckler did not vote.

Buckler was unavoidably out of the room and explained that he desired to be recorded as favorable.

Some of the others probably dodged.

We may now see what the people of Minnesota will say to state owned elevators.

Opponents will probably call this a plunge into Socialism; but is it any more so than state rural credits, or state hail insurance, or state administration of workmen's insurance, or state insurance of public buildings, or state education, or state control of banks, or the work of the state examiner, or the state securities commission, or a multiplicity of other state activities?

It is very easy to call a thing State Socialism, but that is no argument against the thing itself.

I am probably far more opposed to state activity, where it can be avoided, than most of those who talk so loud against Socialism; and I am very sure if the state would perform faithfully and efficiently the three natural functions of any and all government, there would be far less call for the state to engage in other and more questionable duties that might better be left to individual and co-operative effort.

Several important amendments to the co-operative laws were enacted, giving a much wider scope and greater freedom to co-operative socities.

So far as voluntary co-operative associations are concerned, I am fully convinced that they should have the greatest possible freedom to organize for any legal purpose whatsoever, unhindered by any legislative restrictions, free to do anything they please, so long as they refrain from engaging in criminal or swindling operations.

OLEOMARGARINE

Some measures purporting to be in the interest of farmers, to my mind are of doubtful merit.

Among these especially is the bill to prohibit the manufacture of Oleomargarine containing butter as one of its ingredients.

Oleomargarine is a wholesome food product.

The more butter it contains the more wholesome it is.

The butter used in the manufacture of Oleomargarine is purchased in May and June, just when the supply is largest, and such purchase at that time, without doubt, helps to increase the demand and keep up the price.

It is impossible to prohibit the importation and sale of such Oleomargarine within the state, as that would be interfering with interstate commerce.

The net result, therefore, is simply to drive such manufacture out of the state, but not necessarily to diminish the sale of the article in the state.

The only thing the state can justly do with reference to Oleomargarine or any other wholesome product is to require that it be sold for just what it really is and not otherwise.

Any person has an inherent natural right to use Oleomargarine, nut oleo, or any other such product if he so desires and no law may justly put any obstacle in his way.

Furthermore, when the farmers attempt to play the game of privilege—when they try to get a little slice of special privilege for themselves—they always get the worst of it.

The only hope for the farmer, or any other worker, is to bend his efforts to get rid of privilege everywhere.

"Equal rights for all and special privileges for none" is the only safe slogan for farmer or worker.

Some day they will realize this. Then they will abolish all privilege, and gain freedom, equality and prosperity.

Neither can you help the farmer by hedging about, restricting, taxing or otherwise harassing those who handle grain, live stock, or other farm products.

Every such move re-acts on the producer and must inevitably do so.

Your co-operative societies—for buying, shipping, selling, banking, or other purposes—here is your remedy—not in restriction.

BILL WOULD STOP SALES "SCALPING"

The "anti-scalping" bill was one of five measures recommended for passage by the markets and marketing committee of the legislature.

It requires chambers of commerce to make public all transactions that take place on their floors, recording the amount and price of all grains sold. This is to prevent "scalping" in sales.

The commission men, under this bill, which was introduced by Representative R. A. Wilkinson, would be required to report all their transactions, which the chambers of commerce would make public in their daily bulletins.

All such laws as this will only add to the expense of handling grain, and the farmer must pay the bill.

Label "Cold Storge"

The markets committee recommended another bill introduced by Wilkinson, one requiring the use of the words "cold storage" on the invoice of all articles in cold storage for 30 days or more. This to prevent the sale of cold storage articles as fresh food.

Of course all products should be sold for what they really are.

CHAPTER X.
LABOR LEGISLATION

"The boy stood on the after deck and leaped far out to sea."

It is said the boy did this of his own FREE WILL AND ACCORD.

BUT

The ship was on fire.

We are told that workingmen and women enter employment of their OWN FREE WILL and accord; that they work on dangerous machinery, that they breathe foul air and labor under vile and unsanitary conditions; that they work long hours for small wages, and submit to all kinds of indignities and exploitation, and all this of their OWN FREE WILL and accord.

Probably.

So did the boy jump into the sea.

The fact is that neither the boy nor the worker is FREE to do anything else.

Labor is exploited because it is not free.

It is not free because the earth is monopolized and held away from labor at a price labor cannot pay.

Why is the earth monopolized?

Because it pays the monopolizer.

Why does it pay?

Because the present taxes on vacant lots and lands are less than the increase in value that the speculators think they can get.

Why are the taxes less than the unearned increment?

Because our tax system overburdens the user of land whether in country or city, and hence the burden on the speculator is low while the users' tax is high.

IDLE LOTS EMPLOY NO LABOR

Increase taxes on these idle lots and they will be put to use—

AND LABOR WILL GET JOBS

Reduce the taxes on our homes and industries, and there will be more homes and more industries—

AND LABOR WILL GET MORE JOBS

And don't forget that the farmer is a laborer, and usually a very poorly paid laborer.

If all the lots and lands were idle, then all the people would be out of work and would soon starve to death.

If all land could be put to its best use in country and city—if land speculation could be destroyed—if unused land were free, as it used to be fifty or sixty years ago, there would be at least two jobs for every worker.

THINK WHAT THAT WOULD MEAN!

TWO JOBS OR MORE FOR EVERY WORKER!

Not much need for strikes.

Not much need for labor laws.

Not much need for labor organizations even, except for social betterment.

Wages would be the normal wages—the full product of the effort of the worker.

All the forces of nature would play into the hands of the worker.

He would not jump into the sea of his OWN FREE WILL AND ACCORD.

"THE DECK WOULD NOT BE ON FIRE"

How simple all this is!

Yet how few labor leaders sense it!

How very much simpler and easier than to force employers to give higher wages.

Employers are not usually the cause of low wages, not even indirectly.

Employers are often—more often than not—the fellow victims of monopoly and privilege.

If labor men had devoted a tenth of the effort to correcting the tax laws, that they have used to fight their employers, the monopolists would have been taxed out long ago and the problem solved.

It never will be solved any other way.

None of the LABOR laws, so called, that were proposed in 1923 would have been worth more than the paper they were written on, even if they had passed—and very few passed.

A vast labor wasted—worse than wasted; for that wasted energy might have been used to help reform the tax laws.

A penny held near enough to the eye will obscure the sun.

Just so a petty LABOR LAW may obscure the greater benefit which lies a little farther away.

AND YET

This is not to say that no effort is worth while to ameliorate unbearable conditions while waiting for the education of legislators.

The one measure that the labor men regarded as of the most important in 1923 was the "FULL CREW BILL."

Much valuable time was spent both for and against this bill.

Many public hearings took place.

The railways bitterly opposed and the organized labor forces did all that was possible in support of it.

The whole matter came to a climax Wednesday, March 21, when the Senate considered the bill on special order, and spent three hours in its discussion.

The bill was simple.

It provided for three brakemen on all freight trains of more than 40 cars, and for a pilot on all light engines.

The railways spent much money in securing telegrams to both Senators and House members from all parts of the state opposing the bill.

These telegrams were suspiciously all alike—and looked much as if they had all been inspired from a central source.

Boylan, Solberg, Carley, Bridgeman, Buckler, Hausler, Morin and Devold spoke earnestly for the bill.

Johnson, E. P. Peterson, Bonniwell, Cameron and Gillam opposed, largely on the ground that it would necessitate great additional expense and hence increase the cost of transportation, which must be borne principally by the farmers.

The advocates insisted that the additional expense would

be negligible—indeed, they claimed that the companies would save more than the cost, and would really be ahead in the end.

The roll call showed the following:

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 28:

Ahles,	Devold,	Landby,	Peterson, N.,
Arens,	Frisch,	Lee,	Ribenack,
Bessette,	Haagenson,	Lennon,	Romberg,
Boylan,	Hansen,	Morin,	Schmechel,
Bridgeman,	Hausler,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sletten,
Buckler,	Jackson,	Nordlin,	Solberg,
Carley,	Kelson,	Pederson,	Zamboni.

Those who voted in the negative were, 34:

Adams,	Furlow,	Nelson, W.,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Bonniwell,	Gemmill,	Orr,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Brooks,	Gillam,	Peterson, E.P.,	Sweet,
Cameron,	Illsley,	Putnam,	Thoe,
Cashel,	Johnson,	Rockne,	Thwing,
Child,	Just,	Rosenmeier,	Turnham,
Denegre,	Larson,	Serline,	Wahlund,
Diesen,	MacKenzie,	Sorenson,	
Fickling,	Madigan,	Stevens,	

Five did not vote—Cliff, Conroy and Dwyer were sick—Millett had been excused. Lund had been present at roll call but did not vote on the bill.

The vote of Senator Nelson of Freeborn County against the bill caused a great deal of criticism. It was declared that he had pledged himself in his campaign to vote for such a bill. He did not vote either way on the first roll call, but finally voted no.

REGULATING EMPLOYMENT AGENTS

Another labor bill, prepared and pushed by the State Industrial Commission, proposed to license and regulate all employment agencies.

Now the ordinary employment agent is under strong temptation to take the money of the poor down and out working man, send him away to a job, enter into a combination with a job foreman to have the men discharged at the end of a few days, then send out more—and split the fees with the dishonest foreman.

This and many other systems of swindling are charged against the employment agents.

Hence license—regulate—legalize and control, and increase the power and patronage of the State Industrial Commission which has been roundly denounced as a political agency more interested in magnifying its own powers than in helping the workers.

A peculiar feature of this bill required all teachers' agencies to come under its provisions, though such agencies have never been subject to criticism as being either dishonest or unfaithful to their clients who are both teachers and schools.

Such is the greed for power when once it gets a taste.

April 13, this bill came up for passage.

Myrtle Cain offered to amend cutting out teachers' agencies.

Walworth insisted on keeping them in.

Iverson, Stockwell and Nellermoe showed that these agencies were co-operative associations of teachers, that there was no relation between them and ordinary labor agencies, and no reason why the Industrial Commission should want to control them, unless it were greed for power.

At first Bernard urged keeping them in, but finally was convinced and voted to cut them out.

The house was also convinced.

The teachers' agencies are still free to do their proper and useful work, unhampered by political meddlers.

There were no votes against the bill.

The Senate slightly amended the bill and sent it back, but it was impossible to reach it for concurrence in the Senate amendment, so the bill died.

ONE DAY OF REST IN SEVEN

This was another bill upon which Labor spent infinite time and effort and got next to nothing.

This bill attempted to provide and enforce, in practically all industries in the state, that no person should be required nor permitted to work more than six days in any week.

The Senate spent all day April 3rd in amending and then passing what little was left of the bill, by a vote of 51 to 10 as follows:

Here are the ten opponents:

Bonniwell,	Denegre,	Peterson, N.,	Stevens.
Brooks,	Fickling,	Serline,	
Cashel,	Larson,	Sorenson,	

But so little of the bill was left that it might as well have been killed outright.

There is another feature of this kind of legislation, that its sponsors rarely consider.

Suppose men or women want to work seven days in the week for awhile, what will this law do to them?

Will it not prohibit such work?

This was forcibly illustrated after this bill had passed the Senate.

Workers in the Pillsbury A Mill at Minneapolis nearly all signed a petition against the bill saying they preferred to be free to work more than 6 days if they chose.

Petitions asking the legislature to defeat the "one day's rest in seven" bill were circulated among the workers of Pillsbury Mill A, and signed by 600 of the 750 employes, according to information received today from M. A. Lehman, general superintendent of the Pillsbury Mills. Of the remaining 150, some were not available at the time the petitions were circulated and some refused to sign.

"The men are tickled to death to get this extra work during September, October and November," Mr. Lehman said today. "It is the time of the year when fuel, winter clothes, taxes and many other seasonal expenses are to be met. We don't make them work seven days; we let them if they choose to, and pay them time and a half for their Sunday work."

Petition Circulated

The petition which was circulated at the noon hour Wednesday, reads as follows:

"To the honorable members of the State Legislature

assembled, state capitol, St. Paul, Minnesota: Whereas, we, the undersigned employes of the Pillsbury Flour Mills Company, situated at Minneapolis, Minnesota, most respectfully and earnestly petition your honorable body to defeat the so-called 'one day's rest in seven' bill. This bill, if allowed to become a law, would seriously affect the conditions of our employment and menace the welfare of our families."

Such laws are quite as likely to hurt as to help.

The House further amended and then passed the bill.

THE 8 HOUR BILL

Another labor bill, earnestly worked for and lobbied for by many labor men was the bill to prohibit more than 8 hours work in all state employment, including road work.

On April 9th it was argued long and forcibly on both sides and finally defeated by a vote of 27 yeas—36 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Dwyer,	Millett,	Ribenack,
Bessette,	Haagenson,	Morin,	Rosenmeier,
Boylan,	Hausler,	Nelson, J. W.,	Solberg,
Bridgeman,	Jackson,	Nordlin,	Sweet,
Buckler,	Landby,	Orr,	Thwing,
Child,	Lennon,	Pederson,	Wahlund.
Devold,	Lund,	Peterson, N.,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Fickling,	Kelson,	Serline,
Ahles,	Frisch,	Lee,	Sletten,
Bonniwell,	Furlow,	MacKenzie,	Sorenson,
Brooks,	Gemmill,	Madigan,	Stevens,
Cameron,	Gillam,	Peterson, E.P.,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Carley,	Hansen,	Putnam,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Cashel,	Illsley,	Rockne,	Thoe,
Denegre,	Johnson,	Romberg,	Turnham,
Diesen,	Just,	Schmechel,	Zamboni.

