

# The Minnesota Legislature of 1921

BY



LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY  
STATE OF MINNESOTA  
C. J. BUELL

Author of

"The Minnesota Legislature of 1913"

"The Minnesota Legislature of 1915"

"The Minnesota Legislature of 1917"

"The Minnesota Legislature of 1919"

"The Currency Question"

"Monopolies and Trusts"

READ THE CHAPTER ON TAXATION ON PAGE 51

---

This Book is not Copyrighted  
Quote as Much as you Please  
But Give Credit.





W. I. NOLAN, Speaker of House.



LOUIS L. COLLINS, Lieutenant Governor.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword and the Author's Point of View.....	5- 6
CHAPTER I	
A General Survey .....	7-11
CHAPTER II	
Are We Drifting into "Prussianism"?.....	12-15
The State Police Bill.....	15-18
The Alien Registration Bill.....	19-21
The Craze for Regulation.....	22
CHAPTER III	
The Farmer and His Problems.....	24-25
The Farmer's Legislative Program .....	25
CHAPTER IV	
The Laborer and His Problems .....	29
Workman's Insurance .....	30-34
Thrifless Maryland .....	34
CHAPTER V	
The City—Home Rule—Local Self Government.....	36
The Sullivan Street Railway Bill.....	36
Mr. Lowry's Appeal for the Brooks Coleman Bill.....	38
The Daily News Editorial .....	39-40
Propaganda for Street Railway Bill.....	43
Norton to the Rescue.....	45-46
No Public Service Corporations.....	48
Municipal Lighting Growing Steadily.....	49
Advantages of Publicly Owned Street Railways.....	50
CHAPTER VI	
Taxation .....	51
The Ability Theory .....	51
The Measure of the Benefits of Government.....	52
The First Victory Over the Iron Land Owners.....	53-56
The Fight for a "Tonnage Tax".....	56
The Johnson Veto .....	56
The Net Value Idea .....	57
The Burnquist Veto .....	58
Six Iron Ore Tax Bills.....	59
The House Tax Committee .....	60-63
The Senate Tax Committee .....	63
Carley's Great Speech.....	64
Clamping the Lid on the Range Towns.....	66-69
Warner's Constitutional Amendment.....	70
The Word "Occupational" and Its Effect.....	71-73
The Royalty Tax—Effects of Its Defeat.....	73-76
Income Tax Amendment .....	77
CHAPTER VII	
Election Laws .....	79
The Benson Bill, S. F. 7.....	79
The Convention Bill .....	81
The Gjerset Party Bill.....	85
CHAPTER VIII	
Prohibition Enforcement .....	87
Delly's 4 Per Cent Beer Amendment.....	88
The Real Remedy, Education, Enlightenment.....	89
CHAPTER IX	
Road Legislation .....	91
The Haugland Jacobson Amendment .....	91
The Christianson Amendment .....	92
McGarry's Attempt to Amend.....	92
CHAPTER X	
Guaranty of Bank Deposits.....	94
The Voluntary System .....	95
The Compulsory System .....	96
CHAPTER XI	
Some Suggestive Sidelights .....	97
Oil and the Civil Service.....	97
Legislators and Their Pay.....	98
The Nimocks Free Pass Bill.....	98
The Nimocks Pay Increase Bill.....	99
The Prize Fight Bill .....	100
Hibbing, Chisholm, and Mr. Kleffman.....	102
"Growing the Hoodlum" Burbank.....	102
Nimocks and His Bent .....	105
Amending the Eight Hour Law .....	107
Rodenberg's Sheriffs' Pay Bill .....	107

# FOREWORD

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

Like all its predecessors, its publication is made possible only thru 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.

To both of these classes of critics the author has replied: "It is the intent of the author to give a fair and impartial analysis of important bills, stating the arguments both for and against, so far as may be, in the language of those who favor or oppose. At the same time he must reserve to himself the right to express his opinion as regards the wisdom of measures proposed or enacted.

The author is not willing to present a colorless array of facts, neither is it his intention to judge the motives of men; but he does intend to discuss the MERITS OF MEASURES and explain what seems to be the logical results of the acts of members.

## THE AUTHOR'S POINT OF VIEW.

And the author desires to declare frankly that he approaches this work from a definite point of view. That point of view was very clearly set forth at the beginning of Chapter I of "the Minnesota Legislature of 1919" in the following words:

"This book is an earnest attempt to discuss public questions from the point of view of **Democracy and Americanism**.

Democracy and Americanism must follow the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

If they do not mean that all men, and women, too, are born **free**, and **equal** as to political rights and industrial opportunities, then they do not mean anything.

If Democracy and Americanism do not mean the opposite of Autocracy, privilege and favoritism, tyranny, militarism and repression, then they have no meaning.

Democracy and Americanism must mean free thought, free speech, freedom to assemble and discuss any and all questions. Otherwise they are meaningless terms and only a mockery on the lips of those who pronounce them.

Any proposed legislation that cannot square itself with these principles should be rejected, unless it can be shown that it is a step in the direction of greater democracy, though not reaching the complete ideal.



### The Acid Test.

The acid test of all proposed legislation should be:  
Does it lead away from injustice and toward greater justice?

Does it remove restriction and lead toward liberty?

Does it tend to establish a higher degree of political rights and industrial opportunities?

Does it increase opportunities for open and honest expression on all questions, or does it close the door and limit freedom of thought and speech?

Does it tend to preserve and extend the principle of home rule and local self-government, or does it destroy that principle?

Does it more equally distribute the common burdens in proportion to benefits received, or does it place burdens upon those who can and will shift them onto other and weaker shoulders—onto shoulders already bowed with too great a load?

Does it tend to remove the cause of dissatisfaction and unrest, or does it propose to crush and suppress the symptoms that arise from injustice?"

### Prevention Better Than Punishment.

You can't make men good by hanging them.

You can't stop crime by locking criminals up. History is full of the failure of mere punishment to prevent crime.

Picking pockets was once punishable by death; and the historians tell us how the thugs plied their trade in the very crowds that were witnessing the hanging of pick pockets.

On the other hand when Edward III wished to get rid of highway robbers, he had the underbrush cleared away for 100 feet on each side of the road.

Brilliantly lighted city streets are far more effective than hordes of policemen.

The Iowa law which makes it practically impossible for the automobile thief to sell the machine, goes farther to prevent that sort of thieving than all the penal statutes that could be passed, and if all the states were to adopt that law, there would be very little inducement to steal automobiles; for they couldn't be sold.

Are you curious to know what the Iowa law is? It is very simple, based on the principle of the traveler's check. Every automobile is required to carry a small card, properly protected, containing the number of the license, the engine number, make, model, year, factory number, style, times registered, fee paid, new or second hand, date of registration, license number, name of owner and P. O. address, countersigned by Secretary of State and County Officer.

The above should give to all readers a fairly clear idea as to the AUTHOR'S POINT OF VIEW.

Let us then proceed to a consideration of what was proposed and what was done in the legislative session of 1921.

# The Minnesota Legislature of 1921

## CHAPTER I.

### A GENERAL SURVEY.

The legislature of 1921 was a great disappointment and a great satisfaction,—a disappointment to both extremes,—the extreme radical and the extreme reactionary,—and a satisfaction to reasonable people who do not expect to reform all evils at one session, but are thankful for even small progress; for on the stepping stones of today's progress we can rise to greater things tomorrow.

Many progressives are frankly disappointed at the small progress toward reforming our infernally bad system of taxation, while a bunch of reactionaries are declaring that the legislature ripped out the very foundations of all sound theories of taxation and opened a Pandora's Box of new and crazy notions.

The principle of home rule and local self government was pretty badly jolted by the Street Railway Bill, and the limit put on the local expenditures of the range towns; but not nearly so badly as the authors of those bills started out to do.

Repression and "Prussianism" ran rampant in a number of measures which did not pass, while the benevolent regulators of everybody else's business got very little satisfaction compared with what they went after.

Perhaps reasonable people should be thankful for the good done and evil avoided, rather than to bewail the evil done and the good destroyed.

All told it confirms Einstein's theory of relativity.

#### **The Membership.**

The Senate was composed of the same men who sat in 1919.

#### **The House Members.**

Of the 131 members of the house, 81 were members in 1919, four had served one or more terms in former sessions, and 46 were new men with no previous experience. Thirty-one of the members of the 1919 legislature were not candidates again; one filed again, but died before the election, while 17 were defeated for re-election.

If the author may be permitted to express an opinion he thinks that several of the new men are a great improvement over some who did not contest and some who were defeated.

For honesty, earnestness and general intelligence the house of 1921 will probably take as high rank as any of its predecessors of recent years, in spite of the fact that narrowness and partisanship did sometimes appear. This is due to a number of causes:

First, the liquor question is out of the way. That has helped more than any other one thing. Men who have represented wet districts for several sessions now frankly say, "It is much easier for us to be decent than it used to be."

Second, the last few years have witnessed a wider diffusion of general intelligence on industrial and economic questions, especially among the farmers, tho this improvement shows itself noticeably everywhere. The automobile has helped very much in rural districts in the spread of general knowledge on all subjects. There is far more social life of all kinds than formerly. Public education has been extended both thru the schools and thru farmers' clubs, farm bureaus, and co-operative associations. The Non-Partisan League movement has profoundly stirred thousands of rural communities and stimulated much thought, tho it must be admitted it has also aroused much prejudice on both sides.

Third. The labor movement of the cities has reached out and taken in a far broader field of study than of old, and this has shown itself in the character and intelligence of the men it has supported for legislative positions.

Fourth. The accomplishment of equal suffrage has injected an element of sincerity and enthusiasm far beyond anything noticeable in the past.

And last, but not least, the fact that the members are not elected as party men, has probably been as great a factor as any. The old custom of throwing a legislative nomination to some party hack who had been disappointed in securing a more lucrative office is now unknown.

It has been freely charged that the men who get into the legislature under this system are mostly not responsible to any party or any principles,—mere self seekers who put themselves forward, blow their own horns and thus succeed in getting themselves elected. While this is probably true in a few cases, it is very far from the truth in most cases. Most men who come to the legislature are widely known and highly respected in their own communities. Most of them are earnest, sincere, rather modest men, who have made a fair success in their occupations, professions, or business enterprises.

Of course, practically all are more or less loosely associated with one or another of the three great political divisions into which the people of the state are divided—Republicans, Democrats and Non-Partisans, including both the Farmer and Labor groups.

But very few of these members can be driven by a party whip tho that whip is still in evidence. This fact was very well illustrated by the vote in the Senate on the Coleman bill to abolish the civil service in the department of oil inspection. The author of the bill, Mr. Coleman, is a Republican leader and it was rather expected that he would be able to whip most of the senators of that party into line for his bill. But the senators had not been elected as Republicans, Democrats or anything else. The leaders for repeal were Coleman and Putnam, Republicans, and John Sullivan, Democrat; while the supporters of Civil Service were led by Carley, Democrat, strongly supported by Gandrud, Hamer, Gillam and Benson, Republicans, and Devold, who always proclaims himself a Socialist. Jackson and Sageng, also Republicans, were holding themselves in reserve to oppose the bill if it should get on the calendar.



On this issue senators endorsed by organized labor also split, and all but Devold and Swanson voted against Civil Service. All Non-Partisan League senators voted on the Civil Service side. Six democrats voted for Civil Service and six against.

The vote on many other important questions in both houses would be just as instructive, if carefully analyzed, showing that men take sides according to their knowledge, their principles (their ignorance or prejudice sometimes), but seldom according to their party affiliations in national politics.

Several of the most consistent Jeffersonian Democrats in both houses are Republican in party politics; while some of the worst Tories and reactionaries claim to be followers of the great and world renowned Democrat who wrote the Declaration of Independence.

And what possible relation can there be between national parties on the one hand and the economic, industrial, social, or moral questions that engage the attention of a state legislature?

Read the following quotation from a letter to the Tribune:

"In connection with the current discussions of the merits and demerits of the non-partisan method of electing a state Legislature, which now prevails in Minnesota, there has been much loose talk about the inferiority in character and ability of men elected by the present system as compared with men elected by the partisan system. I leave the general discussion of the subject to others, but on this particular matter of the personnel of legislatures past and present I have had exceptional opportunity to observe and upon the basis of such observation I can say unhesitatingly that the above claim is exactly contrary to the fact.—George B. Safford, Superintendent of Minnesota Anti-Saloon League.