THE CAR SHED BILL

For many sessions the workers who are engaged in repairing cars and other railway equipment have demanded properly equipped sheds to protect them from the weather while engaged in the work of making such repairs.

This bill, H. F. 512, was introduced by Samec, Starkey and Bowers and passed the House April 13 by a vote of 70 to 47.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, A.,	Delury,	Kinneberg,	Nelson,
Anderson,G.A.,	Dilley,	Kleffman,	Noonan,
Anderson,S.P.,	Duemke,	Kramer,	Olson,
Barnes,	Enstrom,	Lagerstedt,	Pattison,
Bendixen,	Finstuen,	Lang,	Peterson, C.A.,
Benson,	Flahaven,	Larson,	Peterson, L.,
Berg,	Fowler,	Lewer,	Pratt,
Bernard,	Geister,	Lockhart,	Rodenberg,
Blum,	Green,	Long, F. D.,	Salmonson,
Bowers,	Hitchcock,	Long, P. J.,	Samec,
Cain,	Hurlburt, D.,	Masek,	Skaiem,
Darby,	Iverson,	Mauritz,	Spindler,
Davis, R.,	Johnshoy,	Mayman,	Starkey,
Day,	Johnson, E.,	Murphy,	Stein,
Deans,	Kempfer,	Nellermoe,	Stevens,

Stockwell,	Thomas,	Trovatten,	Welch,
Sweitzer,	Thompson,	Walworth,	Mr. Speaker.
Swenson, E.,	Thorkelson,	Washburn,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Christianson,	Girling,	Johnson, J. G.,	Oren,
Cole,	Gislason,	Knudsen,	Pearson,
Cullum,	Grandstrand,	Kolshorn,	Rohne,
Curtis,	Haugland,	Lammers,	Scallon,
Dahle,	Herreid,	Lightner,	Shonyo,
Davis, C. R.,	Hompe,	MacLean,	Strandemo,
Emerson,	Horton,	McKnight,	Swenson, O.A.,
Escher,	Hough,	McNelly,	Taylor,
Fabel,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Merritt,	Therrien,
Farmer,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Moen,	Waldal,
Fisk,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Naylor,	Wilkinson.
Forestell,	Johnson, J. A.,	Neuman,	

April 18 the Senate passed S. F. 408 instead of H. F. 512. So no law was passed, tho both bills were exactly alike. The Senate had refused to suspend the rules to substitute.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Dwyer,	Lennon,	Romberg,
Bessette,	Frisch,	Lund,	Schmechel,
Boylan,	Haagenson,	Millett,	Sletten,
Bridgeman,	Hansen,	Morin,	Solberg,
Buckler,	Hausler,	Nelson, J. W.,	Thoe,
Carley,	Jackson,	Nordlin,	Thwing,
Child,	Kelson,	Pederson,	Zamboni.
Devold,	Landby,	Peterson, N.,	
Diesen,	Lee,	Ribenack,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Furlow,	Madigan,	Sorenson,
Ahles,	Gillam,	Nelson, W.,	Stevens,
Bonniwell,	Illsley,	Peterson, E.P.,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Brooks,	Johnson,	Putnam,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Cameron,	Just,	Rockne,	Sweet,
Denegre,	Larson,	Rosenmeier,	Turnham,
Fickling,	MacKenzie	Serline,	

In each House this bill received the solid Farmer-Labor support, with the exception of Furlow in the Senate.

It is needless to say that the railroads opposed most strenuously this attempt to protect workmen from heat in summer and cold, snow and bitter winds in winter.

I hope no labor man will set me down as a friend of the monopolists and exploiters, because I have so freely criticised this sort of LABOR LEGISLATION.

It is just because I feel so strong a sympathy for the laborer and his sufferings that I say what I do,—that I try to point out a better way,—a simpler, easier and more effective way to solve the problems of labor, and solve them permanently.

The laws of Nature are just and wise altogether, and will give to each ALL he produces.

But first the evil statutes of man must be repealed.

Then and not till then will labor come into its own.

And I wish to say that the REAL labor members have a very clear conception of the futility of mere palliatives.

CHAPTER XI.—EDUCATION

There are two separate, distinct, antagonistic theories of education.

One assumes that the child is naturally perverse, willful, depraved.

The other takes the child for what he really is—an active, inquiring, eager thing, full of emotions and desires, ever reaching out, experimenting, trying to find out things for itself.

One theory of education would build a great machine, all carefully planned out with subjects of study for each grade—with tests—examinations—infinite details of regulation, all governed from the top and all made subservient to an autocratic will, handing down to subordinate teachers and assistants, advisers, supervisors, co-ordinators, home visitors, placement directors, etc., handing down to all these the courses of study, the questions for examinations the rules for government in every detail, with truant officers and punishments to enforce its arbitrary decisions. The ideal of this group is exemplified by the city superintendent who declared that his system was so perfect that he could sit in his office, look at his watch and tell what every teacher and every pupil SHOULD be doing at that moment in every school in the city. This theory worships SYSTEM and would crush and deform the child, if necessary, to fit the SYSTEM.

The other theory would fit the school and all its accessories of teachers, studies, books, playgrounds—everything—to meet the requirements of the child,—to answer his self prompted questionings, or rather to help him to answer them for himself,—to aid him in his natural longing for information,—to lead him step by step to see for himself and decide for himself the ways of right and proper living.

The one theory makes promotion and success depend upon getting high daily marks, passing examinations, making grades, securing coveted prizes without much regard to methods employed, the glare and glitter of so called "COMMENCEMENTS," and all the infinitude of follies that go along with these things.

The other theory pays little attention to marks, grades, tests, examinations, promotions or any of the other glaring and spectacular features of what we call "education," but it tries to help the child to help himself—to leave him free to unfold normally, to aid him to become strong, healthy and natural physically, with a keen, active, logical mind, and with a sweet, modest, loving spirit, intelligently determined but tolerant—testing all things and holding fast to what is good.

Few of our schools probably exemplify either of these extremes.

Most of them are a mixture of the two.

But nearly all proposed educational bills lead either toward one or the other.

THE PART TIME BILL

An excellent illustration of the first theory is to be found in the so called Part Time Bill, H. F. No. 649, introduced by Mrs. Paige, Messrs. Norton, MacLean and McKnight.

This bill provided COMPULSORY part time schools for all employed persons under 18 years of age who had not finished two years of high school.

On the afternoon of April 4th this bill was considered on special order.

It was ably defended by Mrs. Paige, McKnight, Stevens, Lang, Pratt, Washburn and Hitchcock; and opposed by Myrtle Cain, Bowers, Spelbrink, Ralph Davis, Neuman, Nellermoe, Starkey and Iverson.

Nellermoe first secured an amendment providing for a referendum to the people of the district before the system could be put into force; and another providing that all teachers in these schools must possess equal qualifications with teachers in all other schools of the same grade.

Norton and others declared that such a referendum would kill the bill; that it was not a question for the people but for the board of education; that the voters were in no way fitted to decide such questions.

Lang and Pratt declared that the State Federation of Labor was back of the bill and pointed to a letter on each member's desk from the officers of the Federation urging all to vote for it.

Myrtle Cain replied that the St. Paul and Minneapolis Federations of Labor had both gone on record against it, as had also the Woman's Trade Union League and the Housewives' League.

Neuman insisted that the compulsory feature alone was enough to condemn the bill; and then Myrtle Cain read that part of the bill providing for fines of $50 or imprisonment for 60 days for violation of the act, and declared that her young brother, or her parents, or both, would have been paying fines or living in the jail most of the time for three years if this had been the law; and yet he was a good boy and is still a fine young man, and there are many others like him. The school offered him nothing. His interests were not there. He wanted other employment—other experiences. This bill would make a criminal of every independent boy or girl that couldn't be crushed into the system.

The opponents of the bill had organized their opposition with much thoroughness, and the roll call showed the result, 54 for, 69 against, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Bendixen,	Haugland,	Long, P. J.,	Scallon,
Bernard,	Herreid,	MacLean,	Shonyo,
Christianson,	Hitchcock,	McKnight,	Smith,
Cullum,	Hough,	Merritt,	Stevens,
Curtis,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Murphy,	Strandemo,
Dahle,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Naylor,	Sweitzer,
Darby,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Noonan,	Thomas,
Deans,	Johnson, J. G.,	Norton,	Veigel,
Emerson,	Kempfer,	Odegard,	Walworth,
Escher,	Kolshorn,	Paige,	Washburn,
Fowler,	Lammers,	Pattison,	Wilkinson,
Gehan,	Lang,	Peterson C.A.,	Mr. Speaker.
Gislason,	Lightner,	Pratt,	
Green,	Long, F. D.,	Quinn,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, A.,	Fisk,	Lewer,	Spelbrink,
Anderson,G.A.,	Forestell,	Lockhart,	Spindler,
Anderson,S.P.,	Geister,	Masek,	Starkey,
Barnes,	Girling,	Mauritz,	Stein,
Benson,	Grandstrand,	Mayman,	Stockwell,
Berg,	Hompe,	McNelly,	Swenson, E.,
Blum,	Howard,	Moen,	Swenson, O.A.,
Bowers,	Hurlburt, D.,	Nellermoe,	Taylor,
Cain,	Iverson,	Nelson,	Teigen,
Davis, C. R.,	Johnshoy,	Neuman,	Thompson,
Davis, R.,	Johnson, E.,	Olson,	Therrien,
Day,	Johnson, J. A.,	Oren,	Thorkelson,
Dilley,	Kinneberg,	Pearson,	Trovatten,
Duemke,	Kleffman,	Peterson, L.,	Waldal,
Enstrom,	Knudsen,	Rodenberg,	Welch.
Fabel,	Kramer,	Salmonson,	
Farmer,	Lagerstedt,	Samec,	
Finstuen,	Larson,	Skaiem,	

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

In strong contrast to this bill illustrating the arbitrary autocratic, centralized theory of education, was the bill to provide a system of physical education, with instruction in dietetics and the laws of health.

This bill, H. F. 370, was sponsored by Nolan, Norton, Walworth, Duemke, Christianson, Hitchcock and MacLean, and was passed in the House Tuesday, April 3rd.

DeLury and Stockwell made strong pleas for physical education.

"Let us develop all children into strong, healthy, intelligent men and women, not a few athletes, as now, with all the others as audience and applauders for the few heroes."

Pattison tried to cut out Section 4 which provided for a general physical director at $3,000 a year to co-ordinate the work, to prepare literature and assist the present teachers to intelligently carry out the objects of the law.

The House defeated Pattison.

Dahle, Salmonson, J. N. Jacobson, Haugland, S. P. Anderson, Neuman, Kempfer, Moen and Iverson opposed the bill, partly on the ground of expense; partly, as Iverson said, because it savored of centralization.

In addition to DeLury and Stockwell, Lang pleaded for a strong body to house a strong mind, and E. Swenson, Pearson, Christianson, Hitchcock, Cole, McKnight, Stevens, Nellermoe and Waldal favored the bill in strong speeches.

The roll call showed 68 for, 41 against.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Barnes,	Davis, R.,	Girling,	Johnson, J. A.,
Berg,	Day,	Gislason,	Kinneberg,
Bernard,	DeLury,	Green,	Kleffman,
Bowers,	Dilley,	Haugland,	Lang,
Cain,	Duemke,	Herreid,	Lewer,
Christianson,	Emerson,	Hitchcock,	Lightner,
Cole,	Finstuen,	Hompe,	Long, F. D.,
Cullum,	Forestell,	Horton,	Long, P. J.,
Curtis,	Fowler,	Hurlburt, D.,	MacLean,
Davis, C. R.,	Gehan,	Johnson, E.,	Masek,

McKnight,	Odegard,	Stevens,	Thorkelson,
Merritt,	Paige,	Stockwell,	Veigel,
Murphy,	Pearson,	Sweitzer,	Waldal,
Naylor,	Peterson, L.,	Swenson, E.,	Walworth,
Nellermoe,	Rodenberg,	Taylor,	Washburn,
Noonan,	Samec,	Thomas,	Welch,
Norton,	Starkey,	Therrien,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, A.,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Lockhart,	Shonyo,
Anderson,G.A.,	Iverson,	Mayman,	Skaiem,
Anderson,S.P.,	Jacobson, J.N.,	McNelly,	Spelbrink,
Bendixen,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Benson,	Johnshoy,	Neuman,	Stein,
Dahle,	Johnson, J. G.,	Olson,	Strandemo,
Escher,	Kempfer,	Pattison,	Swenson, O.A.,
Fabel,	Knudsen,	Pratt,	Teigen.
Flahaven,	Kramer,	Rhone,	
Geister,	Kolshorn,	Salmonson,	
Grandstrand,	Lammers,	Scallon,	

TO INVESTIGATE THE REGENTS

February 14 Putnam moved to confirm the Governor's appointments to the Board of Regents of the University.

Carley moved, as a substitute that the Governor's nominations be not confirmed but referred to the committee on education for investigation.

After a long debate, in which the present Board of Regents and their administration was unmercifully criticized by Carley and others, and ably defended by Adams, Geo. Sullivan and others, the Carley resolution was defeated.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Fickling,	Larson,	Romberg,
Bessette,	Gemmill,	Lee,	Schmechel,
Boylan,	Haagenson,	Lund,	Sletten,
Bridgman,	Hausler,	Morin,	Solberg,
Buckler,	Johnson,	Nelson, J. W.	Thoe,
Carley,	Just,	Nordlin,	Thwing,
Devold,	Kelson,	Orr,	Wahlund,
Diesen,	Landby,	Pederson,	Zamboni.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Denegre,	MacKenzie,	Serline,
Ahles,	Dwyer,	Madigan,	Sorenson,
Bonniwell,	Frisch,	Millett,	Stevens,
Brooks,	Furlow,	Nelson, W.,	Sullivan, G.H.
Cameron,	Gillam,	Peterson, E.P.,	Sullivan, J.D.
Cashel,	Hansen,	Peterson, N.,	Sweet,
Child,	Illsley,	Putnam,	Turnham.
Cliff,	Jackson,	Rockne,	
Conroy,	Lennon,	Rosenmeier,	

Later the Bonniwell Bill was passed requiring the Governor to appoint one Regent from each Congressional District as fast as present terms expire.

Stockwell denounced this bill as being worse than the present system, "It won't help at all, but it will fool the people with the idea that they have gained something, when they haven't."

CHAPTER XII.

TEMPERANCE AND LEGISLATION.

"Let your moderation be known of all men."

"Be not among wine bibbers; for wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging; and whosoever indulgeth is not wise."

Thus spoke the ancient sages, and their words have come down to us as words of wisdom.

All through the ages, from the most remote civilization to the present day, the wise ones have raised a voice of warning against drunkenness, gluttony and all excesses.

It has been one age long process of education, and education must ever be the principal reliance of those who would save civilization from the curse of excess.

In the early days in America everyone used intoxicants, and many indulged beyond reason; but our philosophers, like Franklin and others, were ever and always teaching the virtues of temperance.

By the middle of the last century a very strong sentiment had arisen among the more intelligent of our people against the use of intoxicants, many total abstinence societies had been founded and thousands had taken the pledge.

THE CIVIL WAR AND ITS INFLUENCE

Then came the Civil War with its trail of drunkenness and loose living, as with all wars.

But worse than all this and more far-reaching in its evil effects, was the fiscal policy of the Government of putting a heavy tax on liquors.

This led immediately to the organization of the Brewers' Association, in 1863, and to the beginning of the liquor interests in politics.

The Distillers' Association soon followed, and thus another liquor interest entered and began to influence public affairs.

However, the educational work continued. The various temperance societies were having wonderful success in persuading people that intoxicants were injurious,—that alcohol in all its forms was injurious,—when taken into the system, and that the only safe course was to let it entirely alone.

I need not go into details. The history of the temperance movement is an open book and all who will may read of its successes in converting people to the principles of total abstinence.

The Good Templars, the Sons of Temperance, the Frances Murphy Movement, and the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, with their Father Matthew societies and other temperance organizations, were all active and successful.

In many communities the open saloon came to be looked upon as a public nuisance and some of the worst of them were abated under the common law.

It looked as if the good work would go steadily forward,—that temperance would become the fashion,—that drunkenness and debauchery would be outlawed by common consent,—and that the liquor traffic would wane and die out for want of patronage, and because of general public disapproval.

AND THEN THE HIGH LICENSE MOVEMENT

And then arose a powerful group of very stupid, short-sighted, but well meaning people, who began to advocate the doctrine of HIGH LICENSE.

"If we can only adopt a system of licenses—very high licenses—we will make it cost so much to start and maintain these drinking places that few can afford to pay and we can the better control and regulate them."

You all know the argument. You who are among the middle aged and older have heard it many times.

Those of us who predicted even greater evils from the liquor traffic under high license were scorned as impractical theorists and denounced as defenders of the very traffic we had spent our money and lives in educating people to avoid.

Well, HIGH LICENSE won the day. It was put into effect almost everywhere, and then its evils began to be plain to even the stupid good people who had been so sure of the success.

HIGH LICENSE really did succeed, but in a way that its early advocates were too dull to foresee; but just as its opponents had foretold all along.

It succeeded in putting the liquor interests permanently into politics and entrenching them there.

Every brewer and every saloon keeper was forced to become a politician and to do all in his power to put his friends and supporters into public office.

The very life of their business depended on it.

It was not long before the ordinary poor man found it impossible to start or continue in the saloon business. The license fee alone was a thousand dollars or more, but this was the lesser part of the expense.

Every saloon must be a gilded palace enormously expensive to furnish and maintain; and so the wealthy brewers came to own the saloons; and it wasn't very many years until those gilded palaces occupied many of the best corners in all our cities, and their proprietors were devoting all their energies to the work of attracting customers and making drunkards.

Thousands of men, who would scorn to be seen going in or coming out of the ordinary low saloon now became the regular patrons of these palatial dens of vice.

High license had made the saloon **respectable.** Business and professional men, politicians and statesmen, freely gathered within its gilded walls, rested their feet upon its massive brazen fenders, leaned against the rich mahogany bars, bent the elbow to tip the cut glass chalice and drink its delicious but deadly contents; while they feasted their gaze upon the luxurious furnishings, the polished plate mirror and the paintings of beautiful nude women that adorned the walls.

Everything about these resorts was designed to whet the appetite, excite the passions and increase the patronage from which to draw the profits, out of which all this luxury must be supported.

Indeed the liquor interests were not satisfied with drawing in the adult population and taking their money in ex-

change for the poison that slowly undermined their physical health, stealthily destroyed their will power, sapped and ruined their moral stamina and finally left them as flotsam and jetsam on the surface of society, a curse to themselves and a disgrace to all near them,—the final fruitage of the high license system. No, this is not enough, the liquor Moloch must be fed.

And so inventive genius was employed to design ways and means to entrap the young and unwary.

Candies and sweets of all kinds were doctored with small doses of alcoholic stimulant to create an appetite in the children and lead them on to crave stronger stimulants, and thus replenish the ranks of the patrons of the saloons.

In short, the High License system conceived and established by well meaning people, but extremely short sighted, stupid and ignorant (the most of them were "highly educated"), had about reached perfection, and was bringing forth its natural, logical and legitimate fruitage.

And the fruitage was all bad, showing how impossible it is to get a good fruit from a vicious tree, no matter how pure the motives of those who had planted and watered,—no matter how high and noble their ideal,—no matter how beautiful and imposing the tree itself may look when it has reached its full flower and fruitage. The flowers will always stink and the fruit will prove to be apples of Sodom.

HOW TO GET RID OF THE SYSTEM

It now became apparent that the system must be destroyed, but how?

The enemies of the Moloch immediately divided into two camps and proceeded to quarrel over the methods to be employed in ridding society of the accursed beast that had sprung from the union of our old friend Good Intentions when married to the stupid and shameless, tho externally beautiful courtesan, Ignorance.

One camp demanded immediate and uncompromising suppression of the whole evil system. They organized the Prohibition Party and proceeded to attempt the impossible task of inducing enough people to join them to carry elections and put their own advocates and partisans into the public offices.

Here and there they won an election,—here and there they gained political control,—but about the only permanent effect they had upon the thought of the nation came through their remarkable work of education.

The other group were more practical. They realized that the licensed and legalized saloon was the center around which the whole evil system revolved. So they organized the Anti Saloon League and proceeded to work up a sentiment against the system of licensing.

LOCAL OPTION

They secured the enactment of statutes conferring upon the voters in small political units the right to decide for themselves.

This is democratic. This conforms to the fundamental principle of home rule and local self government in local affairs.

Gradually thousands of villages and small cities availed themselves of this right and refused to license and legalize the evil.

It was simply an extension of the old common law right of any person to go into the courts and demand the abatement of a nuisance.

Local Option simply extended to the voters of the small political unit the right to abate the common nuisance, the saloon, by electing public officers who would refuse to license, and thus make legal, these "recruiting offices of hell."

THE ANTI SALOON LEAGUE AND COUNTY OPTION

In the meantime the Anti Saloon League began to demand that the system of Local Option be broadened and extended to the County.

They demanded County Option, and backed up their demand by showing that the county is the unit for the prosecution of criminals and the support of paupers. Therefore it is entirely logical and democratic that the voters of the county should decide the question whether or not the saloon should be permitted.

It was a long and bitter fight in Minnesota, but in 1915 the legislature passed the county option law, and the people rapidly proceeded to vote out the saloons, until, within six months 46 counties, under this law put an end to the anomaly of a **licensed** and **legalized nuisance** and ten others had become dry under local option and the Chippewa Indian Treaty.

NEXT THE STATE

And now the states began to refuse to license and make legal; and by 1919, 32 states had abandoned the whole licensing policy and had outlawed the saloon.

In the meantime Congress had submitted the eighteenth amendment to the federal constitution which proposed to outlaw the entire business of manufacturing, transporting, and selling intoxicating liquors.

The states rapidly ratified this amendment and on Jan. 16, 1920, it was proclaimed the fundamental law of the nation.

ENFORCEMENT

I cannot do better than to print again what I wrote two years ago.

Prohibition of the liquor traffic has been written into the constitution and laws of the nation and of every state.

But it is one thing to prohibit by law and quite a different thing to enforce the law that prohibits.

It is **unlawful** to manufacture any kind of intoxicating liquor to be used as a beverage.

But thousands of people are doing it just the same. They simply defy the law.

It is **unlawful** to transport liquor.

But the country is full of "rum runners."

It is **unlawful** to sell liquor for people to drink.

But thousands are doing it.

It is **unlawful** to have liquor in your possession to be used for drinking purposes.

But the law is not obeyed.

Prohibition has got rid of the licensed and legally protected saloon.

Let us be thankful for that.

Its door is no longer open, ever beckoning to young and old to come in and buy poison under legal protection, to steal their brains away.

But the soft drink parlor, the drug store, the pool room and many other places are now doing secretly what the licensed saloon once did openly.

Newspapers publish long editorials on the evils of liquor and the necessity of law enforcement, and in the adjoining column print squibs and quips ridiculing prohibition and making light of law violation.

BUT

In spite of all these evils—the remnants, the back wash, the dying gasps of an unholy system—the abolition of the open saloon and the prohibition of intoxicating liquor have already produced wonderful results.

The trail has been blazed. It will now be easier to follow.

The violators of law, though active and persistent, are comparatively few, and their numbers will steadily diminish with the increase of temperance sentiment and more efficient enforcement.

To this end a bill was prepared which the temperance people claimed would considerably help in the enforcement of the laws.

The principal change in the present law made it prima facie evidence of guilt if, during search and seizure, any evidence of guilt should be deliberately destroyed.

This was designed to reach those cases where proprietors and employes of soft drink places proceed to destroy all evidence of violation of the law just as soon as the enforcement officers appear upon the scene.

This provision to some extent changes the ancient rule of evidence, and so it was very strongly opposed in both house and senate, but the provision could not be stricken out.

The bill also considerably enlarged the definition of a nuisance, so as to cover anything that is generally used in the manufacture of alcoholic drinks.

After Welch had secured an amendment requiring all enforcement officers to secure warrants and proceed by "due process of law" the bill passed the house April 5th by a vote of 85 to 44.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,G.A.,	Cullum,	Escher,	Herreid,
Anderson,S.P.,	Curtis,	Finstuen,	Hitchcock,
Barnes,	Dahle,	Fisk,	Hompe,
Bendixen,	Darby,	Forestell,	Horton,
Benson,	Day,	Fowler,	Hough,
Berg,	DeLury,	Gislason,	Howard,
Bernard,	Duemke,	Grandstrand,	Hulbert, C.E.,
Christianson,	Emerson,	Green,	Iverson,
Cole,	Enstrom,	Haugland,	Jacobson,J.N.,

Johnshoy,	MacLean,	Paige,	Sweitzer,
Johnson, E.,	McKnight,	Pearson,	Taylor,
Johnson,J.A.,	McNelly,	Pratt,	Teigen,
Johnson, J. C.,	Merritt,	Quinn,	Thompson,
Kempfer,	Moen,	Rohne,	Thorkelson,
Knudsen,	Naylor,	Salmonson,	Trovatten,
Kolshorn,	Nelson,	Shonyo,	Veigel,
Lagerstedt,	Neuman,	Skaiem,	Waldal,
Lammers,	Noonan,	Spindler,	Washburn,
Larson,	Norton,	Spooner,	Mr. Speaker.
Lightner,	Odegard,	Stevens,	
Lockhart,	Olson,	Stockwell,	
Long, F. D.,	Oren,	Strandemo,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson, A.,	Girling,	Mauritz,	Smith,
Blum,	Gehan,	Mayman,	Spelbrink,
Bowers,	Hurlburt, D.,	Murphy,	Starkey,
Cain,	Jacobson,O.P.,	Nellermoe,	Stein,
Davis, C. R.,	Kinneberg,	Nimocks,	Swenson, E.,
Davis, R.,	Kleffman,	Pattison,	Swenson,O.A.,
Dilley,	Kramer,	Peterson,C.A.,	Thomas,
Fabel,	Lang,	Peterson, L.,	Therrien,
Farmer,	Lewer,	Rodenberg,	Walworth,
Flahaven,	Long, P. J.,	Samec,	Welch,
Geister,	Masek,	Scallon,	Wilkinson.

I am not here inserting the roll call on the Welch Amendment, referred to above, because Mr. Norton claimed that all that Welch asked is now guaranteed by both the constitution and the statutes; but 75 members believed it would be safer to have the guaranty embodied in this act as well. 39 voted against the Welch Amendment, largely on the ground that it was not needed.