Again it is common, in some quarters, to speak of the legislature as a bunch of crooks, grafters, and chumps; but the man who will take the trouble to make a study of the work in committee, to watch the discussion on the floor, and to really acquaint himself with the inside workings of the legislature of Minnesota, as now constituted and in operation, must conclude that there has been great improvement in the past fifteen or twenty years.

Of course there is still room for improvement, but there is every reason to believe that it will be forthcoming just as fast as the people themselves improve.

A stream can hardly rise higher than its source.

#### **The Speaker.**

Speaker Nolan came to the work of the session better equipped than two years ago, tho even then he was probably quite as efficient a speaker as ever wielded the gavel.

Business certainly does move under his direction and it is helped to no small degree by the clear and powerful voice of Reading Clerk Ryberg.

Oscar Arneson, thru all his years of service, has grown constantly more and more efficient as chief clerk.

### **The Committees.**

Speaker Nolan says he wrote each member asking him to express his preference as to committee assignments, and that he assigned as far as possible in conformity with those preferences.

There was some complaint that Non-Partisan League and Labor members did not receive fair consideration in the committee appointments. They had no representation on the following committees: Appropriations, Banks, Markets and Marketing, Military Affairs, Public Highways, and Rules; and only one member on Elections, Insurance and Public Utilities; all very important committees.

Of course they could not expect any representation on the Rules committee; and Mr. Nolan explains that there were so many members asking for places on those other committees named that he intentionally gave the appointments to the majority faction. Minorities never expect chairmanships and seldom fare very well any way.

Aside from these few committees the minority fared very well, their proportion on many committees being considerably larger than their membership in the house would justify. This is true of Cities, Commerce, Manufacturers and Retail Trade. Corporations, Dairy Products and Live Stock, General Legislation, Labor, Motor Vehicles, Municipal Affairs, Public Domain, Public Health and Hospitals, Public Welfare and Social Legislation, Railroads, Re-apportionment, Soldiers' Home and Bonus Act, State Development and Immigration, Temperance, Towns and Counties, University and Schools, and Workmen's Compensation.

The Non-Partisan League and Labor forces had almost exactly one-fourth of the members of the house and on all the above committees they had more than one-fourth of the representation; while on two committees—Corporations and Public Welfare and Social Legislation, they had a majority of the members.

It may be said that in a legislature elected on a basis of no party affiliation, there should be no such thing as majority or minority factions. There will always be factions. In 1915, 1917 and 1919, lines were plainly drawn between wets and drys. In 1915 the wets won the speakership and organized the house. In 1917 and 1919 the drys won and so controlled the organization. In 1919 the Non-Partisan League members refused to vote for the majority candidate for Speaker. In 1921 the League and Labor forces united and had their own candidate for Speaker. They felt that such action was necessary. This is a matter neither for praise nor blame, but they must then be satisfied with minority representation and they were. They did not complain.

It is no small job to put 131 members into committee places and have them all satisfied. On the whole members seemed to be well pleased with their appointments and all committees gave very earnest attention to bills assigned to them; tho certain individual members were lazy.

The Tax Committee was plainly designed to report favorably a progressive program of tax reform and they did so to some extent, but not nearly so much as some hoped for.

The Committee on Elections was evidently filled with members who were expected to carry out the Republican program of greatly amending the primary law, but, as the session progressed, the demand from the people to let the primary alone became so strong that the committee concluded not to do much "ripping of the primary."

On the whole there was good teamwork. Of course, prejudice and partisanship cropped out here and there, but for the most part there was earnestness and harmony, thoughtfulness and independence.

There were, however, a few notable exceptions; Nellermoe's attempt to amend the bonus law raised a great ruction, but when the bill came back from the conference committee with fully half of Nellermoe's proposed change put into the bill by the conservative senate, it passed without a word of disapproval.

Nellermoe had tried to make the Minnesota bonus law conform to the provisions of the proposed federal law which passed the House but failed in the Senate. This federal law would give the bonus to all who served faithfully and were honorably discharged; regardless of the fact that, at first, they might have objected for conscientious reasons or on the ground of alienage.

Child would deny a bonus to any "conscientious objector," even to Sergeant York who later won more medals for bravery at the front than any other soldier, while Christianson would refuse a bonus to anyone who claimed exemption on the ground of alienage.

The Senate amendments had taken care of the "aliens," but Sergeant York would still be left out in the cold if he were a citizen of Minnesota instead of Tennessee.

Chairman Hompe, an old civil war veteran, and Cullum of Duluth protested, but in vain.

Welch's attempt to criticise the federal railway law was perhaps somewhat lacking in polish and refinement, and the house worked itself up into quite a fury over it; but almost the same criticism, embodied in another resolution, coming from another source, slipped through very smoothly.

The Star and the Daily News both declared that house members had been unduly influenced in the case of the street railway bill, and both charged attempts at corruption. The Star was solemnly investigated, but no one thought of calling the News on the carpet.

Certain members, representing unpopular ideas and theories of government, had to be very careful or they would be called down by certain other members who were very sure that their own ideas and theories were much more correct and respectable.

But these were only little ripples on the calm surface of things legislative, and served to add variety and spice to what might otherwise have been a little dull.

It is the calm pool that stinks and breeds malaria, while the dashing stream gives us pure and sparkling water.

## CHAPTER II.

## ARE WE DRIFTING INTO PRUSSIANISM?

"Those who deny liberty to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."—Abraham Lincoln.

"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."—Benjamin Franklin.

When De Tocqueville visited the United States in the first half of the last century, and, as a result of his observations, published his famous work, "Democracy in America," he described a race of people strong, powerful, independent, self reliant,—a people who did things for themselves,—a people who organized themselves into societies and groups for the purpose of bringing about results, and scorned to whine at the feet of government or ask public aid,—a people jealous of their personal rights and liberties who governed their lives by the rules of common sense,—a people who refused to permit the meddlesome interference of public officials.

Their churches were free religious institutions, in no way subsidized from the public treasury; their schools were their own, organized and supported by the localities they served, unhampered and unhindered by regulations from above; they needed few policemen, for each man largely governed himself by the law of equal freedom and recognized the right of his fellows to do the same; the natural resources of the country were abundant and free, so that none need long remain the servant or hired man of another. It is true, our forefathers of one hundred years ago were crude and unpolished, but there was an equality of opportunity that made for equality in all things else. Your hired farm hand of today was likely to be your neighboring farm owner of tomorrow. The workman in your shop was sure to own a shop of his own in a few years. Yes, the land was free, and we used to sing, "Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm."

Then came the Civil War with its enormous cost and indebtedness, and the crushing burden of taxation that followed.

Privilege began to create millionaires and the poor to multiply.

The people were poor because the privileged were rich.

More and more the free lands fell into the possession of the few.

More and more the sturdy, independent farmers left the plow and began to flock to the cities.

Farming had ceased to be the best paid occupation and was rapidly becoming the poorest.

At the same time our vast forests and our limitless deposits of iron, coal and other minerals were becoming the private property of fewer and fewer holders, while Rockefeller was getting possession of the oil.

Our cities were growing rapidly and creating a class of urban landlords the equal of the Dukes and Earls of England.

Land was no longer free, and so the laborer had no outlet.

Wages declined in proportion to the cost of living, and strikes, lockouts and all sorts of labor troubles began to appear and disturb the peace of the nation.

Tho the underlying cause of all the trouble was plainly to be found in monopoly and privilege,—in our system of stupid and crushing taxation of the poor and the practical exemption of the rich,—in patent laws and currency contraction 'til a debt of a dollar, whether the debt were public or private, was more than twice as hard to pay,—in all these various forms of privilege, I say, was the patent cause of it all; and yet both masters and workmen were too blind to see what their feet stumbled over every moment of their lives.

Everybody knew that landlordism was the ruin of Ireland, but none could see that a more subtle and terrible landlordism was eating the heart out of America. So the workers began to plead for petty pieces of patchwork in the form of labor laws, and so the Congress at Washington and the state legislatures began to respond with a patch here and a salve there and a bandage somewhere else, while all the time the main cause of the trouble remained utterly untouched.

The poor put their children to work in the mills, the factories and the sweat shops, and wages, of course, declined.

Then arose the "saviors of society," properly berated the inhumanity of the parents, and demanded compulsory education to force the children back to school.

A few there were who pointed out that all fathers and mothers would naturally and eagerly desire to keep their children in school, if only they had the means; but they were laughed to scorn by the "saviors of society"; and here and there a hard hearted miser was pointed to in proof that parents were inhuman and the STATE must save the children.

Long hours and the speeding up process drove the workers to drink, and again the "saviours of society" thought to diminish the drink evil by charging tremendously high licenses for permission to run the rum shops where men were made drunkards.

Anything—anything but to restore the free land and equal opportunity and give the people a chance.

Anything—anything these "saviours of society" would gladly do except to get off the backs of the producers and let them be free to stand erect.

Sad as it may seem, the workers, too, were afraid to throw down their burdens and demand an equal chance, or were they simply ignorant and knew not how to unload their burdens and achieve their freedom?

A great English statesman once declared, "You can tax the last bite out of the poor man's mouth and the last rag from off his back and he will not know what is crushing him. He will simply complain of hard times and beg a dole from his more fortunate brother or from the state."

And so the producers begged more doles and each dole only added to their burdens, for it was by indirect taxation that the doles were paid for, and they were taxed two dollars for every dollar of dole they got.

The "saviours of society" established free libraries, and the laborers paid for them in higher taxation.

They established free medical clinics, and again the laborers paid.

The poor could not afford to marry as in the days of our grandfathers, and prostitution grew apace; the scarlet woman walked the streets and the brothel became a running sore on the body politic. Then the "saviours of society" looked upon the work they had done, but they knew not that it was the work of their own hands; so they lifted up their voices and wailed a long, loud wail. They cursed the poor for their vices, but knew not that it was themselves who had made them poor.

The idle rich and the unemployed poor go side by side forever, and the one is the cause of the other.

More patches and plasters, more salves and bandages, more legal restraints and legislative restrictions,—and the poor paid for it all in heavier taxation; but they knew not that they paid.

And then came the great war that killed and crippled millions of men—the strong young men of the world; and the workers got better wages. They became heady and insolent and now and then one wore silk shirts and high priced shoes; and so the Pharisees lifted up their hands in horror and their voices in wails of anguish at the extravagance of the workers; yea, verily, from their million dollar homes and their ten thousand dollar limousines they lifted up their voices and wailed about the extravagance of the workers.

But the day of the workers was brief. Their period of prosperity came to a sudden end. The bread line and the soup kitchen returned once more, and things began to look "normal" again.

And now the "saviours of society" find their old occupation restored. They can now plan more plasters and patches and bandages to bind up the wounds of the poor. They can devise more restrictions and meddlesome legislation, appoint more politicians to supervise the work, and levy more taxes; and the poor can pay the bills.

As a result of the war and lack of employment a wave of crime sweeps over the land, and wise (?) legislators propose to restore the death penalty, establish the electric chair, and lengthen prison sentences for "taking" an automobile **without the consent of the owner** and driving it **across a county line!!!**

The same wise (?) legislators propose to **prohibit** landlords from charging higher rents while they are busy increasing taxes on homes.

Having deprived the people of their right to freely use the earth,—having permitted a few monopolies to absorb and possess the natural resources of timber and coal, of iron and copper, and oil, of the lots of the city and the lands of the county, of the water power, the electricity and



the means of transportation,—having impoverished the masses by creating the millionaires, the State then steps in and increases its restrictions and regulations until it nearly reaches the "Prussian" ideal of a bureau of finger prints, a card index and police espionage for every man, woman and child from birth to death.

The writer of these words is not a pessimist. He has not drawn this gloomy picture because he loves darkness.

He is the strongest kind of an optimist. He points out these evils because he would rouse his readers to an other kind of activity.

Not by more laws,—not by more restrictions,—not by heavier penalties; but by more liberty, more opportunity, greater equality of environment, abolition of indirect tax burdens that crush the producer, destruction of land monopoly through laws that will absorb the speculative value, restoration to the people of the opportunity to freely co-operate to produce and exchange the good things of life.

TAX OUT THE MONOPOLISTS AND LET THE PEOPLE USE THE EARTH THAT NATURE GAVE EQUALLY TO ALL, and THE PEOPLE WILL TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES.