IN THE SENATE

John D. Sullivan moved to send this bill, H. F. 1049 to the Judiciary Committee to investigate as to its constitutionality.

After a long debate Sullivan won 38 to 23.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Ahles,	Devold,	Lennon,	Romberg,
Arens,	Dwyer,	Lund,	Rosenmeier,
Bessette,	Fickling,	MacKenzie,	Schmechel,
Bonniwell,	Frisch,	Morin,	Serline,
Boylan,	Furlow,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sullivan,G.H.,
Brooks,	Haagenson,	Nordlin,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Cameron,	Hausler,	Peterson, N.,	Sweet,
Carley,	Illsley,	Putnam,	Zamboni.
Cashel,	Just,	Ribenack,	
Denegre,	Kelson,	Rockne,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Jackson,	Orr,	Stevens,
Child,	Johnson,	Pederson,	Thoe,
Diesen,	Landby,	Peterson,E.P.,	Thwing,
Gemmill,	Lee,	Sletten,	Turnham,
Gillam,	Madigan,	Solberg,	Wahlund.
Hansen,	Millett,	Sorenson,	

The Senate Judiciary Committee by a vote of 12 to 10

amended the bill so as to provide that if congress should change the present federal enforcement act known as the "Volstead Law"—in such a way as to diminish or increase the alcoholic content of "intoxicating" liquor, then, automatically, the Minnesota law should change accordingly.

This question aroused one of the most bitter contests of the session, in the Senate April 16th, when the bill came up on final passage.

Johnson moved to strike out the amendment, and the debate which followed was long drawn out. Johnson, Stevens, Child, E. P. Peterson, Jackson, and Putnam insisted that Minnesota should retain the present law,—that we should not bind ourselves to follow congress,—that we should assert our right of home rule,—that to adopt this principle would be to extend an invitation to congress to increase the alcoholic content of "intoxicating" liquor and bind ourselves beforehand to do the same, and that such a course would result in throwing the whole wet and dry question back into politics again in every congressional district.

This is the very crux of the whole question. We must not sign a blank check and turn it over to congress to fill in.

We must stand by the right of our state to make our own laws. Even tho congress might increase the maximum alcoholic content, we are not obliged to follow and increase it here.

Furthermore, such a law would be unconstitutional, as no state can make its laws, contingent on the act of another legislative body.

Sullivan, Nordlin and Kelson made strong pleas to retain the amendment inserted by the Judiciary Committee, but were unsuccessful.

Johnson's motion to strike out carried 34 to 31.

This is largely a dry and wet vote. Several senators calling themselves democrats and theoretically favoring home rule, and self government for the state, voted to bind the state hand and foot and deliver it over to congress. People sometimes do strange things.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Gemmill,	Madigan,	Sorenson,
Bridgeman,	Gillam,	Orr,	Stevens,
Buckler,	Hansen,	Pederson,	Sweet,
Cameron,	Illsley,	Peterson,E.P.,	Thoe,
Carley,	Jackson,	Putnam,	Thwing,
Cashel,	Johnson,	Schmechel,	Turnham,
Child,	Landby,	Serline,	Wahlund.
Diesen,	Larson,	Sletten,	
Furlow,	Lee,	Solberg,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahles,	Devold,	Lennon,	Ribenack,
Arens,	Dwyer,	Lund,	Rockne,
Bessette,	Fickling,	MacKenzie,	Romberg,
Bonniwell,	Frisch,	Millett,	Rosenmeier,
Boylan,	Haagenson,	Morin,	Sullivan,G.H.,
Brooks,	Hausler,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Conroy,	Just,	Nordlin,	Zamboni.
Denegre,	Kelson,	Peterson, N.,	

Ahles tried to strike out that part of the bill which makes it prima facie evidence of guilt to deliberately destroy evidence, but secured only 21 votes as follows:

Ahles,	Conroy,	Hausler,	Romberg,
Arens,	Devold,	Lennon,	Sullivan, **J.D.,**
Bonniwell,	Dwyer,	MacKenzie,	Zamboni.
Boylan,	Fickling,	Nordlin,	
Bridgeman,	Frisch,	Peterson, N.,	
Brooks,	Haagenson,	Ribenack,	

Then Devold tried to have the whole matter submitted to popular vote before the law became effective. He secured only 20 supporters.

Ahles,	Devold,	Hausler,	Ribenack,
Bessette,	Dwyer,	Lennon,	Romberg,
Bonniwell,	Fickling,	Morin,	Schmechel,
Boylan,	Frisch,	Nordlin,	Sullivan, **J.D.,**
Conroy,	Haagenson,	Peterson, N.,	Zamboni.

On final pasage the vote stood 44 to 19.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Gillam,	Lund,	**Serline,**
Bridgeman,	Haagenson,	Madigan,	Sletten,
Buckler,	Hansen,	Millett,	Solberg,
Cameron,	Illsley,	Morin,	Sorenson,
Carley,	Jackson,	Nelson, J. W.,	Stevens,
Cashel,	Johnson,	Orr,	Sullivan,G.H.,
Child,	Just,	Pederson,	Sweet,
Denegre,	Kelson,	Peterson,E.P.,	Thoe,
Diesen,	Landby,	**Putnam,**	Thwing,
Furlow,	Larson,	Rockne,	**Turnham,**
Gemmill,	**Lee,**	Schmechel,	**Wahlund.**

Those who voted in the negative were:

Ahles,	Conroy,	Hausler,	Romberg,
Arens,	Devold,	Lennon,	Rosenmeier,
Bonniwell,	Dwyer,	MacKenzie,	Sullivan, **J.D.,**
Boylan,	Fickling,	Nordlin	Zamboni.
Brooks,	Frisch,	Ribenack,	

Four did not vote. Cliff and Wm. Nelson were sick and excused.

Bessette and Peterson of Wadena were present.

It will now be a little harder for the soft drink places to violate the law and escape.

Such violations are deliberate and intentional, and their places should be permanently closed upon conviction.

Drunkenness is a serious matter. It will destroy any people who yield to it. It is especially dangerous when the young and thoughtless see the law ridiculed by their elders, in the public press and places of amusement, and violated with impunity.

Education Necessary

Nor is strict enforcement the only thing necessary.

Education is still more vital,—education both of parents and of children.

Young people do not acquire an appetite for intoxicants all of a sudden.

Many a fond mother is unconsciously laying a founda-

tion for such an appetite when she encourages her little child to drink tea or coffee or eat highly spiced foods.

No normal child craves these things. At first they are revolting to his naturally sensitive taste; but constant repetition deadens the sensitiveness, and in a little while he will be so changed that simple, wholesome food will not please him. It does not produce the sensation he has learned to crave.

Right here is where so many fond mothers make the crucial mistake.

The child that refuses simple food should have no food at all till he is really hungry.

This abnormal craving for highly spiced foods develops further into a demand for candy, chewing gum, and the abominable habit of stuffing between meals.

A little later soda fountain slop and bottled soft drinks, with their sharp pungent taste, will further prepare the victim for the inevitable result,—a craving for alcoholic beverages.

The Real Remedy

Don't start the child along that path.

Don't destroy his naturally delicate taste.

He won't have to be reformed later.

The schools must more intelligently continue the education of the child in the direction of plain, simple living and the exercise of homely virtues.

THE DOCTORS AND THE CHURCHES

The American Medical Association is on record to the effect that alcohol in all its forms is absolutely worthless to cure disease—yes, worse than worthless, for it breeds disease instead of curing.

Then why not prohibit its prescription by doctors and its sale by drug stores? And the churches, too, if they really want to do something for temperance let them end forever the use of alcoholic wine at the communion table.

THE DRUG HABIT

The alcohol habit leads naturally to the drug habit. But probably more people are led into the use of drugs by these old line doctors who freely administer hypodermic injections to relieve pain.

Many cases of this kind are reported in the newspapers, and there are probably many more that we never hear of.

Medical literature is full of such cases. Why can't the medical doctors take a lesson from the nature cure healers, who never administer drugs, yet are more successful in permanently relieving pain by removing the causes that produce the pain.

Headache tablets and other similar nostrums are also guilty of much harm. They do not remove the cause, and they do tend to create the drug habit.

How slowly we learn! How stupid we are!

CHAPTER XIII.—ELECTION LAWS

The legislature of 1921 went farther in the way of regulating political parties than any other law making body in the United States.

Political parties are voluntary organizations of citizens, of a more or less temporary character, with a shifting and uncertain membership, who have come together for the purpose of shaping public policy.

To this end they attempt to secure the nomination and election to office of men or women who favor their avowed ideas.

Membership in such parties is purely voluntary and is constantly changing.

Nothing should be done to prevent the freest possible flow from one party to another or from any or all existing parties to a new party or to any number of new parties.

It would, therefore, seem to follow that the membership, doctrines, platforms, organizations, methods of propaganda, and all other matters relating to the parties themselves, are outside the scope of governmental regulation.

So far as these matters are concerned, it is none of the government's business; and nowhere, in a real democracy, would such meddling be tolerated.

These parties are voluntary co-operative associations fully capable of making their own rules and regulations; and the only business of government is to protect them in these rights.

BUT

It is the business of government to prescribe rules and regulations for the election of public officials.

Hence we have registrations and elections both primary and final, all hedged about so as to secure the freest possible expression of the electors in the choice of their public servants.

This is the point where government steps in and not before this.

In many cities, states and counties there are no primary elections at all.

Proportional Representation

In some—very many, in fact—members of city councils and parliaments are elected by a system of proportional representation, so that no considerable group of people can be unrepresented.

This makes for satisfaction and stability, and tends powerfully to send the ablest and best of each group into the legislative body.

But in all these places, the purely party organization and regulation is free from governmental espionage or control.

Not until the voter is ready to cast his ballot does he come into contact with any governmental machinery.

A bill to provide for a constitutional amendment that would permit Proportional Representation in any city with a home rule charter was prepared, and was introduced by Myrtle Cain, Mrs. Paige, MacLean, Lockhart and Starkey.

It was made a special order for April 9th but could not be reached and did not come to a vote.

Wherever tried this system has resulted in electing to city councils and other legislative bodies the ablest and best in each considerable group of voters and no considerable minority is ever unrepresented, hence no disgruntled minorities.

THE PRE-PRIMARY CONVENTION LAW OF 1921

But in 1921 the legislature of Minnesota went far beyond this line of logical demarcation, and adopted a complicated, undemocratic, meddlesome system of regulation over the internal affairs of political parties, and set up governmental machinery for the choosing of delegates to party conventions,—practically forcing parties to hold conventions whether the members desired to or not, and laying down rather minute rules for governing such conventions when held.

This played strongly into the hands of the faction in power and gave them a mighty and undue advantage in the election of 1922.

In spite of this advantage the party in power was pretty completely riddled.

They lost the U. S. Senator and several Congressmen, and came very near losing the Governor and several other state officers.

Very many members of the legislature who voted for this expensive, undemocratic and meddlesome statute were defeated and others experienced a change of heart.

Many people lack foresight, but hindsight is a great teacher.

THE REPEAL BILL

Gislason and Teigen, both of whom voted in 1921 against this undemocratic measure, brought in a bill to repeal the law and return to the previous status relative to the primary elections.

This bill came upon special order in the afternoon of March 1st and it was remarkable to observe the friendly co-operation of elements who were intensely hostile two years before when this new departure was crammed down the throats of a loudly protesting minority.

Time and experience are great teachers.

There is probably no quicker way of getting rid of a bad system than to try it out.

It had been tried and found wanting.

Hardly a voice was raised in defense of the Pre-primary Convention law that only two years before was to be the salvation of the state and the savior of the people from radicalism.

The roll call on the final passage of the repeal bill found only 7 voting no: Anderson, A. Cole, Dilley, Haugland, Norton, Stevens and Wilkinson.

Anderson voted no under a misapprehension so that the negative vote was really only six.

Of those voting to repeal the following had voted for the law two years before:

Bendixen,	Hulbert,	Neuman,	Swenson,O.A.,
Christianson,	Jacobson,J.N.,	Nimocks,	Taylor,
Cullum,	Johnson, J. A.,	Pattison,	Thomas,
Curtis,	Lightner,	Rodenberg,	Thompson,
Girling,	Murphy,	Shonyo,	Mr. Speaker.
Green,			

The law had worked disastrously for those who sponsored it two years before and now they made haste to get rid of it.

IN THE SENATE

March 23 this repeal bill came up in the Senate and was somewhat amended by the author, Senator Arens.

George Sullivan of Stillwater was the only one to defend the old law and his was the only vote against repeal—61 voted for it and five were absent. Putnam did not vote.

The following voted for the bill two years ago and now voted to repeal: Adams, Brooks, Denegre, Larson, Rockne, Turnham and J. D. Sullivan, also Child, Cameron and Serline, who voted for it as House members in 1921.

PERMANENT REGISTRATION

Nimocks and others introduced and secured the passage of a system of permanent registration for the three larger cities of the state.

Under this plan, if you are once registered, you will not need to register again unless you move. Then you go to the City Clerk and have a new registration card made out.

This new system will save the cities a great deal of expense, and will relieve the voters of much annoyance.

Why shouldn't the voter be permanently registered as long as he lives in the same house?

Nimmocks and others also tried to change the time for city elections for the three large cities to November and do away with the spring elections for city officers; but this move was not at all popular.