Did the legislature of 1921 do anything to hinder or to help?

Yes, some; much meddlesome and restrictive legislation was proposed, but little was passed.

Some real relief was accomplished.

Read on and learn for yourself.

#### **A State Safety Commissioner.**

Senator Nolan and Representative Wicker had introduced a bill creating a Commissioner of Public Safety and giving him very considerable powers over all peace officers in the entire state.

This bill was bitterly contested on the ground that it was the beginning of a state constabulary system, which is opposed by all organized labor; that it was a revival of the "Safety Commission" which was hostile to the Non-Partisan League and prohibited their meetings; that it would interfere with the police departments of the cities; and that it would furnish a soft job for politicians who would be of little or no service in running down and catching criminals.

The sponsors of the bill declared that crime had become a state wide matter, largely due to the automobile, and that a central power to co-ordinate all the police forces of the state had become necessary.

Of course, crime is largely the result of environment.

War is always followed by a crime wave. In war things are taken by force and with little regard to moral or legal right. After the war is over this same psychology continues, and the wave of crime sweeps over the country. If to this is added unemployment the wave will reach a higher level.

Arrests, punishment, prisons do little good. The prospective criminal doesn't intend to get caught. He selects the time and place for his robbery, and he takes good care that the police are not invited to be present. He expects to escape and usually does.

All the safety commissioners in the world can do very little to prevent crime.

Possibly they may help a little to catch criminals after the crime is committed.

Possibly not.

Opportunity for honest work at good pay will do more to diminish and finally eliminate crime and criminals than all the police ever employed or prisons ever built.

When it is easier to earn an honest living than to steal it, most people will stop stealing and go to work.

It will be cheaper and lots more fun, besides being conducive to neighborliness, good feeling and brotherly love.

At the end of the battle of the contending factions, the bill passed the senate, 41 to 22.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Fowler,	Lindsley,	Sullivan, G. H.
Anderson,	Gillam,	McGarry,	Sullivan, J. D.
Baldwin,	Gjerset,	Nolan,	Swanson,
Benson,	Gooding,	Orr,	Turnham,
Blomgren,	Guilford,	Palmer,	Van Hoven,
Brooks,	Hall,	Peterson,	Vibert,
Cliff,	Hegnes,	Putnam,	Ward,
Coleman,	Hopp,	Rask,	Widell.
Cosgrove,	Kingsbury,	Reed,	
Cumming,	Kuntz,	Ribenack,	
Denegre,	Larson,	Rockne,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bessette,	Conroy,	Johnson,	Sageng,
Bonniwell,	Devold,	Lee,	Schmechel,
Boylan,	Dwyer,	Loonam,	Stepan,
Callahan,	Erickson,	Millett,	Wold.
Carley,	Gandrud,	Naplin,	
Cashel,	Jackson,	Romberg,	

Three did not vote: Hamer, Handlan and Madigan. Hamer and Madigan were sick, Handlan was in the coat room a few minutes later.

After this bill had passed the senate, people began to give it more careful study.

The legislative subdivision of the St. Paul Association gave a special meeting entirely to its investigation, and voted unanimously to disapprove for the following reasons:

1. It empowers the Safety Commissioner to "super-vise and direct all public peace officers of the state." Chiefs of police and their forces, all sheriffs and their deputies, all local marshals and constables, would be obliged to obey all his orders. Local control would be destroyed.

2. In Section 3 it was declared to be the duty of "all public peace and prosecuting officers in the state" "to promptly comply with all directions of the State Public Safety Commissioner."

In the original bill these officers were compelled to comply with all "reasonable" directions, but on motion of Senator Rockne, the word reasonable was cut out.

3. If any peace or prosecuting officer "shall wilfully refuse or neglect to perform any official duty imposed by this act, he shall be guilty of malfeasance and nonfeas-

ance in office, shall be removed therefrom by the governor, \* \* \* shall be disqualified from holding the office during the remainder of the term, and shall forfeit not less than \$100 nor more than \$500."

4. This bill would set up an irresponsible despot in the state capitol who would have absolute and unlimited power throughout the entire state. As amended and passed by the senate his orders need not even be **reasonable**. They must be obeyed unquestioningly by every peace and prosecuting officer of the state.

5. If a state constabulary is objectionable this system would be infinitely worse. A state constabulary would be a comparatively small force with no control over local, city and town police, nor county sheriffs, nor prosecuting officers; but under this system all these would be absolutely controlled by this one man power at the center of government.

For these reasons the legislative subdivision of the St. Paul Association opposed the bill without a dissenting voice.

#### In the House.

In the house this bill came up on special order Saturday, April 9, and was debated at great length.

One after another, amendments were adopted until its own father would not have known it.

First, J. B. Pattison proposed a series of amendments that converted the bill into a mere **bureau** of criminal identification and detection.

These amendments were temporarily withdrawn to permit of a series of amendments by Mr. Washburn which seemed to strip the bill of every objectionable feature.

Child came to the support of Washburn with a most telling speech, and they won by a large majority over Wicker and Eaton, who tried to save the bill.

Pattison then secured an amendment prohibiting the bureau from interfering, in any way, in case of strike or other labor trouble.

Nellermoe then attempted to limit the head of the bureau to such as had at least ten years' experience in police or detective work.

Eaton declared that such limitation would be unconstitutional. "You can't limit the Governor in his power of appointment", and McPartlin made a long speech denouncing the amendment as an attempt to force the Governor to make the appointment out of the "sink hole of corruption that festers in the two big cities".

It was generally supposed that Nellermoe's object was just the reverse—to prevent the appointment of a certain chief of police whose experience was much less than ten years.

In the midst of this controversy Keller offered a further amendment to the effect that not only the chief but all his subordinates must have had at least 10 years of experience.

Both Nellermoe and Keller met defeat.

Sweitzer secured the passage of another change that still further stripped the bureau of power.

Moen now tried to reduce the compensation, to cut out the deputy, all subordinates except office force and most of the appropriation. He failed.

During the process of emasculation, Wicker made pleas to save the bill and declared he would move to indefinitely postpone if the force of the bill were so completely destroyed; but when the house had finished the job, he let the denatured bill go to a vote.

It was lost. 53 ayes, 61 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Briggs,	Green, F. A.,	Nollet,	Shanks,
Cameron,	Haugland,	Norby,	Sweitzer,
Child,	Hinds,	Nordgren,	Swenson, O. A.,
Christianson, T	Hompe,	Norton,	Taylor,
Conley,	Howard,	Oren,	Trowbridge,
Cullum,	Jacobson,	Parker,	Warner,
Curtis,	Kelly,	Pattison,	Washburn,
Dilley,	Levin,	Perry, T.,	Wicker,
Dorweiler,	Lightner,	Rako,	Wilkinson,
Eaton,	McGivern,	Risse,	Wright,
Enger,	McPartlin,	Rodenberg,	Mr. Speaker.
Gerlich,	Melbye,	Ross,	
Girling,	Neuman,	Selvig, .	
Grant,	Nimocks,	Serline,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Gislason, J. B.,	McLaughlin,	Spindler,
Baxter,	Goodspeed,	Miller,	Stahlke,
Bendixen,	Goodwin,	Miner,	Stein,
Bensen,	Gran,	Moen,	Strand,
Bernard,	Grove,	Murphy,	Swanstrom,
Brown,	Hemstad,	Nellermoe,	Swenson, C. J.,
Burdorf,	Hitchcock,	Nordlin,	Swenson, E.,
Carlson,	Hulbert,	O'Keefe,	Teigen,
Christensen, A	Johnson,	Olson, L. E.,	Thomas,
Cummings,	Keller,	Olson, Lars,	Thompson,
Day,	Kleffman,	Pedersen,	Thorkelson,
DeLury,	Kozlak,	Perry, J. T.,	Walworth,
Enstrom,	Lagersen,	Putnam,	Welch.
Flahaven,	Lauderdale,	Samec,	
Gartner,	Lennon,	Sluke,	
Gislason, C. M.,	Lockhart,	Spelbrink,	

### **ANOTHER ATTEMPT THAT FAILED.**

The greatest war in all history was fought "to make the world safe for democracy" and save civilization from "Prussianism".

It seems that both those terms—"democracy" and "Prussianism"—are not very clearly defined in the minds of some voters and some legislators.

Measures the most undemocratic—the most completely at variance with our Declaration of Independence—the most destructive of the principles of American liberty—the most tyrannical and oppressive—the most peculiarly "Prussian" in all that justly makes the word "Prussian" a stench in the nostrils of every real American democrat—such measures meet the thoughtless approval of thousands of supposedly intelligent American citizens, receive the favorable

support of a large section of the press, and are embodied in proposed statutes in every legislature in the country.

The Minnesota Legislature of 1921 received many such bills.

Greatly to its credit very few became law.

### **The Alien Registration Bill.**

One of the most glaring illustrations of the drift away from true democracy and Americanism, and toward "Prussianism" was the bill, introduced by John W. Olsen, of Minneapolis, himself born an "alien", House File 1007.

This bill required the registration of every alien in the state over 16 years of age. Every alien was required to carry his registration card with him at all times. If he moves from one locality to another he must get a transfer.

There was no specific provision that he must show his card at the door of churches and other public places, but it could readily be amended to remedy this defect.

### **SERIOUSLY.**

Why this insane fear and hatred of "aliens"?

Doesn't the alien come to us full grown and ready to earn his living and much more?

Is he not therefore less a burden upon our productive resources than are those other "aliens" who come to us by way of the "stork" from the land of the unborn?

And how long ago was it that our forefathers—even the proudest of us—came to this country as "aliens"?

How many people would there be in Minnesota today, had no "aliens" ever come?

How much civilization, wealth, culture, education, would we have but for the "aliens" and their descendants?

Isn't it a little presumptuous in us, as soon as we have got settled down and learned the language, so we can be fairly understood, to be questioning the motives of the next comers, harassing them with stupid requirements, and making it hard for them to become assimilated?

And what sort of feelings and emotions will be aroused in these "aliens" by such a system of espionage?

Will this kind of clubbing and harrowing make them love their adopted country more?

Wouldn't it be better to give the newcomer a welcome, clasp his hand and show real friendship, help him to learn our language and to understand our ideals as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights?

Wouldn't it be better to thank him for the value he has brought with him, his physical strength, his productive power, his love of liberty?

Wouldn't it be better to adopt the tolerance and kind feeling of General John J. Pershing when he says:

"There were with me in the Philippines, in Mexico and in France thousands of foreign born men hardly able to speak our tongue who had in their hearts the spirit of Americanism and devotion to make the supreme sacrifice. Indeed, there was often a zeal for all that America means that would put to blush many older Americans who have fallen below the obligations of their birth-right.

Or consider the following from an address by Charles Nagel, Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet of President Taft:

### **Country Is Learning.**

"We have learned—that is, some of us have, and others think we have. The soldiers at the front learned. When they found a man there they needed to ask no questions. His presence was sufficient. Whatever the land of his birth, he was a comrade, fighting for the same country and principles, under the same flag. There was no question of nationality there.

"Others at home formed the opinion that a man of foreign parents or of foreign birth should forget his native land and allow his love for his parent country to cool. This is not true. If it were, then he might as easily forget his country of adoption in time of strife. We cannot Americanize on such a foundation, for it is contrary to the laws of human nature.

"Americans must be built from the soul. Americanism cannot be legislated into existence, only so far as we can properly conduct government for the benefit of all. The foreigner, the immigrant, must be imbued with the spirit of this nation and its institutions. The public schools do much to foster this. There the children easily are won over to the flag and they take their patriotism home to their parents."

The Elections Committee reported out this bill for passage, but it did not get far in the house.

Twice Mr. Olsen tried to secure a special order. Twice he rung the changes on the danger to our institutions of letting aliens run loose among us unidentified and unlabeled; but each time the House refused, and the bill died.

Some day we shall learn that more flies can be caught with molasses than with vinegar; and that good citizens are more easily made by kindness than with clubs.

This article is not written to criticise Mr. Olsen. Personally he is a pleasant, refined, educated gentleman; but obsessed with the idea that "aliens" are dangerous to our institutions.

Would they not be more dangerous if we clubbed and harassed them into becoming citizens? And how much confidence in our institutions have those who fear they will be cracked, destroyed and ruined, by a few more aliens coming among us?