City politics should be kept free from state and national questions, and this can only be done by having separate city elections.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

Minnesota had a Presidential Preference Primary law in force at the election of 1916, but it was repealed in 1917.

In 1923, H. F. 781, was introduced by Spindler, Barnes, R. Davis, Veigel, Skaien, Enstrom, Welch, Nellermoe, Stockwell, Mrs. Kempfer and Myrtle Cain.

This bill re-established the Presidential Primary.

It was reported for passage by the Elections Committee, but was not voted on.

Of the eleven sponsors of this bill, eight were elected with Farmer-Labor endorsement and the other three were regarded as progressive.

THE GARBO SYSTEM

H. F. 774, introduced by E. Swenson, Bernard and Bowers, provides the Garbo System of assembling and counting ballots in cities of the first, second and third classes.

Under this system it is practically impossible to make a mistake in counting ballots.

CHAPTER XIV.

GOOD ROADS AND $20,000,000 OF BONDS

Of course everybody wants good roads.

The questions on which men differ are:

When, where and how shall they be built?

Shall they be built slowly and be paid for as we go along, or shall we go into debt for them and trust to getting rid of the debt later?

Finally, who shall pay for them and how?

Of course everyone declares they must be paid for by those who benefit by them.

Then they begin to quarrel over the question

"WHO BENEFITS?"

It goes without saying that the owners of land adjacent to, and near, these good roads get a great benefit.

Their lands will be worth more, will sell for more, will rent for more, after the roads are built than before.

Owners of automobiles will also be benefited.

In Iowa and some other states, the cost of making and keeping up these good roads is divided between the land owners and the automobile owners.

But in Minnesota the Constitutional amendment locating these trunk highways and providing for their construction, put all the cost upon the automobiles.

The land owners get the benefit without cost.

It soon appeared that the automobile taxes could not pay all the bills and build roads as fast as the people demanded them.

By the time the Legislature of 1923 was elected, the sentiment of the state was pretty well divided.

The Highway Commissioner, Mr. Babcock, proposed to issue $20,000,000 of bonds over a period of two years so as to get the main roads built quickly and thus save time and expense to owners of automobiles.

Representatives from rural districts urged that we go slow,—test out the roads we have,—give the system a fair trial,—don't rush into debt.

THE $20,000,000 BOND BILL

This bill was discussed and passed in the Senate April 10th and used up most of the day.

The champions of bonding and rapid work were led by Senator Adams of Duluth.

The Farmer-Labor group almost solidly opposed.

At the end of the long debate the roll call showed the following result:

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 35:

Adams,	Denegre,	MacKenzie,	Stevens,
Ahles,	Diesen,	Madigan,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Arens,	Dwyer,	Morin,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Bessette,	Frisch,	Orr,	Sweet,
Boylan,	Hansen,	Peterson, N.,	Twing,
Bridgeman,	Illsley,	Ribenack,	Turnham,
Brooks,	Just,	Romberg,	Wahlund,
Cameron,	Larson,	Rosenmeier,	Zamboni.
Child,	Lennon,	Serline,	

Those who voted in the negative were, 29:

Bonniwell,	Gillam,	Lund,	Schmechel,
Buckler,	Haagenson,	Millett,	Sletten,
Carley,	Hausler,	Nelson, J. W.,	Solberg,
Cashel,	Jackson,	Nordlin,	Sorenson,
Devold,	Johnson,	Pederson,	Thoe.
Fickling,	Kelson,	Peterson, E.P.,	
Furlow,	Landby,	Putnam,	
Gemmill,	Lee,	Rockne,	

Cliff, Conroy and Wm. Nelson were absent, sick.

Desperate efforts were made in the House to get this bill to a vote, but every effort failed.

The nearest approach to a fair test of strength occurred late in the evening April 17.

The Senate had passed a resolution to recall the bill from the House.

If this bill could be recalled and thus get it out of the House, then it would be possible for the House to attach the bill, as an amendment, to another road bill, and possibly thus pass it as a rider.

As long as the Senate bill was before the House it could not be so attached. A House rule forbids.

Senator Rockne, an opponent of the bill, now moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill had been recalled.

In this contest, Child, who had voted for the bill, refused to stand for "such crooked tactics" and urged reconsideration.

Rockne's motion carried—36 to 29.

The following Senators, all of whom had voted for the bill, agreed with Child and voted to reconsider: Bridgeman, Dwyer, Frisch, Illsley, Lennon and Zamboni.

Adams now tried again to recall the bill from the House, but lost—32 to 33. Bridgeman, Child, Frisch and Zamboni refused to support this second attempt to recall.

So the Senate bill was still in the House, and could not be attached as an amendment to another road bill.

A fierce battle had been raging in the House most of the afternoon; led by Wilkinson against permitting the Senate to recall the bill, and, on the other side, by Hitchcock, who favored the bond issue, and therefore wanted the House to accede to the Senate's request.

About half after nine Stockwell moved to lay the whole matter on the table.

This motion carried 76 to 51 and thus the $20,000,000 bond issue was killed.

This vote is a pretty fair test of the strength of each side in the House.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, A.,	Day,	Haugland,	Kinneberg,
Anderson,G.A.,	Deans,	Hompe,	Kleffman,
Anderson,S.P.,	Emerson,	Hough,	Knudsen,
Bendixen,	Enstrom,	Howard,	Kramer,
Benson,	Escher,	Iverson,	Kolshorn,
Bowers,	Farmer,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Lagerstedt,
Cain,	Fisk,	Johnshoy,	Lammers,
Cole,	Flahaven,	Johnson, E.,	Larson,
Darby,	Forestell,	Johnson, J. G.,	Lewer,
Davis, C. R.,	Gislason,	Kelly,	Lightner,
Davis, R.,	Grandstrand,	Kempfer,	Mauritz,

Merritt,	Paige,	Spindler,	Teigen,
Moen,	Peterson, L.,	Spooner,	Thompson,
Naylor,	Pratt,	Starkey,	Thorkelson,
Nellermoe,	Quinn,	Stein,	Trovatten,
Nelson,	Salmonson,	Stockwell,	Veigel,
Neuman,	Shonyo,	Strandemo,	Washburn,
Olson,	Skaiem,	Swenson, E.,	Welch,
Oren,	Smith,	Taylor,	Wilkinson,

Those who voted in the negative were:

Barnes,	Gehan,	Long, P. J.,	Peterson, C.A.,
Berg,	Geister,	MacLean,	Rodenberg,
Bernard,	Girling,	Masek,	Rohne,
Blum,	Green,	Mayman,	Samec,
Cullum,	Herreid,	McKnight,	Scallon,
Curtis,	Hitchcock,	McNelly,	Stevens,
Dahle,	Horton,	Murphy,	Sweitzer,
DeLury,	Hulbert, C. E.,	Nimocks,	Swenson, O.A.,
Dilley,	Hurlburt, D.,	Noonan,	Thomas,
Duemke,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Norton,	Therrien,
Fabel,	Johnson, J. A.,	Odegard,	Waldal,
Finstuen,	Lang,	Pattison,	Walworth.
Fowler,	Lockhart,	Pearson,	

In general Northern Minnesota favored this bond issue, assisted by a little more than half the representatives from Hennepin and Ramsey counties and scattering votes from the southeastern part of the state.

The opposition came largely from the Farmer-Labor group and other farmer districts.

Their strong point was that a very large part of the automobile taxes are now absorbed by interest on bonds, and with $20,000,000 more bonds it would nearly all be so absorbed, leaving little or nothing to build new roads with.

A STATE CEMENT PLANT

In connection with this matter of state roads, has arisen the question of a state owned and operated cement plant.

The advocates of such a plant claim that it would free the state from the grip of the cement trust, supply the needed cement at a much lower cost than the state now pays and thus save many millions of dollars.

On April 16 the House passed a bill for a Constitutional Amendment that would, if carried by popular vote at the election of 1924, permit the Legislature to establish such a plant for the manufacture of cement.

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 73:

Anderson, A.,	Day,	Horton	Masek,
Anderson,G.A.,	Deans,	Howard,	Mauritz,
Anderson,S.P.,	DeLury,	Hurlburt, D.,	Mayman,
Bendixen,	Dilley,	Iverson,	Moen,
Benson,	Duemke,	Johnshoy,	Nellermoe,
Berg,	Enstrom,	Johnson, E.,	Nelson,
Blum,	Finstuen,	Kleffman,	Odegard,
Bowers,	Flahaven,	Kramer,	Olson,
Cain,	Fowler,	Kolshorn,	Paige,
Cole,	Geister,	Lagerstedt,	Peterson, C.A.,
Darby,	Girling,	Lang,	Peterson, L.,
Davis, C. R.,	Gislason,	Larson,	Pratt,
Davis, R.,	Haugland,	Lewer,	Rodenberg,

Rohne,	Spooner,	Swenson, O.A.,	Waldal,
Samec,	Stein,	Thompson,	Walworth,
Skaiem,	Stevens,	Therrien,	Washburn,
Smith,	Stockwell,	Thorkelson,	Welch,
Spindler,	Strandemo,	Trovatten,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were, 34:

Barnes,	Hitchcock,	Long, F. D.,	Quinn,
Christianson,	Hompe,	Long, P. J.,	Scallon,
Curtis,	Hulbert, C. E.,	MacLean,	Shonyo,
Dahle,	Jacobson, J.N.,	McKnight,	Sweitzer,
Emerson,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Merritt,	Taylor,
Escher,	Johnson, J. G.,	Murphy,	Thomas,
Fabel,	Knudsen,	Naylor,	Veigel,
Fisk,	Lammers,	Noonan,	
Forestell,	Lightner,	Pearson,	

Twenty-four did not vote.

Twice during the turmoil of the last day of the session attempts were made to suspend the rules and pass this bill, but only 44 votes could be had and the rules could not be suspended. The following senators voted against giving the bill a chance on both roll calls: Adams, Brooks, Cameron, Denegre, Stevens, George H. Sullivan, O. D. Sullivan. There were eleven who did not vote either way on the first roll call and 15 on the second. It takes 45 votes to suspend the rules and only 44 could be secured.

Bessette, Lennon, W. Nelson and Ribenack voted "no" on the first roll call. Any one of these men could have given the bill a chance, but refused.

The bill would undoubtedly have passed if it could have come to a vote, and it was only a proposal to let the people of the state vote on the question.

What was the cement trust doing?

A GASOLINE TAX

In order to secure more money for road building and upkeep, the legislature submitted a proposed constitutional amendment for a tax on gasoline.

If the people adopt this amendment, the next legislature will be confronted with a number of serious problems.

How will it be possible to separate the gasoline used in automobiles and trucks that wear out the roads, from the gasoline used in stoves, stationary engines, machinery on the farm and for other purposes?

Of course such gasoline should not be taxed for road purposes.

In one way this gasoline tax would be fair. Automobiles from outside the state would thus contribute to the upkeep of our roads which they are helping to wear out.

In my opinion it is a fatal defect in our road laws that we have wholly abandoned the Elwell principle of assessing a part of the cost of these roads against the owners of benefited lands.

In northern Minnesota especially, lands that were practically worthless will be greatly enhanced in value; and the owners, largely non residents, will not contribute one dollar either to their construction or upkeep; while farmers and workers and business men will pay the bonds, principal and interest.

CHAPTER XV.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATION

In the chapter on the three essential functions of government, it was pointed out that the making and maintaining of highways of all kinds is a necessary duty of government;—that, in the very nature of things, it is not an individual or private matter;—that no public way can be made or maintained except thru public action;—and that this public action may be performed directly by the government or by corporations created by government and empowered to perform these functions.

Hence we have the public service corporation,—a creature of government and at all times subject to governmental regulation.

HOME RULE AND LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT

In harmony with the principle of home rule and local self government, these public service corporations should be, and usually are, regulated and controlled by the municipality which they serve.

This is democracy.

BUT

The powerful public utility corporations,—gas, electric, street railway, etc., that serve the modern city prefer to escape from local control, and come under state control.

Therefore, some fifteen years ago or more, a great campaign was put on all over the nation, to create state public utility commissions.

This movement was fostered and supported by the utility corporations in a very widespread and expensive propaganda; and was successful to a considerable extent in fooling or corrupting legislators to create these state commissions.

This movement met its Waterloo in the legislature of Minnesota in 1913, where the State Utility Commission got only 30 votes out of 130 members of the House.

Since then I believe no other state has adopted this plan of a STATE commission to regulate and control LOCAL utilities.

BUT

Minnesota has a State Railroad and Warehouse Commission, which is an entirely proper thing for STATE purposes, but a very bad thing for regulating LOCAL affairs.

However, since 1913, the local utilities have strenuously striven to get themselves under the Railway and Warehouse Commission.

In 1915 all the telephone companies of the state, not only those of state-wide activity, but also all the little local companies, including the farmers' co-operative locals, were turned over to this state commission.

It is needless to say that the result has been a very great dissatisfaction in the local communities, who are now demand decentralization and a restoration of their local affairs to local control.

THE STREET RAILWAY PROBLEM

The street railway bill passed by the legislature of 1921, taking from the cities much of their control of their street railway system and putting that control into the hands of the State Railway and Warehouse Commission proved a dangerous boomerang.

As pointed out in the first chapter, many who voted for this bill in 1921 were defeated in the elections of 1922.

Many members were elected on a platform demanding the repeal of the "Brooks-Coleman" street railway bill.

Early in the session Stockwell, Nellermoe and Myrtle Cain introduced such a bill providing for complete repeal.

This seemed rather dangerous to some, as it might leave the cities in a somewhat uncertain condition as to street railway matters.

Would the repeal of the "Brooks-Coleman" law restore the former franchises which had been surrendered in exchange for indeterminate permits?

Would the cities lose all that had been gained in the way of publicity, valuation, etc., in the past years?

These were serious questions, and finally, early in February, came the so called Nordlin-Starkey bill, which simply provided for the transfer from the Railway and Warehouse Commission to each city council of all the power which the "Brooks-Coleman" bill had given to the Commission.

This bill was introduced into the Senate by Nordlin and Hausler of St. Paul, and into the House by Starkey, Masec, Mauritz, and Blum of St. Paul; Bowers, Nellermoe, and Swenson of Minneapolis; Bernard, Barnes, and Lockhart of Duluth, and Kinneberg of Todd County.

Later a bill was introduced by the Duluth members which was somewhat more specific in its terms than the Nordlin-Starkey bill.

Then finally came the Sweitzer-Pearson bill which proposed to unite St. Paul and Minneapolis into one street railway system with a single fare and universal transfers covering both cities.

Minneapolis strongly opposed this bill, claiming that cars could not be operated in St. Paul as cheaply as in Minneapolis, and hence that city would be obliged to bear a part of the St. Paul burden.

The final outcome of all these bills there was much discussion but no results.

PUBLICITY FOR ALL PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATIONS

Stockwell, Bernard, Duemke and Myrtle Cain introduced a bill to require all public service corporations to open all their books and records to the regularly constituted authorities of every city or village served by them. It could not be reached.

This is a very important matter and should be passed at the next session without fail.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE CARLEY INVESTIGATION

January 30th Carley introduced a resolution charging violation of the corrupt practices act by the "various political parties, political committees, and other agencies within this state during past campaigns and during the last pre-primary and pre-election campaign";

Also charging that employees of the different departments of the state government were required to contribute money and time for political purposes;

Also charging persistent and willful misrepresentation by the administration forces against their opponents, resulting in the unjust defeat of good and honest men, contrary to the best interests of the commonwealth;

And then asking for the appointment of a committee of seven to investigate and report; the committee to be as follows:

Senators Carley, Johnson, Thwing Schmechel, Boylan, Kelson and Just.

Instead of this committee asked for by Carley, the Rules Committee reported out a resolution February 28, considerably amending Carley's resolution and providing for a committee of seven to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor.

March 5 he appointed the following committee:

McKenzie, Furlow, Carley, Rosenmeir, Schmechel, Rockne and Morin.

A majority of this committee is supposed to be affiliated with the Republican party; Carley, a Democrat, and Schmechel and Morin, Farmer-Labor.

Rockne demanded that Carley be placed under oath and required to produce evidence to prove his charges.

This Carley refused to do, claiming that this committee had been appointed not to investigate Carley, but to determine the truth or falsity of the charges he had preferred.

A pretty hot contest was waged over this question for several days; but finally, on March 16, Furlow came on the floor of the Senate with a motion which, if adopted, would have practically instructed the committee to proceed according to the demands of Rockne, now apparently supported by a majority of the committee.

Mr. Carley offered as a substitute motion the following:

The investigating committee appointed under and pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Senate on March 1st, 1923, having asked the Senate for instructions as to its powers, duties, methods of procedure and extent of its investigation, said committee is hereby advised and instructed as follows:

That said Committee call before it such persons as it deems can give evidence relative to, or throw light upon any of the matters referred to in said resolution.

That said Committee compel the production of all books and records in the possession, or under the control of such persons called for examination.

That such Committee examine and cross-examine any and all persons so called and examine any and all books and records produced before the Committee.

That members of such Committee are, each and all of them, investigators and that none thereof are prosecutors or defenders of persons called to testify or who might be interested in the outcome of the investigation.

That in conducting such investigation the committee will necessarily call the persons connected with or members of the various political parties, political committees or other agencies referred to in the resolution.

That such committee go to such extent as will bring before it all evidence obtainable within the time the committee has to devote to the investigation.

That such committee may select one of its members to conduct the examination of witnesses produced, but that each of the other members should be given opportunity to further question.

That such committee proceed at once to carry out these instructions and the mandate of the resolution.

Then came a long and highly interesting debate, at the end of which Carley gained a pretty complete victory,—40 to 24.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Dwyer,	Lee,	Peterson, N.,
Bessette,	Fickling,	Lund,	Ribenack,
Bonniwell,	Haagenson,	Madigan	Romberg,
Boylan,	Hausler,	Millett,	Schmechel,
Bridgeman,	Illsley,	Morin,	Solberg,
Buckler,	Johnson,	Nelson, J. W.,	Sorenson,
Carley,	Just,	Nordlin,	Thoe,
Cashel,	Kelson,	Orr,	Thwing,
Devold,	Landby,	Pederson,	Wahlund,
Diesen,	Larson,	Peterson,E.P.,	Zamboni,

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Frisch,	Lennon,	Serline,
Ahles,	Furlow,	MacKenzie,	Stevens,
Brooks,	Gemmill,	Nelson, W.,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Cameron,	Gillam,	Putnam,	Sullivan, J D.,
Child,	Hansen,	Rockne,	Sweet,
Denegre,	Jackson,	Rosenmeier,	Turnham,

Cliff, and Conroy, sick. Sletten excused, absent.

It was jokingly claimed that the stand pat Republicans and the Bourbon Democrats had united against Carley and had gone down to defeat, overwhelmed by the Farmer-Labor "reds" united with progressives of all shades of "pink."

At any rate from now on the committee ceased quarrelling, and began to really investigate as per instructions of the Senate.

These investigations occupied much time of the committee and aroused general public interest, not only at the Capitol, but in all parts of the state and beyond the borders.

On the last day of the session the Committee split into three parts and submitted three reports covering about 20 pages of the Senate Journal.

One report was signed by MacKenzie, Furlow, Rosenmeier and Rockne; another by Carley and Schmechel, and a third by Morin.

I quote the following from the majority report:

1. No evidence was adduced to show that the Republican campaign committee took any part in the election of members of the present Legislature or in attempting so to do or expended any money for that purpose.

2. No evidence was adduced to show that any postage or stationery was furnished by state departments for the campaign; on the contrary it was proved no request to that effect was made.

3. No evidence was adduced to show that any employees of the state were used to mail out literature for the Republican or any other campaign committee.

4. No evidence was adduced showing that the Republican State Central Committee was furnished stenographic help from offices in the State Capitol except in two instances, and in these two instances it was claimed that the work was done during the customary vacation period. That William H. Brown, an employee in the Secretary of State's office put in some time at the Republican State Central Committee headquarters for which the committee paid him and during which time it was understood he was not to receive pay from the state. Later the Honorable Julius Schmahl, then Secretary of State, decided that he be paid his regular salary inasmuch as during such period he had kept up a part of his work in the office of the Secretary of State. Mr. Brown also claimed that the time spent included a part of his regular vacation period.

5. No evidence was adduced showing that the State employees engaged in campaign speaking either in 1920 or 1922; it does appear, however, that Reverend Hauser, while in the state employ, did some campaign work in the country districts, for which he was not compensated but in connection with which he drew $100 expense money from the campaign committee.

6. An examination of the reports of the receipts of campaign funds from state employees show that such contributions were so similar in size that one must conclude that such contributions were made on some uniform basis. The Committee feels, however, that appointees, the continuation of whose jobs depend upon the re-election of their chief are simply spending money in the interest of continuing their own employment in making campaign contributions and if such contributions are voluntary for that purpose and are not the result of assessment or coercion there is nothing improper about making them.

The majority report then goes on to admit that the Governor's private secretary had acted as Chairman of the Republican State Central Committee, and had drawn his pay from the State during the time so employed; but claimed that he had performed all the duties required of him by statute.

They also admit that Mr. J. F. Gould who acted as secretary of the Republican Committee did draw pay from the State as a military officer, during a period of about five weeks, while he devoted his time to raising campaign funds.

Also R. B. Rathbun, Superintendent of Banks, drew pay from the State for about four weeks, while devoting his time

to the Speakers' Bureau of the Republican Committee; but it was claimed that he kept up his work in the banking department.

It was admitted that several others drew their regular pay while doing campaign work for the party.

It was also conceded that the Sound Government League had collected and spent large sums of money "to save the State from Socialism," that is, to save the state from the opponents of the Republican party, namely:

The Non-Partisan League.

The Working People's Non-Partisan Political League.

The Farmer-Labor party.

They claimed that the Non-Partisan League had collected and expended nearly $2,000,000 in the state of Minnesota alone.

Mr. Henry G. Leigan, General Secretary of the National Non-Partisan League entered a general denial that his organization had spent any such amount and was present and asked to be permitted to testify; but he claims that the committee rejected his offer and he was not called.

THE CARLEY-SCHMECHEL REPORT

The Minority report, signed by Carley and Schmechel, reiterated all of the 18 specific charges, and sums up as follows:

From all of the evidence produced before said committee and all other proceedings had, in connection with such investigation, the undersigned members find the following facts:

That in the conduct of the campaign for 1920 the Republican State Central Committee received and expended $9993.26.

That in adition to such committee a volunteer committee known as the "Preus for Governor" Volunteer Committee, of which B. L. Kingsley was Secretary, expended $1292.52 and a further committee known as the "Turritin Republican Committee" expended $1500.00 and a further committee known as the "Committee of One Hundred" spent $20,107.38. The Publicity Bureau so called was headed by Ray P. Chase, Deputy State Auditor, and expended $25,000. The Speaker's Bureau headed by O. H. Griggs carried on a very active campaign handling the speakers throughout the campaign, but made no report of its receipts and expenditures and no evidence relative thereto was produced before the Committee.

In addition to these active campaign committees, all of which were interested in the same result, to-wit: the election of the Republican State ticket, a movement was started in the latter part of 1919, in St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth. A meeting of business interests was held in St. Paul, at the Minnesota Club, at which about sixty of the leading business men of St. Paul were present.

A large fund was arranged for at this meeting and John R. Mitchell of the Capital National Bank was selected as Treasurer of such fund.

A similar meeting was held at the Kitcha Gama Club in Duluth at which meeting about one hundred leading busi-

ness men of Duluth were present, and at that meeting a large fund was arranged for and David Williams of the First National Bank of Duluth was named as Treasurer of that Fund.

Another meeting was held at the Minneapolis Club in Minneapolis, at which meeting a large number of leading business men of Minneapolis were present and at that meeting a large fund was arranged for and F. A. Chamberlain of the First National Bank was selected to act as Treasurer of that fund.

The evidence also developed that Mr. A. W. Strong of Minneapolis, who did not permit himself to be examined by the Committee knew considerable about the subscribers to the Minneapolis fund and the disposition thereof, as also did Mr. W. A. Durst of the Minnesota Loan and Trust Company of Minneapolis.

After providing for a sufficient fund arrangements were made for the organization of the Sound Government Association. This Association was organized with the avowed purpose of fighting socialism and socialistic doctrines in Minnesota. Its officers did not include any of the men who were connected with the financing of the movement. The membership in the Sound Government Association was made up of men and women over the State and these men and women helped to conduct the campaign conducted by the Sound Government Association proper. Harry Curran Wilbur of St. Paul had complete charge of the Sound Government Association and its operations. F. G. Ingersoll, an attorney at law of St. Paul, Minn., was selected as Treasurer of the funds that were delivered to the Sound Government Association by the business interests of St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth, contributing such funds. The Treasurer of the Sound Government Association proper was Henry Von der Weyer of the Merchants National Bank of St. Paul, Minn.

Henry Von der Weyer as such Treasurer kept a careful account of his receipts and expenditures as Treasurer of the Sound Government Association. The money he handled came from small contributions from business men and from memberships throughout the state and amounted to about $6,600 and the whole thereof was expended for the Sound Government Association in twelve checks, the largest of which went toward payment of Minnesota Issues, a publication of the Sound Government Association.

F. G. Ingersoll, and Harry Curran Wilbur agree that in the conduct of all of their operations of the Sound Government Association, outside of the funds of Henry Von der Weyer, they expended a total of about $220,000 and that such expenditures were largely paid to McGill, Warner & Co., for the printing of "Minnesota Issues," "Leaders of the Non Partisan League" and other pamphlets, and a two-page reprint of the Minneapolis Tribune of March 7, 1920, and about $30,000 in addition to said printing was paid for the expenses of speakers, office organization, moving picture films and county representatives outside of the three large cities.

An examination of the bank account of F. G. Ingersoll produced by R. W. Lindeke, Cashier of the Merchants National

Bank shows that instead of $220,000 having been received and expended by Mr. Ingersoll in the conduct of the Sound Government Association, there was received by him $379,380.62, and that he issued checks against the same amounting to $375,095.32. Mr. Ingersoll had no books, checks, vouchers or other data to show what became of this money. He expended about $155,000 outside of the expenditures made by him for the Sound Government Association. The only light this committee received as to these expenditures is the testimony of the witnesses themselves, when they declared that they were Republicans, interested in the Republican campaign and election of the Republican ticket and that when the election was over, the state was saved and they had accomplished what they desired to accomplish and that the issue in the campaign of 1920 was the issue of socialism and the fight was against the Non Partisan League and the principal tickets in the field after the Elimination Convention of 1920 and after the primaries was the Republican State ticket and Farmer Labor ticket and the further light, shown by the fact that after the anouncement in "Minnesota Issues" of the success of the campaign the Sound Government movement dwindled and was abandoned very soon thereafter.