For my part I have such an abiding faith in the principles upon which the fathers founded our democracy, as to firmly believe that all ordinary men admire, love and respect those principles. If those principles are ever overthrown and destroyed it will not be by the "aliens" who come here to enjoy their blessings, but by the monopolists and privileged who shout the loudest about their own Americanism.

### **THE STREET TRADES BILL.**

Another, a rather mild and benevolent encroachment this time, on the personal rights of parents and children, was the so-called Street Trades Bill which provided that no boy under 12 years of age could engage in any occupation whatever on the streets, and no boy under 16 nor girl under 18 could "distribute or sell newspapers, magazines, periodi-



cals or circulars upon streets or in public places." Peddling and bootblackening were also prohibited.

### BUT

If they secured a permit and bought a badge from the "authorized officer" then it was different.

"The bill deprived parents and children of their inherent rights and handed them back a privilege on condition that they get a permit, pay for a badge and wear it.

Thus declared objectors to the bill which was bitterly contested and defeated in the House Thursday, March 31.

"George E. Vincent and Marion L. Burton, former presidents of the University of Minnesota; Jake Preus, Governor, and Bill Nolan, speaker of House, are all horrible examples of what becomes of boys who sell papers on the street," said Representative Warner.

### Charges Prejudices.

"It is probably true that in the early development of the state some boys successful in later life found such vent for their energies, but they would vote for this bill, I venture to say," replied Representative Child, adding that Speaker Nolan's vote would show their views. The speaker later voted for the bill. Opposition was blamed by Representative Child, to prejudices and false assumptions.

Representative Pattison explained the purpose of the bill to protect boys without proper parental care and home environment, and the plan for employment certificates and permits to keep a check on their conduct in street trades.

"I'd be ashamed to go home and look my four little boys in the face if I voted for this bill," said Representative McPartlin. "I think it is a shame for a band of childless men and childless women to pick on the little boys of this state. To pass this bill would be to admit that the streets are unfit places for children and inability to regulate conduct on them. Boys go wrong because of delinquencies of parents, and street trades will not affect the properly reared boy. This bill would brand as delinquent any boy who sold a paper without the required permit."

"It would appear that the gentleman from Koochiching doesn't know anything about this bill, which is intended to care for children not protected by their parents, or that he doesn't know anything about children," retorted Representative Pattison.

Representative Lightner said that the bill was opposed by newsboys' clubs.

Iverson declared they were trying to shift the care of children from the parents and the home to the state. Because some children need guardians, you would deprive all parents and all children of their inherent natural rights.

Those who voted for the bill were 60:

Anderson,	Carlson,	Grant,	Goodspeed,
Bendixen,	Child,	Green, F. A.,	Jacobson,
Bensen,	Cullum,	Grove,	Keller,
Bernard,	Darby,	Haugland,	Kleffman,
Briggs,	DeLury,	Herried,	Levin,
Brown,	Dilley,	Howard,	Long,
Cameron,	Gislason, J.B.,	Hulbert,	McGivern,

Melbye,	Oren,	Serline,	Thomas,
Moen,	Pattison,	Shonyo,	Thompson,
Murphy,	Pedersen,	Spelbrink,	Trowbridge,
Norby,	Putnam,	Spindler,	Walworth,
Nordgren,	Risse,	Stein,	West,
Nordlin,	Rodenberg,	Sweitzer,	Wicker,
Norton,	Samec,	Swenson, C.J.,	Wright,
Olson, L. E.,	Selvig,	Teigen,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were 44:

Arens,	Girling,	Lee,	Rako,
Baxter,	Gislason, C.M.,	Lightner,	Scribner,
Burdorf,	Goodwin,	Lockhart,	Shanks,
Christensen, A.,	Gran,	McLaughlin,	Sluke,
Christianson, T.,	Hemstad,	McPartlin,	Stahlke,
Conley,	Hinds,	Miller,	Strand,
Curtis,	Hitchcock,	Miner,	Swanstrom,
Day,	Holmquist,	Nellermoe,	Swenson,
Dorweiler,	Hompe,	Nelson,	O. A.,
Enger	Iverson,	Neuman,	Thorkelson,
Enstrom,	Johnson,	Olson, Lars,	Warner,
Flaherty,	Kelly,	Parker,	Welch,
Gartner,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,	Wilkinson.
Gerlich,	Lauderdale,	Perry, T.,	

This bill was revised and again put on final passage April 11, after a few clarifying amendments proposed by Mr. Christianson had been adopted.

This time it fared better and passed 78 to 17 leaving 34 not voting.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Cummings,	Kozlak,	Nollet,	Swanstrom,
Day,	Lightner,	Olson, Lars,	Swenson, E.,
Flaherty,	McPartlin,	Sluke,	
Gislason, C.M.,	Miner,	Stahlke,	
Hemstad,	Nellermoe,	Strand,	

Such legislation as this is conceived with the best of intentions, but does no real good.

### THE CRAZE FOR REGULATION.

Every session bills are introduced to bring under state regulation some other line of human effort, some other occupation or business.

Frequently these bills are asked for by the people themselves who are engaged in the occupation.

They want to shut out competitors.

They want to make it hard for those who are not in to get in.

Hence they ask for requirements, restrictions, regulations, and a paid commission to do the regulating, examining, licensing, permitting or refusing to permit.

You enjoy your right to earn a living in your chosen occupation, not by your ability and fitness or your success in making good, but by what certain politicians, appointed for the purpose, may think your qualifications may be; by your skill in answering such questions as they may ask.

Bills of this character were introduced in 1921,—many of them.

One to regulate and license cosmetologists.

One to regulate and license architects.

One or two to license dealers in land.

To further regulate commission merchants.

To regulate the sale of sleighs.

To compel political parties to hold conventions and subjecting them to minute regulation.

To require reports—to some public official—from all dealers in "all food stuffs" other than cold storage.

Cold storage is already regulated to little useful purpose.

Several bills by Nimocks to regulate house owners,—the rents they may charge, and the relations between them and their tenants.

A bill by Nimocks to "regulate the issuance and circulation of statements affecting candidates for office."

A bill to license **private** detectives. Wouldn't it be better to prohibit private detectives from ever exercising the functions of public police officers?

This is far from being all the attempts at further regulation of things that in their nature are and ought to be private affairs. All these failed.

It is not difficult to see why regulation seems to be necessary.

It is much more difficult to discover the underlying cause of that **seeming** and remove it.

For only by finding and removing the causes that appear to make all this regulation, restriction, supervision and espionage necessary shall we ever escape from the net.

It surely cannot be that the Divine Force that rules in Nature has no better system for governing the acts of men than with restrictions, punishments, policemen and prisons.

If not, how long will it be till half the people will be employed to regulate the actions of the other half?

The true solution must be not more man made laws and regulations, but more liberty—liberty bounded only by the equal liberty of all others.

Freedom—not restraint—is the natural law,—freedom to **use** the materials and forces of nature and enjoy the products of individual or co-operative effort, without toll to foretaller or land grabber, or tax on any products of labor.

The bounties of nature must be the equal heritage of all the children of men, and the value which attaches to these bounties because of the presence and necessities of the people; their civilization and enlightenment; their labor of hand and brain; their wealth in all good things produced,—that value which arises irresistibly, and increases proportionately with the evolution of society,—that value which is always greatest where men most do congregate,—that value must be used—not to swell the private purses of a few monopolists,—but to meet the common needs of all.

While it is not particularly creditable to the intelligence of those who conceive and introduce these measures for more restrictions and penalties, it is cause for rejoicing that so few of them are enacted into law,—that so many of them die in committee or are killed on the floor of House or Senate.

## CHAPTER III.

**THE FARMER AND HIS PROBLEMS.**

The real basic need of the farmer is in no way different from that of any other producer.

Like the miner, the quarryman, the hunter, the fisherman, the lumberman, the manufacturer, the merchant, the builder,—like all these he must first of all secure a piece of land,—he must have a chance to use the resources of nature.

Right here is the greatest handicap of the prospective farmer today. He finds it hard—very hard—to get a piece of land whereon to make his farm.

Oh, yes, there are lands that he can get practically without money; but what he saves in money he pays twice over in deprivation.

The “cheap lands” that we hear so much about are really the **dearest** lands when we consider all the cost.

Now the prospective farmer, like everybody else, was born naked and penniless; he has nothing but his hands and his brain with which to earn a living; and when he reaches the age of young manhood and looks about him for a piece of unused land on which to build a home, and out of which he can produce a living for himself and his growing family, he finds that some forestaller—some land grabber—has got in ahead of him and demands an exorbitant price before he will consent to get out of the way and let him have the land to use.

This price—this tribute—that the farmer must pay to the land speculator—runs all the way from a dollar or two an acre, if he is willing to locate many miles beyond the limits of civilization, up to a thousand or more an acre, if he tries to get close to the centers of population where he can enjoy the advantages of community life.

**So much for his first problem.**

The second is his annual expense, that he may produce his crop and get it to market.

And here, again, he finds himself under a terrible handicap.

He clears a portion of his land at a cost of great labor, and his taxes are increased.

He buys a team and a plow to break the sod and prepare for a crop, and his taxes are increased.

He builds a cheap cabin to shelter himself and family and again he is penalized by higher taxes.

He fences in his holding to keep his horses and cattle from straying, and again the tax gatherer hunts him out and levies a fine.

He buys clothes for his children and furniture to make the home more comfortable, and he finds that these things have all been taxed and taxed against every person who has handled them from the raw material to the finished product, and now he must pay all those taxes with a profit on each and every one of them. It is all in the price he pays when he buys them at the store;—and every year the tax assessor comes around and fines him again for having them in his possession.

And the land grabber who "owns" the vacant land all about, winks his other eye, and puts up the price of "his" land.

But this isn't all; when he has raised a crop of grain or a carload of hogs, cattle or sheep and proposes to send them to the terminal market, he finds he must pay a higher freight rate, because, in our wisdom (?) we have levied a heavy tax on the gross earnings of the railway.

And still our farmer's troubles are not complete. He must borrow money. And the interest is more than double what it need be because of the taxes on money,—the taxes on the bank and all the machinery of credit.

Money could be furnished at one per cent interest if we would fix things right; but the land speculator wants the money to buy up the land "to hold so the farmer will be able to get it when he needs it"—"to hold" so the land won't run away, I suppose, and he can afford to pay high interest.

Land speculation is largely responsible for high interest rates, high taxes on industry, high prices for all products, and most of the other evils of our civilization.

And land speculation is built solely on the fact that we allow the speculator to get away with the publicly created value of his land—in country and city—instead of taxing it away from him for the benefit of the public which has created it.

Here then is the farmer's second problem—the problem of reducing his expenses of running his farm and getting his crops to market.

And the two problems—the high price of land to start with and the enormous burden of direct and indirect taxation that crushes him are really only one problem—the problem of shifting the burden of public expense to the shoulders of those who are now securing the "unearned increment" which the public creates and ought to have to meet the public needs.

What did the legislature of 1921 do?

They claim that they did much.

Time will tell.

They passed the "farmers' program" and it is now the law of the state.

#### What Is That Program?

H. F. 63, introduced by Wilkinson and others, was a bill to improve the law relating to the organization of co-operative associations, granting more extended powers, permitting them to associate with other co-operative associations to form a state wide co-operative, and allowing such association to become a member of a nation wide association.

This bill secures to co-operative associations nearly all the legal rights and powers that are acknowledged to belong inherently to persons and voluntary copartnerships.

Why not all such rights?

S. F. 15 by Cumming, Sageng, Gandrud and Cliff, to extend and enlarge the powers of the Commissioner of Agriculture, to advise and assist in the organization of co-

operative associations, to aid them to install suitable accounting methods and to audit their accounts if invited to do so.

H. F. 34, by T. Christianson, to so amend the constitution of the state that the credit of the state could be loaned in aid of agricultural development.

### **The Anti Futures Bill.**

The bottom fell out of the wheat market.

Prices dropped from a high point of a little more than three dollars to less than one fifty, and then still lower.

All this took place in a few months.

Most of the drop occurred after the ban on buying and selling for future delivery had been removed by the government.

Many people, especially farmers, immediately jumped to the conclusion that the slump was caused by the bears in the wheat pit.

Were they right in this conclusion?

The grain men declared that there was no relation of cause and effect.

"The price of wheat was abnormally high the same as everything else, and had to come down, like everything else."

"Beef and pork have dropped to about one-half."