Furthermore, that the said "Minnesota Issue" was published every two weeks during the primary and the election campaign and that after the "Minnesota Issue" announcing the result of the election, published on Nov. 24, 1920, headed "Great Victory over Radicalism won by Citizens, Socialist Leaders of the Non Partisan League Unmasked by Tireless Work of Education," only two more volumes of this paper were published, one January 28, 1921, and one in March, 1921, and the only reason given by the witnesses for the discontinuance of such campaign of education was that they had no more funds.

In the conduct of the examination it was found that John R. Mitchell as Treasurer, of the St. Paul business interests, received as contributions, $180,900, and that he delivered various checks drawn against this account as Treasurer, to Mr. Ingersoll, the last one for $2604.91 on July 14, 1921, and that thereafter he paid no money to the Sound Government Association out of this fund and that at such time he had on hand $13,795.09. His account further shows that in 1922 he issued checks against this account between January 31, 1922, and January 13, 1923, of $2,550.00, in six checks.

No explanation of these disbursements was made to the Committee. Mr. Mitchell did testify he contributed to the campaign fund for 1922.

Mr. Ingersoll testified that whenever he needed funds he "hollered" for them calling upon John R. Mitchell of St. Paul, Mr. L. C. Harris of Duluth, Mr. A. W. Strong of Minneapolis. Mr. Harris however, testified he had nothing to do with the distribution of the fund and when requests were made on him for money he referred them to Mr. David Williams of the First National Bank of Duluth. The only evidence furnished the Committee as to the receipts and disbursements of the Duluth business men's fund is that furnished in a telegram from the said David Williams which

says, "that about seventy thousand dollars was raised for this movement in Duluth."

The only evidence which the Committee was able to find from the examination of witnesses from Minneapolis as to the amount of money raised and expended in Minneapolis, or otherwise, and connected with this fund was the evidence of Mr. F. A. Chamberlain, who testified he received various checks in large amounts and that he delivered the checks in bundles to Eugene J. Carpenter, now deceased or Mr. A. W. Strong or Mr. Wm. A. Durst.

It further appears from the testimony of Charles R. Adams, Chairman of the Republican State Central Committee and Mr. I. A. Caswell, Republican National Committeeman, that an attempt was made to gather funds in Minnesota, to help make up a deficit in the National Republican Campaign fund by Mr. Henry R. Jackson of New York City, and that practically all of the prominent Republicans of St. Paul and Minneapolis were solicited by him in the latter part of 1920 and early in 1921, and that because of the heavy contributions made by them for the 1920 state campaign, only about five thousand dollars was collected by said Jackson and that the said Jackson reported that said men had been "bled white" in the campaign of 1920. The men solicited by said Jackson included those named herein as being desired as witnesses and other prominent Republicans whose names were furnished by said Adams and Caswell.

It further appears that none of the funds collected for the various committees conducting the Republican State Campaign went to the National Committee and that the only amounts contributed to the National Committeeman for his conduct of the state campaign was $962, which he collected and disbursed.

It further appears that the officers of the Republican State Central Committee kept no books or records showing receipts and disbursements of that organization. Such memoranda as was kept, was immediately destroyed at the close of the campaign. That the so-called committee of "One Hundred," and other Committees referred to in the conduct of the state campaign kept no books or records and at the close of the campaign destroyed such data as they had; that in the expenditure by Ray P. Chase of $25,000, which he expended in publicity for the election of the Republican State ticket, all transactions were had in cash and the money was paid to him as he required it by A. H. Turritin, President of the Lincoln National Bank of Minneapolis, at that time, and who has since died. That said Chase deposited in his left-hand trouser pocket the $25,000 received and checked it out of such pocket keeping no record thereof. That the Chairman of the committee was requested to bring before the Committee the books and records of the accounts kept by said Mr. Turritin, as custodian of the funds of the various committees which he was connected with, but that no such books or records were produced.

The undersigned further find that in the conduct of the 1920 campaign as well as the 1922 campaign, in order to evade violation of the Corrupt Practice Act, the said State

Central Committee, representing the Republican party, reported the handling of no more funds than were allowed by law, but the activities of the campaign were conducted by other committees and bureaus, one of which was headed by Ray P. Chase, Deputy State Auditor, one by R. B. Rathbun, now Superintendent of Banks, one by O. H. Griggs, who was in charge of speakers, one by an attorney by the name Lundquist who organized Clubs and other committees, performing similar duties, and that all of said committees had the same object in view, to-wit: the election of the Republican State ticket and Mr. Rathbun testified he was informed by Mr. Adams of a proffer of contributions collected by J. H. Shoonmaker, custodian of the Capitol Building, of something less than one thousand, which Mr. Shoonmaker had collected from employees under him, which Mr. Adams could not accept because he was nearing the limit allowed by law, and that he, said Rathbin, requested the funds for his committee in charge of speakers.

The evidence further shows that in the conduct of the 1920 campaign, as well as the 1922 campaign, a large portion of the funds collected for the Republican State Central Committee, came from employees of the various departments of the state government, and that a large number of employees were used in the conduct of the campaign by the said State Central Committee and other volunteer committees and that while they were campaigning they drew their salaries as such state employees and that among those were W. N. Brown of the Secretary of States Office, Jennie Yerke of the same office, Charles R. Adams, Secretary to the Governor, B. L. Kingsley, Bonus Board, and the Fire Marshal's Office, Otto Diercks, Superintendent State Timber Department, John T. Craig, Auditor's Office, Ray P. Chase, Deputy State Auditor, J. H. Kaisersatt, Chief of Accounts, State Auditor's Office, and various other state employees.

The evidence further shows that J. F. Gould, Secretary of the Republican State Central Committee, was advanced to the position of Major drawing a salary of $404 per month, in the Adjutant General's Office, about the time he assumed the duties of Secretary to said committee in 1922, and from that time on he devoted practically all his time as secretary of the committee, drawing his salary from the State. In connection with the testimony of said Gould it appears that from seven to ten men, including the said Major Gould, traveled about this state on what was termed "secret service work"; that these men were furnished by the Adjutant General's Department and traveled over the state at the suggestion and upon the request of Governor J. A. O. Preus, and that the said Gould visited nearly all portions of the state on such "secret service" missions while he was acting as Secretary to the Republican State Central Committee in 1922, but that the nature of such "secret service" work was not divulged to the Committee; that the Adjutant General sent out men on "secret service" work upon request of the Governor and that seven to ten men were out during the summer and fall of 1922.

Further, the evidence shows that B. L. Kingsley acted as

chauffeur for the Governor and for Ray P. Chase and Lieutenant Governor Collins in the campaign of 1922, and that Otto Diercks acted as advance man for the Governor, and that during said time both were employees of the State and receiving their salaries as such, the one in the Fire Marshal's office and the other in the State Timber Department.

The evidence further shows that state employees were out speaking during the campaign of 1920 and 1922, and while out speaking were paid their regular salaries.

The evidence further shows that employees were assessed in at least one department and the contributions made by the various employees of several other departments were such as to clearly indicate that there was a systematic understanding or collection, or contribution, from said employees according to the amount of salary received by such employees and that such system prevailed in the office of the Railroad and Warehouse Commission, Adjutant General's Department, State Auditor's Office, Secretary of State's Department, State Treasurer's Office,
Public Examiner's Office,
Banking Department,
Custodian's Department,
Agricultural Department,
Fire Marshal's Office,
Securities Commission,
Insurance Department,
Oil Inspection,

Dairy and Food Department, and in practically every other department connected with the administration of the state's business except possibly the State Forestry Department.

The undersigned further find that the committee has made unable to examine witnesses connected with the state departments or to examine into the records of the various state departments to ascertain the truth or falsity of many of the charges that are commonly heard relative to the practices referred to in the resolution under which the committee was appointed and that to thoroughly investigate the said practices, together with other matters referred to in the resolution, it would be necessary to examine a great many men in St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth, and other portions of the State, not yet examined, and go into and carefully examine the books, records, vouchers and accounts of various banks, where records of the various political committees were kept and to examine various books, records, vouchers and other transactions in the office of the State Auditor; that the reason these examinations were not made by the Committee were first because of the waste of so much time prior to the beginning of the examination of witnesses and second the limited time left within which the committee has to perform its labors; that in order to get the evidence of the expenditures of the 1920 campaign nearly all of the time of the committee was required, and that in order to complete its examination, the said committee should be continued during the interim between this session of the Legislature and the next session thereof.

The undersigned members further find that other agencies including the Nonpartisan League, Farmer-Labor party, Democratic party, Working People's Nonpartisan Political League, Sanity League and other political agencies might well and ought to be investigated by this committee in order that this committee might intelligently recommend to the next Legislaure proper legislation that will correct the evils that have been going on in this state and that have enabled the money powers to control elections and through elections, legislation and other governmental activities.

As conclusions from the evidence and from the conduct of the investigation, the undersigned members of the committee find that the Corrupt Practice Act of this State has been disregarded and evaded and that such evasion has been accomplished by the organization of numerous committees outside of the principal committee organization and it is clear that such numerous volunteer committees and bureaus were formed for the purpose of evading the State Corrupt Practices Act and to enable the said political parties to carry on a political campaign using money far in excess of that allowed by law.

That in the organization of the business men of St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth, and in the collection of a huge sum of money, the said business men were not entirely actuated with a desire to advance the interests of their country and state, but were using a means to expend money that would bring about the election of the party ticket favorable to such business interests and that in so doing they adopted the Sound Government Association to cover up and camouflage the expenditure of sums of money that ought not to be allowed to be expended in the conduct of any kind of a campaign, be it "educational" or otherwise, while a partisan election was in progress and in which the people of this state were taking part in the selection of their public servants; and if such practices are continued and are permitted by law, the moneyed interests of this state will be able to continue to control elections and to swerve the minds of the electorate and to becloud the real issue.

The Corrupt Practices Act of this state should be so amended as to bring within its provisions all political committees and other agencies that take part in campaigns and so that all receipts and expenditures of such political parties should be made a complete and detailed public record and in such detail as to enable the public at all times to know who furnishes the campaign funds, who distributes them and for what purposes they are expended.

The practice of using state employees for the conduct of the campaign of any political party or any state servant should be regulated by law and should be prohibited. The taxpayers of this state are not paying, and do not want to pay, directly or indirectly, the campaign expenses of any political party or of any political candidate.

Contributions by state employees should be discontinued and such laws should be enacted and enforced as will stop the practice of collecting money from state employees for the purpose of electing heads of departments on any state

ticket. These employees are paid by all of the taxpayers of the state and the salaries paid to these elective officers are sufficient to enable them to finance their own campaigns.

The undersigned recommend that this report be adopted, printed in the Journal of the Senate and that the transcript of the evidence taken in such investigation, together with all exhibits received in evidence be deposited in the Secretary of State's Office and made a permanent record thereof.

Respectfully submitted,
JAMES A. CARLEY,
HERMAN SCHMECHEL.

The minority report signed by Senator Morin simply emphasized certain finds of the Carley-Schmechel report.

I have perhaps given undue space to the work of this committee, but it forcibly illustrates a very deplorable tendency in our politics.

Certain very powerful special interests owe their power almost wholly to favorable statutes and favorable administration of those statutes.

Therefore their privileges depend upon the party in power to a very large extent.

The only remedy that I can see is to wipe out all special privilege and get back to the good old doctrine that government exists not to grant privileges but to protect rights—equal rights for all.

Hence they make strenuous efforts to keep the mass of voters divided, quarreling among themselves; so, that they can retain the political power that enables them to hold their law-created privileges and monopolies, out of which they reap their enormous unearned gains; and it is just these unearned gains that are the bases of their power.

The real line of cleavage is not between so called "capital and labor," but between those who enjoy law created privileges on the one hand and those who do useful work—perform useful service—on the other.

To be specific; on the one hand are: First, The powerful city landlords, who grow rich out of the unearned increment due to the city's growth; Second, Those who control and exploit our great natural resources of coal and all other mineral wealth, including oil. Here is a powerful class of monopolists who are able to place the whole people under tribute. Third, The monopolizers of farm lands and wild lands fit for farms, who have been making themselves rich because of the low taxes they have had to pay, compared with the burden placed on the working farmer. Fourth, vacant lot speculators who are able, because of our unjust tax laws, to shift a large part of their burdens upon the homes and industries of the people.

These are the very small privileged class, and they would soon be deprived of their unjust advantages were it not for the fact that they are able to keep their victims divided.

Who are these victims?

All the laborers, mechanics, farmers, merchants, manufacturers, most professional men—in short all who do useful work of hand or brain or both.

GUARANTEEING BANK DEPOSITS

Several states have adopted a system for the guaranty of bank deposits; among them Oklahoma, Kansas, South Dakota, North Dakota, Washington, and Nebraska.

The excessive deflation of the farmers in recent years has put a very heavy strain on country banks and many of them have been forced to suspend, causing great loss to depositors.

In Oklahoma and North Dakota the guaranty fund had been exhausted and the system seems to have broken down; but in South Dakota the banking department reported that the system was still working and all depositors would be fully protected.

The Committee on Banking had reported out all guaranty bills for indefinite postponement, Wednesday, March 7th.

Welch and Wilkinson, authors of the two bills, made powerful pleas to rescue one of the bills from defeat, but their pleas were unsuccessful.