"Cotton and wool are selling for less than half the former high prices."

"Leaf tobacco also is in the dumps."

"Sugar has dropped from more than 30 cents a pound at the highest level to 6½ or 7 cents at the lowest."

"Some grades of shoes and clothing can be got for less than half the high prices, tho these things are coming down more slowly, as would naturally be expected."

"Building materials have been reduced 20 to 30% and will go lower."

"In short there is a general deflation of prices. The financially strong are able to hold out longest. Where combinations exist the drop comes slowest, but it is all coming along in regular order—in a perfectly natural manner, and we must all take our losses and make the best of it."

This is about the way one side put it.

The other side refused to have it so.

To them it was all a conspiracy of the big fellows to ruin the farmers, to crush the workers and get a tighter grip on the business of the country.

They insisted that the grain gamblers especially were guilty.

A bill was introduced by Gerlich, Wilkinson, Wicker, T. J. Greene, Norton, Rako, Hitchcock, Moen and Nordgren.

H. F. No. 23, a bill for an act defining gambling contracts as applied to sales of wheat, grain and other farm products, declaring the same to be illegal, prohibiting Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade and other similar organizations from making and enforcing rules designed to enforce the carrying out of such gambling contracts, and prescribing penalties for the violation thereof.



The bill came up Thursday, March 3d, and was vigorously debated by Wilkinson, Moen, Neuman and Nordgren for the bill; and by Howard and Washburn against.

On roll call the vote stood 101 for, 18 against:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Gran,	Nelson,	Shonyo,
Arens,	Grant,	Neuman,	Sluke,
Baxter,	Green, F. A.,	Nollet,	Spelbrink,
Bendixen,	Grove,	Norby,	Spindler,
Bensen,	Haugland,	Nordgren,	Stahlke,
Briggs,	Hemstad,	Nordlin,	Stein,
Burdorf,	Hinds,	Norton,	Strand,
Cameron,	Holmquist,	O'Keefe,	Swanstrom,
Carlson,	Hompe,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson, C. J.,
Christensen, A.,	Iverson,	Olson, Lars,	Swenson, E.,
Christianson, T.	Jacobson,	Oren,	Swenson, O. A.,
Conley,	Johnson,	Parker,	Taylor,
Cummings,	Keller,	Pattison,	Teigen,
Curtis,	Kelly,	Pedersen,	Thomas,
Darby,	Kleffman,	Perry, J. T.,	Thompson,
Day,	Lagersen,	Perry, T.,	Thorkelson,
DeLury,	Lauderdale,	Praxel,	Walworth,
Enger,	Lee,	Putnam,	Warner,
Enstrom,	Levin,	Rako,	Washburn,
Flahaven,	McGivern,	Risse,	Welch,
Flaherty,	McLaughlin,	Rodenberg,	Wicker,
Gerlich,	Melbye,	Ross,	Wilkinson,
Gislason, C. M.,	Miller,	Samec,	Mr. Speaker.
Gislason, J. B.,	Miner,	Selvig,	
Goodspeed,	Moen,	Serline,	
Goodwin,	Nellermoe,	Shanks,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bernard,	Eaton,	Lennon,	Scribner,
Brown,	Girling,	Lockhart,	Sweitzer,
Child,	Hitchcock,	Long,	Trowbridge,
Cullum,	Howard,	Murphy,	
Dilley,	Kozlak,	Olsen, J. W.,	

Nimocks was absent sick. He had it recorded in the journal that if present he would have voted **no**.

As the bill finally passed it was regarded as comparatively harmless by the grain men, tho Howard declared it would prevent the millers from hedging their flour sales, and the Duluth elevators from protecting themselves against loss on the grain that was waiting for the opening of lake navigation.

Both sides admitted that **hedging** is necessary. The advocates claimed that the bill would permit **hedging** while prohibiting "gambling." The opponents contended that the "gambling" had grown up about the legitimate grain business, and that this bill would destroy the valuable parts of the business and simply leave the "gamblers" to seek other fields for their activities. Howard in the House and Fowler in the Senate, declared that this bill would tend to destroy the greatest primary grain market in the world, drive the business from Minneapolis and Duluth to Chicago,

and in no way get rid of the evils; the farmers would suffer the loss of the market and pay the cost.

**In the Senate.**

In the Senate the negative vote was:

Adams,	Callahan,	Denegre,	Fowler,
Bessette,	Coleman,	Dwyer,	Ribenack,
Brooks,	Conroy,	Erickson,	

H. F. 25, to declare the Chamber of Commerce, the Duluth Board of Trade, and the South St. Paul Stock Exchange public markets and require them to receive as members Co-operative Associations dealing in farm produce "organized or authorized" to do business in Minnesota—

This bill passed the House with 13 negative votes:

Bernard,	Dilley,	Murphy,	Washburn,
Cameron,	Eaton,	Nimocks,	
Child,	Howard,	Olsen, J. W.,	
Cullum,	Lockhart,	Scribner,	

When it reached the Senate Mr. Fowler insisted that the bill was unconstitutional, and that the legislature had no power to force these exchanges to admit members or to regulate their membership and asked that the bill be sent to the judiciary committee for investigation.

Only 11 voted for this motion:

Adams,	Cosgrove,	Dwyer,	Guilford,
Brooks,	Denegre,	Erickson,	Palmer,
Coleman,	Devold,	Fowler,	

The bill then passed with 14 no votes:

Adams,	Coleman,	Dwyer,	Palmer,
Bessette,	Conroy,	Erickson,	Ribenack.
Brooks,	Denegre,	Fowler,	
Callahan,	Devold,	Guilford,	

This constitutes the principal part of what was called the farmers' program.

In addition resolutions were passed urging the re-establishment of the old "Minnesota Grain grades" which were declared to be a great improvement over the more complicated and technical federal grades. introduced in the Senate by Johnson and fathered in the House by Arens.

A bill was also passed requiring elevators to pay for **dockage**. **Dockage** is the seeds of various kinds found in wheat and other grains which were supposed to be of no value, but which the elevators and mills sold for good prices as feed for animals and poultry.

If by any chance they should help to make farming a more prosperous business, that will increase the price of farm lands to the injury of every one who is trying to get into the farming game and will be no benefit to present land owning farmers who desire to stay in.

If, however, these bills do not bring the help expected, the farmers will be one step nearer finding the true solution.

At the beginning of this Chapter I have indicated that I believe the final solution of the farmers' troubles must lie in cleaning out the land speculators and reducing the farmers' indirect and unjust tax burdens.

Then, and not 'til then, will cheaper money and better markets bring permanent prosperity.

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE LABORER AND HIS PROBLEMS.

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong to those whose labor produced them. But it has so happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly so as possible, is a worthy object of any government."—Abraham Lincoln.

Most people frankly accept this truth so plainly stated by the great emancipator.

It is only when they try to find and apply remedies for these evils that they disagree, and their disagreement is fundamental.

One group is clear thinking and far seeing. They realize that evils can be ended only by removing their causes. They have discovered that "behind every social evil there lies a social wrong", and back of every social wrong will be found a **statute law** or a well established custom. They say repeal or change the law and the social evil will disappear of its own accord.

The other group have not discovered the source of the evil. In fact most of them have not gone far enough to realize that there is any such thing as cause and effect in the social and industrial world.

They see what they call "the conflict between **capital** and **labor**" and never take the trouble to ask whether there is a cause or not. Many labor leaders and most social workers are found here.

A large part of this group declare and insist that this conflict is inevitable; that it always has been and always will be; that the only remedy is for employers to learn to be **good** to their workers and for workers to be faithful to their employers. Here we find the heads of great industrial establishments who take a patronizing and fatherly interest in their employes, and such workers as try to be satisfied with their lot and are thankful "that the boss is so kind to them."

Still another part of this group are equally insistent that the "conflict is inevitable," but they don't take much stock in being good. They look upon their employer as their natural enemy and attempt to organize "One Big Union" to include all workers; to drive out their employers and take over the industry. And then, having seized the industries, they will be able to control the government and operate it in the sole interest of the "proletariat."

All this looks like a pretty big job and one not likely to be accomplished in the near future.

In the meantime legislatures are moving along two different lines toward the bettering of conditions for the workers.

First, and mostly by means of ameliorative measures.

Secondly, by the removal of causes, thus releasing the forces of nature to work for betterment.

### Ameliorative Measures.

Let us consider first some of the ameliorative measures adopted by the legislature of 1921:

#### WORKMAN'S INSURANCE:

The legislature of 1919 split over the question of workman's insurance.

The house passed a bill providing for a state commission and a complete monopoly by the state of all workman's insurance, but it lost in the Senate by one vote.

Each house then appointed a commission to study the question and report their findings to the legislature of 1921.

The two commissions sat together in the taking of testimony and reported back a plan for a state commission to administer all matters relating to workman's insurance.

Senators Jackson and Boylan submitted a minority report favoring state monopoly of workman's insurance, cutting out all company insurances.

P. W. Guilford, Ole O. Sageng and A. J. Rockne favored substantially the same report that had been agreed to by the house commission composed of Speaker Nolan and Reps. Levin, Norton, Parker and McGrath. McGrath was not a candidate for re-election. The other four introduced a group of bills as follows:

H. F. 394, creating an industrial commission of three members to take the place of the present Department of Labor and Industries of the state.

The following quotations from the bill sufficiently describe its scope and powers:

Sec. 14. The Department of Labor and Industries shall consist of the following divisions, to-wit: Division of Workmen's Compensation, Division of Boiler Inspection, Division of Hotel Inspection, Division of Accident Prevention, Division of Statistics, Division of Women and Children, Division of Employment, Division of Mediation and Arbitration and such other divisions as the commission may deem necessary and establish. Each division of the Department and persons in charge thereof shall be subject to the supervision and direction of the commission and of any commissioner assigned to supervise the work of such division, and, in addition to such duties as are or may be imposed on them by statute, shall perform such other duties as may be assigned to them by the Commission.

Sec. 15. The Commission shall have the following powers and duties:

(1) To exercise such powers and perform such duties concerning the administration of the Workmen's Compensation Laws of the state as may be conferred and imposed on it by such laws.

(2) To exercise all powers and perform all duties now conferred and imposed on the Department of Labor and Industries as heretofore constituted, and the bureaus of such department, so far as consistent with the provisions of this act.

(3) To establish and conduct free employment agencies, and after the first day of July, 1921, to supervise the work of private employment offices, all as now provided by law to

do all in its power to bring together employers seeking employees and working people seeking employment, to make known the opportunities for self-employment in this state, to aid in inducing minors to undertake promising skilled employments, to encourage wage earners to insure themselves against distress from unemployment, to investigate the extent and causes of unemployment in the state and remedy therefor, and to devise and adopt the most efficient means in its power to avoid unemployment.

(4) To promote the voluntary arbitration, mediation and conciliation of disputes between employers and employees in order to prevent strikes, lockouts, boycotts, blacklists, discriminations and legal proceedings in matters of employment. In pursuance of this duty it may appoint temporary boards of arbitration or conciliation, provide the necessary expenses of such boards, order reasonable compensation not exceeding \$15.00 per day for each member engaged in such arbitration or conciliation, prescribe rules of procedure for such arbitration or conciliation boards, conduct investigations and hearings, issue or publish statements, findings of facts, conclusions, reports and advertisements, and may do all other things convenient and necessary to accomplish the purposes directed in this act. The Commission may designate a subordinate to be known as Chief Mediator and may detail other assistants or employees for the purpose of executing these provisions, without extra compensation. In order to carry out the provisions of this subsection, the Industrial Commission, or any Commissioner thereof, or any temporary board of conciliation or arbitration, shall have power to administer oaths to witnesses, and to issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses; and if any person refuses to comply with any subpoena issued by the Commissioner, a Commissioner or a temporary Board of Conciliation or Arbitration, or if any witness refuses to testify regarding that about which he may be lawfully interrogated, the judge of any district court of any county in the state, on application of the Commission or of a Commissioner, shall compel obedience by attachment proceedings as for contempt, as in the case of the disobedience of any such subpoena issued by such court.

(5) To adopt reasonable and proper rules and regulations relative to the exercise of its powers and duties, and proper rules to govern its proceedings and to regulate the mode and manner of all investigations and hearings. But such rules and regulations shall not be effective until ten days after their adoption. A copy of such rules and regulations shall be delivered to every citizen making application therefor.

(6) To collect, collate and publish statistical and other information relating to the work under its jurisdiction and to make public reports in its judgment necessary. "On or before the first Monday in January of each year the Commission shall report its doings, conclusions and recommendations to the Governor, which report shall be printed and distributed to the members of the legislature and otherwise as the Commission may direct.

(7) To establish and maintain branch offices as needed for the conduct of its affairs.

This bill passed the House with only one negative vote. Mr. Nellermoe had tried to amend so that the commissioners should be selected as follows:

One by the executive board of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor;

One by the Minnesota State Employers' Association;

And the third by these two.

His amendment was lost and he voted against the bill.

H. F. 350, was practically a new employer's liability law and was passed unanimously.

H. F. 604, regulated workman's compensation insurance, created an insurance board and directed it to fix a "**minimum, adequate and reasonable** rate for each classification under which such business is written."

Mr. Nordlin tried to amend by requiring the board to fix a **maximum** rate instead of a **minimum**.

He declared that to fix a minimum high enough for the regular companies would place the rate far too high for the mutual companies who do not solicit risks and would make the cost of insurance more expensive than necessary.

Mr. Norton replied that the important thing was **security** and too low rates endangered the security of the risk.

Mr. Nordlin's amendment was lost 38 to 78.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Herried,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Arens,	Hitchcock,	Neuman,	Stein,
Bensen,	Iverson,	Nordlin,	Strand,
Day,	Keller,	Olson, L. E.	Swenson, E.,
DeLury,	Kleffman,	Olson, Lars	Teigen,
Enstrom,	Lagersen,	Robinson,	Thompson,
Gartner,	Lockhart,	Samec,	Thorkelson,
Girling,	McGivern,	Sluke,	Warner.
Goodwin,	Miner,	Spelbrink,	
Hemstad,	Nellermoe.	Spindler,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baxter,	Flaherty,	McLaughlin,	Rako,
Bendixen,	Gislason, C.M.,	Melbye,	Risse,
Bernard,	Gislason, J.B.,	Miller,	Rodenberg,
Briggs,	Goodspeed,	Moen,	Scribner,
Brown,	Grant,	Murphy,	Selvig,
Cameron,	Green, F. A.,	Nimocks,	Serline,
Carlson,	Grove,	Nollet,	Shanks,
Child,	Haugland,	Norby,	Shonyo,
Christensen, A.	Hinds,	Nordgren,	Swanstrom,
Christianson, T.	Hompe,	Norton,	Sweitzer,
Conley,	Howard,	O'Keefe,	Swenson, C.J.,
Cullum,	Hulbert,	Olsen, J. W.	Swenson, O.A.
Cummings,	Johnson,	Oren,	Taylor,
Curtis,	Kelly,	Parker,	Thomas,
Darby,	Lauderdale,	Pattison,	Walworth,
Dilley,	Lennon,	Pedersen,	Welch,
Dorweiler,	Levin,	Perry, J. T.,	Wilkinson,
Eaton,	Lightner,	Praxel,	Wright,
Enger,	Long,	Putnam,	Mr. Speaker.

The bill was then passed with only 8 negative votes:

Hitchcock,	Nellermoe,	Nordlin,	Thorkelson,
Miner,	Nelson,	Swenson, E.,	Warner,

H. F. 598, putting boiler inspection into the Department of Labor and Industries, passed unanimously.

H. F. 599, puts the Minimum Wage board into the Department of Labor and Industries, passed unanimously.

H. F. 600, was to have put hotel inspection also into this department, but objection was raised by the traveling men and hotel keepers, so on motion of Mr. Neuman, it was in definitely postponed.

On Wednesday, March 9, all these bills were passed in the Senate with practically no opposition.

Jackson attempted to increase the compensation for injured workmen but could get only 16 votes, as follows:

Callahan,	Erickson,	Millett,	Romberg,
Conroy,	Jackson,	Naplin,	Schmiechel,
Devold,	Johnson,	Orr,	Swanson,
Dwyer,	Lee,	Palmer,	Van Hoven,

All others opposed except 13, who did not vote: Baldwin, Boylan, Cumming, Benson, Loonan, Madigan and Stephen had been erased. Cashel, Gandrud, Gooding, Handlan, Ward and Widell had been present but did not vote.

Dwold and Dwyer voted against 604—the bill to regulate insurance rates thereto.

The last night of the session the house passed H. F. No. 325, a bill for an act to amend Section 9003, General Statutes 1913, same being an act requiring policemen, special policemen, constables, patrolmen, deputy sheriffs and other peace officers to be legal voters of the state and providing a penalty for the appointment of any such peace officers who are not legal voters.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Hemstad,	Murphy,	Strand,
Arens,	Herried,	Nellermoe,	Swanstrom,
Bendixen,	Hitchcock,	Nelson,	Sweitzer,
Bensen,	Hulbert,	Nordlin,	Swenson, C.J.,
Bernard,	Iverson,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson, E.,
Child,	Johnson,	Olson, Lars	Swensen, O.A.,
Cummings,	Keller,	Parker,	Taylor,
Darby,	Kleffman,	Pedersen,	Teigen,
Day,	Kozlak,	Putnam,	Thomas,
DeLury,	Lauderdale,	Rako,	Thorkelson,
Enstrom,	Lee,	Risse,	Walworth,
Flahaven,	Lennon,	Samec,	Warner,
Flaherty,	Lockhart,	Shanks,	Washburn,
Gislason, C.M.	McGivern,	Shonyo,	Welch,
Gislason, J.B.,	Melbye,	Spelbrink,	West,
Goodwin,	Miller,	Spindler,	Wright,
Grant,	Miner,	Stahlke,	Mr. Speaker.
Green, F. A.,	Moen,	Stein,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baxter,	Enger,	Hompe,	Nordgren,
Briggs,	Gerlich,	Howard,	O'Keefe,
Cameron,	Girling,	Levin,	Perry, T.,
Cullum,	Gran,	Lightner,	Praxel,
Dilley,	Grove,	McLaughlin,	Trowbridge,
Dorweiler,	Haugland,	McPartlin,	Wicker.
Eaton,	Hinds,	Norby,	

This bill failed in the Senate.

Labor wanted legislation to require railroads to employ full and adequate crews on trains and on sections of the roads, but both these bills were killed.

The old law establishing an eight hour day in all state institutions was repealed so far as it affected outside help at those institutions and also on state road work.

This was done against the emphatic protest of labor men in both houses.

Except for some increases in compensation, it is doubtful if labor did not lose more than it gained in 1921.

Like the farmer, the laborer is cursed by the high price of land and the excessive burden of taxation.

It is often said that many poor people pay no taxes.

Of course every one who stops to think knows that this is not true.

The very same person who makes this misstatement is likely inside of an hour to solemnly assure you that all taxes are finally paid by the consumer.

The truth is that all taxes on production or exchange or any of the processes thereof are paid either by the original producer (the farmer usually) or by the ultimate consumer, which means every one who eats, wears clothes, lives in houses or consumes anything whatever that is the product of the labor of hand or brain.

And right here is where the farmer and the laborer get crushed by a system of taxation that doesn't stop with taxing them to death but also helps the land speculators to add to their burden.

The following clipping is very significant. It is only one of thousands that could be produced to show how this system works.

#### **THRIFTLESS MARYLAND.**

In the year 1906 the state of Maryland transferred title to an island in the Patapsco river at Baltimore to a private individual for the sum of \$15. The following year two other islands nearby were sold for \$35 each to two other individuals. These islands are merely banks of mud. The purchasers made no other use of them than to sell them later for several hundred dollars profit. The new purchasers have also made no use of the islands, but this year, 14 years after the original sale of the first island, the city of Baltimore, believing the islands essential to a plan of port development, took an option on all three, and the price agreed upon was \$215,000. Of this sum \$125,000 was for the first island and \$90,000 for the other two. In other words, when the state parted title with these islands it conferred the power



on private parties to levy upon the earnings of the people of Baltimore to the extent of \$215,000 in 14 years. In this there is nothing unusual. There is inexcusable prodigality in every transfer of publicly owned land to private individuals. There is inexcusable prodigality every day that state or nation continues to permit private appropriation of communal values. This is the kind of extravagance which is keeping the great bulk of the American people in poverty.—American Economic League Bulletin.

Coming nearer home, read this from the Pioneer Press of March 24, 1921:

#### THOMPSON ESTATE TAX IS COMPLETED.

Final Settlement With State on \$4,912,406 Property of St. Paul Man Is Made.

A tax of \$872.06, making \$153,406.37 which has been paid in inheritance taxes on the \$4,912,406.37 estate of the late Horace E. Thompson, Summit and Avon avenues, St. Paul, was paid to the attorney general's department yesterday. Mr. Thompson died May 1, 1919, the estate being distributed to the widow and five children and representing about one-third of the original estate created by the land grant for the old St. Paul & Sioux City railroad, consisting of large parcels of land in Southwestern Minnesota.

Comment is useless.

The real problem of the laborer—of all who produce or render service—is to correct the evils pointed out in these clippings.

Patchwork labor laws will never solve this problem.

Notice, in neither case did the "owners" of these lands lift a finger to produce the values they secured?

All this value was produced by the presence of an increasing population, its labor, its industry, its thrift, its development in education, morality and civilization.

All this value was produced by others and the land speculators got it, except the little that the state took in taxes.

#### SUPPOSE ALL THE LAND WERE IDLE?

Did it ever occur to you to ask what would happen if all the land were idle instead of half or more of it as is now the case?

What, then, would become of the people?

Is there any other way to produce food, clothing, houses, and all the other useful and desirable things except as labor uses land?

And if such a large part of the good things go to those who merely own and hold land, won't there be a smaller part left for those who work?

And isn't it the one great problem of all who render useful service,—not only the farmer and the laborer, as we call them, but all others,—to see to it that our laws are so changed that it will be easy to get land to use,—to see to it that labor and industry shall be rewarded,—not penalized,—so that we may reach Lincoln's ideal where the producer—not the forestaller—may have the good things of life?

## CHAPTER V.

## THE CITY.

## Home Rule—Local Self Government.

Legally, the city is the creature of the state.

Legally, all its powers are granted by the state.

Legally, the state may take those powers away.

Legally, the state may do with the city about what the legislature may please.

## BUT

Historically, socially, economically, industrially, the city came before the state.

The city was a self-governing community before the state, as we know it, existed.

In the early stages of its evolution, the city WAS the state.

The assumption by the state of the right to rule the city, was the result of conquest and tyranny.

All through the ages there has been a conflict between the free, self-governing cities and the claims of the conquering tyrants.

With the rise of the feudal system, the barons oppressed the people of the cities and deprived them of their rights.

Later a lord or a king would graciously give back, as a favor, part of the rights of which he had robbed the people of the cities.

He would grant them "a charter of liberties."

Even in our own state, until a few years ago, the rights of the cities to self government were not recognized; and we had to amend our constitution in order to enable the people of the cities to resume their natural position of self governing communities.

Only GRADUALLY did the cities of the state avail themselves of these newly acquired rights, and it was less than a year ago that the people of our largest city could agree to assume the responsibilities of self government.

And even yet we have not recognized the right of the cities to complete self government. Even yet we hedge them about as we would an irresponsible infant; we keep them in leading strings; we hamper them in various ways, as if they had to be protected against themselves.

In the legislature of 1921 a very large number of members, especially in the House, were pretty strong believers in the principle of home rule.

In the Senate this sentiment was not so strong—and several bills were introduced that were more or less destructive of this principle.

## The Sullivan Street Railway Bill.

"Section 1. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Railroad and Warehouse Commission to hear and determine any complaint made to such Commission as to the routing of cars or trains thereof and as to any practice or regulation affecting the speed or operation thereof or the convenience of the public in relation thereto, upon any line of street or interurban railway or the cars thereof operating from any point in this state outside of any city or village into or through any city or village, or operating between any village

and any city, or between two or more villages or between two or more cities. Such commission shall have power to hear and determine every such complaint and to make and enforce any order necessary to fully redress such complaint, promote the safety or convenience of the traveling public and every such order shall be final unless appealed from; provided this act shall not apply to any line of such railway operating between two cities of the first class." A companion bill was introduced by Wilkenson and Nollet in the House.

The objection to this bill was that it let the state authorities in to control the routing of cars inside the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and deprived the cities of control over their own streets.