Speeches against the bills were made by J. N. Jacobson, Quinn, Dahle, McKnight and Rhone, while Iverson, E. Swenson, and Enstrom aided in the defense.

The debate continued all the afternoon and resulted in the defeat of all the bills.

The crucial roll call was on a motion by Welch to print H. F. 3 and place it on general orders.

Those who voted in the affirmative were, 55:

Anderson, A.,	Flahaven,	Lang,	Skaiem,
Anderson, G.A.,	Geister,	Larson,	Spelbrink,
Benson,	Green,	Mauritz,	Spindler,
Berg,	Herried,	Moen,	Spooner,
Bernard,	Horton,	Nellermoe,	Starkey,
Blum,	Howard,	Nelson,	Stein,
Bowers,	Hurlburt, D.,	Neuman,	Stockwell,
Davis, C. R.,	Iverson,	Odegard,	Swenson, E.,
Davis, R.,	Johnshoy,	Olson,	Thorkelson,
Day,	Kempfer,	Peterson, C.A.,	Trovatten,
Dilley,	Kinneberg,	Peterson, L.,	Walworth,
Enstrom,	Kleffman,	Pratt,	Welch,
Farmer,	Kramer,	Salmonson,	Wilkinson.
Finstuen,	Lagerstedt,	Samec,	

Those who voted in the negative were, 64:

Barnes,	Fisk,	Johnson, J. A.,	McNelly,
Bendixen,	Forestell,	Johnson, J. G.,	Merritt,
Christianson,	Gehan,	Knudsen,	Murphy,
Cole,	Girling,	Kolshorn,	Naylor,
Cullum,	Gislason,	Lewer,	Noonan,
Curtis,	Grandstrand,	Lightner,	Oren,
Dahle,	Hitchcock,	Lockhart,	Paige,
Darby,	Hompe,	Long, F. D.,	Pattison,
DeLury,	Hough,	Long, P. J.,	Pearson,
Duemke,	Hulbert, C. E.,	MacLean,	Quinn,
Emerson,	Jacobson, J.N.,	Masek,	Rodenberg,
Escher,	Jacobson, O.P.,	Mayman,	Rohne,
Fabel,	Johnson, E.,	McKnight,	Scallon,

Shonyo,	Sweitzer,	Teigen,	Therrien,
Smith,	Swenson, O.A.,	Thomas,	Veigel,
Strandemo,	Taylor,	Thompson,	Waldal.

The state already controls the banks.

It would therefore seem that it would not be any great violation of established principles to require them to provide a common fund to insure depositors against loss.

The only objection yet raised that seems to have any considerable force is that such a system tends to encourage lax banking methods and management, and would tax the strong and efficient banks to protect the weak and inefficient.

If the banks themselves could get together into a co-operative association to encourage safe and careful banking and protect all depositors, it would be the ideal solution of this problem, and would probably be a safer system of guaranty than any compulsory governmental regulation could offer.

Banks refusing or neglecting to join would have hard work to secure deposits.

Perhaps the safety of depositors could be secured by requiring all banks to be bonded to an extent sufficient to cover any possible loss to depositors.

Why not?

Would this be any worse meddling with private business, than the present laws regulating banks and banking.

And then the bonding companies would refuse to bond unsafe banks.

Why isn't this a simpler and safer way than compulsory guaranty under state regulation?

But wouldn't this give the bonding companies a chance to hold up the banks for excessive charges for bonding?

IN THE SENATE

In spite of the fact that the House had killed all the guaranty bills, Senator Lund attempted to save the Senate bill, H. F. 129.

The Committee on Banks and Banking had reported the bill for indefinite postponement on March 14th.

Lund and Sletten had a minority report recommending that the bill do pass.

After considerable discussion in which Rosenmeier, Chairman of the Committee, took strong ground against the bill, the minority report was defeated by a vote of 19 to 45.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Diesen,	Landby,	Nordlin,
Bonniwell,	Hausler,	Lee,	Pederson,
Bridgeman,	Jackson,	Lund,	Solberg,
Buckler,	Johnson,	Morin,	Wahlund.
Devold,	Kelson,	Nelson, J. W.,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Carley,	Fickling,	Illsley,
Ahles,	Cashel,	Frisch,	Just,
Bessette,	Child,	Furlow,	Larson,
Boylan,	Cliff,	Gemmill,	Lennon,
Brooks,	Denegre,	Gillam,	MacKenzie,
Cameron,	Dwyer,	Haagenson,	Madigan,

Millett,	Ribenack,	Sorenson,	Thwing,
Nelson, W.,	Rockne,	Stevens,	Turnham,
Orr,	Romberg,	Sullivan, G. H.,	Zamboni.
Peterson, E.P.,	Rosenmeier,	Sullivan, J. D.,	
Peterson, N.,	Schmechel,	Sweet,	
Putnam,	Serline,	Thoe,	

Three did not vote, Conroy, Hansen, Sletten, all excused.

The following sums up the objects raised by the opponents.

1. National banks cannot be forced to come in.

2. Efficient banks must be burdened for the support of the lax and careless.

3. Nearly one-third of the small banks are in such a shakey condition that they could not qualify and would be forced to suspend.

On the other hand, in any and all insurance the careful and efficient are burdened to protect the reckless, the inefficient and even the criminal, but life and fire insurance are voluntary, while this is compulsory.

IN CONCLUSION

The fact that there were so many new members in each branch of the legislature—40 in the Senate, 73 in the House—is reason enough for the failure of many important measures.

It took longer than usual for members to get their bearings; but when they once got hold of things, rapid progress was made.

Perhaps no legislature in many years has contained a larger number of honest, earnest members, sincerely devoted to the public welfare.

Perhaps no legislature has more faithfully stood out against all attempts to limit personal rights and constitutional liberties, and there were many such attempts.

There was quite complete failure to protect our great natural water resources; but nothing was done to jeopardize what remains still in the ownership of the people. Much in the way of conservation is yet to be done, and must be handled by future legislatures.

Nothing was done to consolidate boards and commissions and eliminate useless employes of the state; but much was done in the direction of a better and more rational tax system, both in good measures enacted and bad proposals killed; and this must be the foundation of all real improvement.

The state government should be simplified; useless boards and commissions abolished; senseless meddling ended; personal rights and liberties restored, and government confined more strictly to its essential duties of guaranteeing equal rights to its citizens and then leaving them free to work out their own affairs in their own way; less state meddling in local affairs. More "pay as you go" and less bonded indebtedness. More old-fashioned independence and less espionage. More protection of fundamental rights and less benevolent meddling.

These should be our aims.

SENATORS	To Investigate the Regents P. 77	For Capital Punishment P. 44	To Tax Ore Royalties P. 49	Labor: Full Crew Bill P. 69	Labor: Car Shed Bill P. 72	Dry Enforcem't: To Send to Judiciary Com. P. 83	Dry Enforcem't: Cut Out Com. Amendment P. 84	Dry Enforcem't: Final Passage P. 85	State Police In Road Law P. 37	To Prohibit Suits vs. Foreign Rys. P. 40	Small Loan Bill P. 24	Prize Fights for All Cities Feb. 16	Carley Wins for Instructions P. 97	For $20,000,000 Road Bonds P. 90
Adams	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Ahles	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Arens	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Bessette	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bonniwell	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Boylan	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bridgeman	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y
Brooks	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Buckler	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Cameron	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Carley	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Cashel	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	N
Child	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N	N	Y
Cliff	N	Y									N	N		
Conroy	N	Y					N	N			Y	Y		
Denegre	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Devold	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Diesen	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dwyer	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fickling	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Frisch	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Furlow	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Gemmill	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Gillam	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Haagenson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Hansen	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Hausler	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Illsley	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Jackson	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Johnson	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Just	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Kelson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Landby	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Larson	Y	N	N	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Lee	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Lennon	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y	N	Y
Lund	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
MacKenzie	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Madigan	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Millett	N	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y			N	Y	Y	N
Morin	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nelson, W.	N	Y		N	N						N	N	N	
Nelson, J. W.	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Nordlin	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Orr	Y	N	Y	N		N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pederson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Peterson, E. P.	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Peterson, N.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Putnam	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N
Ribenack		N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	N		Y	Y
Rockne	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y			Y		N	N
Romberg	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y
Rosenmeier	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N		Y	N	Y
Schmechel	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	N
Serline	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Sletten	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		N
Solberg	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Sorenson	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	N
Stevens	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y		N	Y
Sullivan, G. H.	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	N	N	N	Y
Sullivan, J. D.	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
Sweet	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Thoe	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	N
Thwing	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Turnham	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Wahlund	Y	N	Y	N			N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Zamboni	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	N	N		N	Y	Y

HOUSE MEMBERS	For Pre-Session Expenses P. 15	The Small Loan Bill P. 21	To Kill Woman's Rights Bill P. 30	Rights of Univ. Professors P. 39	To Limit Habeas Corpus P. 43	To Deny Separate Trial P. 43	To Repeal Indeterminate Sentence P. 45	10% Royalty Tax P. 50	To Repeal Tax Limitation Law P. 55	State Owned Elevators P. 65	The Car Shed Bill P. 72	For Part Time Schools P. 75	For a State Cement Plant P. 92	To Kill $20,000,000 Road Bonds P. 91	Prohibition Enforcement P. 82
Anderson, A...	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Anderson, G.A.	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Anderson, S.P.	N			Y	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Barnes	N		N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bendixen	Y		N	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Benson	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Berg	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Bernard	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y
Blum		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Bowers	N	N		Y	N	N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Cain	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Christianson	Y	N		N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N		Y
Cole	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y	Y
Cullum	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y
Curtis	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Dahle	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Darby	Y	Y	Y	Y					N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Davis, C. R...	N	Y	Y	Y				Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Davis, R.	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Day	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Deans	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
DeLury	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Dilley	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Duemke	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Emerson	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Enstrom	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Escher	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Fabel		Y	Y	N	N			N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Farmer		N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N		Y	N
Finstuen	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Fisk		Y	Y	N		N			Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y
Flahaven	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	N
Forestell	Y	Y	Y	N	Y			N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Fowler	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Gehan	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y	Y		Y		N	N
Geister	N	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Girling	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Gislason	Y	N	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grandstand	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N		Y	Y
Green		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Haugland	Y	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Herried		Y		Y		Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y		N	Y
Hitchcock	Y	Y	N	N				N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Hompe	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Horton		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	N		Y	N	Y
Hough	Y	Y		N		Y			N	N	N	Y		Y	Y
Howard	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
Hulbert, C. E.	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Hurlburt, D...	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Iverson	Y	N	N	Y	N		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Jacobson, J. N.	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Jacobson, O.P.		N	Y	N				N	N		N	Y	N	N	N
Johnshoy	N	N	Y	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Johnson, E.		Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Johnson, J. A.	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	N	N		N	Y
Johnson, J. G.		N	Y	Y		Y	N		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Kelly	Y	N		N				N		Y				Y	
Kempfer	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Kinneberg	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N
Kleffman	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Knudson	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Kramer	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Kolshorn	Y	N		N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lagerstedt	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Lammers	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Lang	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	N

HOUSE MEMBERS	For Pre-Session Expenses P. 15	The Small Loan Bill P. 21	To Kill Woman's Rights Bill P. 30	Rights of Univ. Professors P. 39	To Limit Habeas Corpus P. 43	To Deny Separate Trial P. 43	To Repeal Indeterminate Sentence P. 45	10% Ore Royalty Tax P. 51	To Repeal Tax Limitation Law P. 55	State Owned Elevators P. 65	The Car Shed Bill P. 72	For Part Time Schools P. 75	For State Cement Plant P. 92	To Kill $20,000,000 Road Bonds P. 91	Prohibition Enforcement P. 82
Larson		N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Lewer	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Lightner	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Lockhart	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y
Long, F. D.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y
Long, P. J.	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
MacLean	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Masek	Y	Y			N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Mauritz	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Mayman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
McKnight	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
McNelly	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Merritt	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Moen	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Murphy	Y	Y			N	N		N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Naylor	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Nellermoe	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Nelson	N		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Neuman		N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y
Nimocks	Y	Y		N				N	N	N				N	N
Noonan	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Norton	Y	Y		N				N				Y		N	Y
Odegard	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y
Olson	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Oren	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y
Paige	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N			Y	Y	Y	Y
Pattison	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y		N	N
Pearson	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Peterson, C. A.	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Peterson, L.	N	N		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Pratt	N	Y		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Quinn	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
Rodenberg	Y	Y		N	N		N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Rohne	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	N	Y
Salmonson	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Samec	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Scallon	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Shonyo		N		N		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Skaiem	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Smith	Y	N	Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Spelbrink	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N			N
Spindler	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Spooner	N	N		Y	N	N		Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y
Starkey	N	N		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N
Stein	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	N
Stevens	Y	N	N	N			N		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Stockwell	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Strandemo	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sweitzer	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Swenson, E		N		Y	N	N				Y	Y	N		Y	N
Swenson, O. A.	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Taylor	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Teigen	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Thomas	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		Y		N	N
Thompson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Therrien	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Thorkelson	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Trovaten	N		N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y
Viegel	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			N	N	Y	Y		Y	N	Y
Waldal		Y	Y	Y	N	N				Y		N	N	Y	N
Walworth		Y			N	N	N		Y	Y			Y	Y	N
Washburn	Y	Y	N			N	N	N			N		Y	Y	Y
Welch	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Wilkinson		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N			N	N	Y	Y	N
Mr. Speaker		Y	Y		N	Y	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y		Y