This bill came up in the Senate Friday, Feb. 11.

Sullivan complained that the Stillwater people were not treated right in the routing of their cars inside the city of St. Paul.

First, the cars were forced to run too slowly because of all the other cars on East Seventh street.

Secondly, cars should be routed by way of the Union depot to accommodate Stillwater people who came to St. Paul to take the trains.

Thirdly, the loop around by Seven Corners compelled passengers to go clear out to that point to take the cars in order to get a seat.

Orr replied:

The Railroad and Warehouse commission can't give you any better service on East Seventh street. They couldn't order all the local cars off that street, and there is no other street to come in on.

Then if you were routed past the Union depot it would be longer still before you reached the center of the city where most of your passengers want to get off.

Third, as to the Seven Corners loop, the remedy is to require more cars, then you could get a seat. We all have to stand on every line for lack of cars.

Denegre said no complaint had ever been made by Stillwater people either to the city council or to the St. Paul Association. He offered an amendment to the effect that complaints must first be made to the city council and that body allowed 60 days in which to act, then appeal to the Railroad and Warehouse Commission.

Jackson declared he was no better satisfied with the bill as amended. It violated the principle of self government for St. Paul.

Why inject the Railroad and Warehouse Commission! Why not take a case directly to the courts if there is any question that can't be settled by the city council?

Sullivan was insistent. The people of Stillwater were not fairly treated. The city council would not do them justice.

It was the opinion of many that the real object of this bill was to get an entering wedge, to pry away all control of the city over street railway matters, as was proposed in the Brooks-Coleman bill, discussed later.

But Sullivan seems in some way to have convinced many senators, for when the roll was called the bill passed 40 to 21.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Denegre,	Kuntz,	Rockne,
Baldwin,	Fowler,	Lindsley,	Sageng,
Bessette,	Gandrud,	McGarry,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Blomgren,	Gillam,	Madigan,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Brooks,	Gooding,	Nolan,	Turnham,
Carley,	Hall,	Nord,	Van Hoven,
Cashel,	Hamer,	Peterson,	Vibert,
Cliff,	Hegnes,	Putnam,	Ward,
Coleman,	Hopp,	Rask,	Widell,
Cosgrove,	Kingsbury,	Reed,	Wold,

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bonniwell,	Erickson,	Lee,	Romberg,
Boylan,	Guilford,	Loonam,	Schmechel,
Callahan,	Handlan,	Naplin,	Swanson,
Conroy,	Jackson,	Orr,	
Devold,	Johnson,	Palmer,	
Dwyer,	Larson,	Ribenack,	

Six did not vote: Anderson, Benson, Cumming, Gjerset, Millet, Stepan. Stepan had answered to roll call. The other five had not. Denegre and Van Hoven of St. Paul; Brooks, Coleman, Fowler and Turnham of Minneapolis and Adams of Duluth voted for the bill.

Sullivan seems to have captured all country members, except Bonniwell, Larson and Swanson, outside of the Non-Partisan League group. They voted no, except Stephan, who did not vote.

#### **The Brooks-Coleman Bill.**

This bill, introduced by Senators Brooks and Coleman of Minneapolis, took away from the three large cities of the state practically all control of their street railway systems and put the power into the hands of the Railway and Warehouse Commission.

There immediately arose a torrent of opposition in all three of the large cities. The city councils, mayors, commercial clubs, business organizations of all kinds, women's clubs, labor organizations, and all sorts and varieties of persons and clubs began to voice their protests.

In order to present the extremes of contrast I print below Mr. Lowry's appeal for the passage of the bill, followed by a St. Paul Daily News editorial of Jan. 18, 1921.

Mr. Lowry's statement follows:

"Our position in regard to the Brooks-Coleman bill is that we feel that this bill should pass, as it is only by such legislation that it will be practically possible for our companies to properly serve the cities in which we operate.

"In Minneapolis it is claimed that our franchise expires in 1923 and it is obvious that the investing public would not be interested in purchasing our securities under such conditions.

"In both Minneapolis and St. Paul the local governments have granted an emergency increase in fare, subject to alteration at any time, but such an arrangement gives no stability to our securities. Our entire object in urging the passage

of this legislation is to enable us to finance the properties in such a way as to adequately serve the traveling public.

"During normal years we were expending between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000 to keep up with the growth of the cities, and such expenditures are impossible under the existing conditions.

"For the past four years we have endeavored in both cities to secure modifications and extensions of our existing contracts, which would place the property on a sound financial basis, but have been unable to do so, and in view of these facts we feel that placing the rate making power in the hands of an impartial commission, and extension of our right to operate, subject to good behavior or purchase, would give confidence to the investing public to the extent that we would be able to secure the necessary funds to improve the property and render adequate service.

"One of the immediate requirements is the addition of 100 modern two-car trains to take care of the rush hour service. These trains would cost not less than \$20,000 per train, which would mean \$2,000,000 for this item alone.

"We feel confident that if this legislation passes that within two years the cities will feel the effect and that we will be able to again place ourselves in the position of furnishing the finest street railway transportation in the United States at the lowest cost to the car rider."

The Daily News editorial:

#### Robbing Municipalities.

Jan. 18, 1921.

Suppose, Mr. Citizen:

That a business man made a contract with you to deliver a certain commodity over a period of years.

That he made a great fortune off this contract.

That, in spite of the favorable terms of the contract (for him) he never made an offer to lower prices or give you any of the benefits he gained.

That finally a time came when conditions made the contract not so profitable to the business man.

That he went to the legislature and begged the lawmakers to break his contract for him.

Supposing all these things, Mr. Citizen, what would you think of this business man?

You would consider him a short sport, a hedger—just plain yellow, wouldn't you?

The Twin City Rapid Transit Co. is doing just these things.

IT IS TRYING TO SNEAK THROUGH THE LEGISLATURE A LAW THAT WILL PERMIT IT TO TEAR UP ITS FRANCHISE AND LAUGH AT ITS CONTRACTS WITH YOU.

The Brooks-Coleman bill permits just that. Street railway franchises are contracts between company and city. For many years they were very profitable contracts to the Twin City Rapid Transit Co.

The war changed things for the company, as it changed things for you.

DID YOU, MR. CITIZEN, GO TO THE LEGISLATURE FOR AID? You did not. Then why should the company ask the legislature to make scraps of paper out of its contracts?

If a bill permitting the state railroad and warehouse commission to control local utilities is passed, it will be just as disastrous to the smaller communities as to St. Paul, Minneapolis and Duluth.

You who live in the smaller cities of Minnesota, how would you like it if your gas or electric company were permitted to tear up its contract with your city? How would you like to have your city officials sheared of all power?

The passage of the Brooks-Coleman measure will establish a precedent that will rob the people of all control of utilities. The movement was started four years ago with the telephone companies. It won't end, unless a jolt is handed it right now, until every right is taken from the municipality.

The way to stop it?

Watch your senator and your representative. SEE THAT THEY PROTECT YOUR INTERESTS. Question every step they make.

Organize to prevent this big corporation killing.

It's up to you.—Editor, Daily News.

The Brooks-Coleman bill was considerably modified by the Senate committee, and sent out as a committee bill.

It came up in the Senate on special order Thursday, March 10th, and the debate followed somewhat the lines of the Lowry appeal and the Daily News editorial.

The following account of the contest is adapted from the report in the Pioneer Press:

Advocates of the bill successfully resisted every effort at amendment which would have affected vital provisions of the measure. Whatever amending was permitted was done only by friends of the bill.

The measure provides that control of street car fares shall be vested in the State Railroad and Warehouse commission, while municipal councils shall retain control of service, routing, extensions and other matters relating to operation. Right to supervise financial affairs of the company is given the state commission and changes in indeterminate permits, which the bill provides may be issued in exchange for present street car franchises, may be made by the legislature.

#### **Transfers Are Secure.**

Amendments made by the Senate at the instance of Senator James D. Denegre of St. Paul clarified the language of the bill and provided that transfer privileges shall be retained and indeterminate permits shall be granted only to Minnesota corporations.

St. Paulites figured largely in the four-hour debate. Senator Denegre presented the amendments suggested by a committee of the St. Paul Association. Senator Joseph Jackson led the fight on the bill. Senator Charles N. Orr also attacked the measure.

The bill was lauded as a measure that would bring relief to widows and orphans as well as street railway companies, and denounced as a legislative faux pas which would crucify the Twin Cities. Senator James A. Carley of Wabasha was the author of the "widows and orphans" phrase, while the "crucifixion" declamation was uttered by Senator Charles N. Orr of St. Paul.

The bill, liberally amended before its final passage, led Senator Jackson to describe it as "a patchwork that nobody knows what it contains."

#### **Amendments Are Voted Down.**

Amendments intended to radically change the bill were voted down with consistent regularity during the course of the day. The first test vote came at noon on an amendment by Senator J. G. Callahan of Minneapolis, providing for a favorable referendum vote before the bill became operative in any city.

After Senator Jackson of St. Paul had spoken for the amendment, Senator Brooks, one of the authors of the Brooks-Coleman bill, made a remarkable speech. He began by admitting that the Callahan proposal for a referendum vote of the people struck at the "very life of the bill." Then he made the following frank statement regarding the Brooks-Coleman bill:

"This bill (there is no camouflage about it) is a street railway bill. It was designed to relieve the situation in Minneapolis. As originally drawn it gave the street railway company an indeterminate permit (which was, in fact, a perpetual permit), and gave the state Railroad and Warehouse commission power to regulate fares."

The Senate then took a recess for lunch and on again taking up the bill an amendment was presented by Senator Paul Guilford of Minneapolis, which added a provision "that no indeterminate permit be effective in any city until approved and accepted by the chief governing body of that city."

The Guilford amendment was attacked on the same grounds as the Callahan proposal and met the same fate, by a vote of 18 to 42. Two other amendments followed, one by Senator James Dwyer of Minneapolis, prohibiting anything in excess of a fare of 6 cents, which was defeated, 48 to 12, and another by Senator O. A. Devold, Minneapolis, who wanted indeterminate permit limited to ten years. The amendment was lost, 8 to 49.

#### **Arbitration Clause Is Lost.**

Senator Devold's effort marked the last attempt by foes of the bill to change its form in any material particular. Senator Emil Erickson of Duluth, who voted with the opposition throughout the day, introduced an amendment to make the railroad commission a board of arbitration in disputes between the street railway companies and their employes, but on being assured by Senator A. J. Rockne that the amendment was "undoubtedly unconstitutional," Senator Erickson withdrew his proposal.

Several minor amendments to clarify the phraseology of the bill and to make plainer the provision that only one fare could be charged from one point to another in any city, were offered by Senator Adams and readily accepted. The debate on the final passage of the bill then started with Senator Jackson of the opposition, leading. In a lengthy argument he denied the "deplorable conditions" which had been advanced as a reason for the bill existed in St. Paul.

"And neither do they exist in Minneapolis to an extent that cannot be remedied by local legislation," he said.

#### **Says It Is Business Proposition.**

The bill was supported by Senator Carley, who declared that the Senate was confronted "by a business proposition and the duty of determining, as business men, what should be done." Senator Carley declared that the stock of traction companies in the state was not held entirely by the rich and independent, but in many cases by widows and orphans and investors of savings, and that they were entitled to have their investments properly safeguarded.

Senator Charles N. Orr of St. Paul, in opposing the bill, charged that the Brooks-Coleman bill contained but two features, "the indeterminate permit with the right of the railway commission to fix rates and a lot of trading material."

"And the street car people are coming out with a lot more than they expected," he said. "It is admitted that this is a street car bill and that is what it is. The people of the Twin Cities are not asking for it and I do not believe that the people of the state are clamoring for the right to regulate the traction utilities of St. Paul and Minneapolis. I can see by the test vote that this bill is likely to pass but I cannot sit here and see my city and county crucified by such a legislative faux pas as this."

Senator Ole Sageng denounced the bill as approving of "a vicious system of financing public service corporations."

"By providing that the interest on bonds for public improvements and the bonds themselves shall be paid out of the earnings of the company, a means is given the utility of eating its cake and having it too," he declared. "I do not believe that this legislature should swallow a proposition of this kind."

Senator Guilford and Senator Callahan of Minneapolis made last appeals for the defeat of the measure and Senator Denegre of St. Paul again reiterated his faith in the bill, based upon the study and approval of the revamped bill by the St. Paul Association. It was after 5 o'clock when Senator Denegre ceased speaking and the Senators were calling for a vote, discouraging those who felt the urge of further oratory.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Bonniwell,	Erickson,	Lee,	Ribenack,
Callahan,	Guilford,	Millett,	Romberg,
Conroy,	Handlan,	Naplin,	Schmechel,
Devold,	Jackson,	Orr,	Swanson.
Dwyer,	Johnson,	Palmer,	



Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Cosgrove,	Hopp,	Sageng,
Anderson,	Cumming,	Kuntz,	Stepan,
Benson,	Denegre,	Larson,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Bessette,	Fowler,	Lindsley,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Blomgren,	Gandrud,	McGarry,	Turnham,
Boylan,	Gillam,	Nolan,	Van Hoven,
Brooks,	Gjerset,	Peterson,	Vibert,
Carley,	Gooding,	Putnam,	Ward,
Cashel,	Hall,	Rask,	Widell,
Cliff,	Hamer,	Reed,	Wold.
Coleman,	Hegnes,	Rockne,	

The vote on this amendment made it pretty plain that the Senate didn't want the people mussing up the plans of the Street Railway company.

The bill than passed 40 to 23.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Cliff,	Hamer,	Reed,
Anderson,	Coleman,	Hegnes,	Rockne,
Baldwin,	Cosgrove,	Hopp,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Benson,	Cumming,	Kuntz,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Bessette,	Denegre,	Lindsley,	Turnham,
Blomgren,	Fowler,	McGarry,	Van Hoven,
Boylan,	Gillam,	Nolan,	Vibert,
Brooks,	Gjerset,	Peterson,	Ward,
Carley,	Gooding,	Putnam,	Widell,
Cashel,	Hall,	Rask,	Wold.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bonniwell,	Gandrud,	Lee,	Romberg,
Callahan,	Guilford,	Millett,	Sageng,
Conroy,	Handlan,	Naplin,	Schmechel,
Devold,	Jackson,	Orr,	Stepan,
Dwyer,	Johnson,	Palmer,	Swanson,
Erickson,	Larson,	Ribenack,	

#### PROPAGANDA.

After this favorable action of the Senate a group of city bankers who were large holders of street railway stock and also heavily interested in the big city dailies, started a system of propaganda intended to influence house members in favor of the bill.

Post cards were printed and sent out to country bankers, merchants, elevator men and others all addressed to the state capitol, St. Paul, leaving blank spaces to be filled in: Below is a sample of the cards which were returned in large numbers, some, however, having the word NOT written in, "I am not in favor, etc."

March 14th, 1921.

I am in favor of placing local transportation companies under jurisdiction of the State Railroad and Warehouse Commission, as proposed in the Senate committee's substitute (S. F. 687) for the Brooks-Coleman bill now before the state legislature.

Name .....  
 Firm Chaska Flouring Mill Co.,  
 City Chaska, Minn.

### Woodmen Take a Hand.

In addition to this Edward F. Burns, state deputy of the Modern Woodmen of America, sent out to Woodmen lodges an urgent call to increase this membership.

On the back of this call was printed a circular letter addressed:

Esteemed Neighbor:

BRING THIS UP AT YOUR NEXT MEETING.

"Am I My Brother's Keeper"

Then follows a plea for the passage of the Brooks-Coleman bill, an analysis of the bill, and attached to the bottom the following form of resolution so perforated that it could be torn off and mailed to the representative:

To the Honorable Members of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Whereas, We, the members of.....Camp No.....of the Modern Woodmen of America, located at.....State of Minnesota, realizing that a large percentage of our membership in the Twin Cities are in the employ of the Street Railway Systems, and while we hold no brief for the Street Railway Companies, yet we feel that if the condition of the companies can be stabilized, the positions of these employes will be made more secure, and

Whereas, This great Society, representing the common people of this country, stands firmly for whatever affects the home life of its members, and

Whereas, We feel that the passage of the below mentioned legislation will assure the employe both as to the permanency of his position and the amount of his wage, and also work to the great advantage of the municipality by taking the question out of politics and placing its final adjudication in the hands of unbiased experts, to-wit: the State Railroad and Warehouse Commission and the State Legislature,

Therefore, Be It Resolved, That we respectfully urge our representative and senator to use every honorable means to assist in the passage of what is termed the substitute bill for the Brooks-Coleman bill, which bill places the street railways of the state under the jurisdiction of the Railroad and Warehouse Commission, together with the state legislature.

Adopted in adjourned session this.....day of March, 1921.

Respectfully submitted,

..... Consul  
or

..... Clerk

Other letters came in to members from country bankers urging passage by the House. Letters from people who could have no knowledge of the city conditions or the contracts that the cities had with the Street Railway company.

### Rise in Street Railway Stocks.

As it gradually began to look more favorable for the passage of the bill in the House, the stock of the company rapidly rose in value from 36½ to 55, and then dropped back to about 45. Much stock changed hands.

All sorts of rumors were afloat to the effect that members of the legislature had bought heavily of the stock.

When the stock dropped back to 45, the St. Paul News announced that thousands of dollars had been lost by legislators who had plunged.

The Daily Star published a story to the effect that one member of the House had approached Representative Welch with an offer of a big campaign fund for the Non-Partisan League, if the League members would swing into line for the bill.

This charge caused considerable of a tempest among certain House members and a long investigation by the Rules committee of both Mr. Welch and the Star, but they found out nothing of consequence. Their report censured Welch and the Star.

#### Norton to the Rescue.

After the House committee on Public Utilities had held several hearings on the bill, Representative Norton drew an "entirely new bill" and offered it as an amendment to the Senate bill.

It was claimed that this "new bill" amply protected all the rights of the cities, but Representative Lightner denounced it as giving the company three-fourths of all that the original Brooks-Coleman bill had contained, and declared that they would come back next session and get the rest.

Wednesday, April 13th, this new bill came up on special order in the House and was debated till nearly 6 o'clock.

A fierce fight was made by Lauderdale, Miner, Neller-moe, Child, Lightner, Wright and Barnard to amend the bill for the greater protection of the people of the cities, but they were all strenuously opposed by Norton. None of any consequence were adopted except one by Child providing that the company should not be paid for tracks, etc., ordered removed by the city, and one by Lauderdale limiting indebtedness to 85 per cent of the value of the property.

The most important amendment was offered by Bernard of Duluth and provided that the bill should not go into effect in any city until it should be adopted by vote of the people.

Norton strenuously opposed this on the ground that the people could not pass intelligently on a matter of this kind.

The roll call on this amendment furnishes a pretty good test.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	DeLury,	Keller,	Olson, L. E.,
Arens,	Enstrom,	Kleffman,	Olson, Lars,
Baxter,	Flahaven,	Kozlak,	Pedersen,
Bendixen,	Gartner,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,
Bensen,	Gislason, C.M.,	Lauderdale,	Samec,
Bernard,	Gislason, J.B.,	Lennon,	Scribner,
Brown,	Goodwin,	Lightner,	Shanks,
Burdorf,	Gran,	Lockhart,	Sluke,
Carlson,	Grant,	Miner,	Spelbrink,
Child,	Hemstad,	Moen,	Spindler,
Cullum,	Hompe,	Nellermoe,	Stahlke,
Darby,	Iyerson,	Nelson,	Stein,
Day,	Jacobson,	Nordlin,	Strand,

Swanstrom,	Swenson, E.,	Thorkelson,	Welch,
Sweitzer,	Teigen,	Walworth,	Wright.
Swenson, C. J.,			

Those who voted in the negative were:

Briggs,	Grove,	Miller,	Rako,
Cameron,	Herried,	Murphy,	Risse,
Christensen, A.	Hinds,	Neuman,	Rodenberg,
Chrisianson, T.	Hitchcock,	Nimocks,	Ross,
Conley,	Holmquist,	Nollet,	Selvig,
Cummings,	Howard,	Norby,	Serline,
Curtis,	Hulbert,	Nordgren,	Shonyo,
Dilley,	Johnson,	Norton,	Swenson, O. A.,
Dorweiler,	Kelly,	O'Keefe,	Taylor,
Eaton,	Lee,	Olsen, J. W.,	Thomas,
Enger,	Levin,	Oren,	Trowbridge,
Flaherty,	Long,	Parker,	Warner,
Gerlich,	McGivern,	Pattison,	Washburn,
Girling,	McLaughlin,	Perry, T.,	West,
Goodspeed,	McPartlin,	Praxel,	Wicker,
Green, F. A.,	Melbye,	Putnam,	Wilkinson,

Four did not vote, Greene, T. J. Haugland, Thompson, Speaker Nolan. Nolan was presiding. The others had been excused.

The discussion on this amendment went to the root of the whole matter. Bernard declared he could see no excuse for voting against it. "Here is a chance," he said, "for those who represent the people to assert themselves."

Representative Pattison said the street car problem is one that never can be solved in city politics. Norton said the effect of the proposed change "would be to rob the bill of all its good features." Representative Lightner insisted that the "amendment would make the bill a better one." George W. Grant asserted the proposed change was "fair and reasonable."

Representative Levin pointed out that a bill like the one under discussion, involving so many technical questions, was too technical for the average voter, who would not take the time to study it, to pass on it intelligently.

Representative Levin inquired of Lightner whether the latter does not represent the "wealthiest district in the state." Lightner represents the Seventh ward, St. Paul. Lightner retorted that the majority in his district is against the bill and the verbal wrath of Representatives Kozlak and Nellermoe descended on Levin, much to the amusement of the house.

#### Close Vote Results.

So close was the result of the vote on this amendment that the roll call consumed more than ten minutes while members crowded about the House floor in hurried conferences.

"Members ought to keep their seats and not lobby for either side," Representative Child told the House, "while this vote is being recorded."

Representative Lauderdale again essayed an amendment to substitute city councils for the state commission throughout the major portion of the bill. His proposal was killed 63 to 40.

After Miner and Wright had failed to secure any amendments, Nellermoe proposed an amendment to permit school children under 12 years old to ride free and school children between the ages of 12 and 17 to ride for half fare. A chorus of "No" silenced that attempt.

Next Nellermoe attempted to insert a provision in the bill which would have guaranteed city councils the right to issue franchises to passenger carrying agencies other than street car companies. Norton pointed out that this right was not interfered with in the bill, which applied only to street car companies. This attempt also ended in failure.

Lightner then made one of the most powerful speeches of the entire session in opposition. He marshalled his facts and arguments in forceful fashion and riddled the bill from start to finish. He declared that this bill was giving the company three-fourths of all it asked at first in the Brooks-Coleman bill, and that they would come back next session after the rest.

The work of the powerful lobby had been done too effectively. Lightner's logic fell on tired brains, and his brilliant thrusts made little impression.

Everything had been nicely taken care of and the bill finally passed 69 to 57.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Briggs,	Grant,	Murphy,	Ross,
Brown,	Green, F. A.,	Neuman,	Selvig,
Cameron,	Grove,	Nimocks,	Serline,
Christensen, A.	Herried,	Nollet,	Shanks,
Christianson, T.	Hinds,	Norby,	Shonyo,
Conley,	Hitchcock,	Nordgren,	Swenson, O. A.,
Cummings,	Holmquist,	Norton,	Taylor,
Curtis,	Howard,	O'Keefe,	Thomas,
Darby,	Hulbert,	Olsen, J. W.,	Trowbridge,
Dilley,	Johnson,	Oren,	Warner,
Dorweiler,	Kelly,	Parker,	Washburn,
Eaton,	Lee,	Pattison,	West,
Enger,	Levin,	Perry, J. T.,	Wicker,
Flaherty,	Long,	Perry, T.,	Wilkinson,
Gerlich,	McGivern,	Praxel,	Mr. Speaker.
Girling,	McLaughlin,	Rako,	
Goodspeed,	McPartlin,	Risse,	
Gran,	Miller,	Rodenberg,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Cullum,	Hemstad,	Lennon,
Arens,	Day,	Hompe,	Lightner,
Baxter,	DeLury,	Iverson,	Lockhart,
Bendixen,	Enstrom,	Jacobson,	Melbye,
Bensen,	Flahaven,	Keller,	Miner,
Bernard,	Gartner,	Kleffman,	Moen,
Carlson,	Gislason, C. M.,	Kozlak,	Nellermoe,
Child,	Gislason, J. B.,	Lagersen,	Nelson,
Burdorf,	Goodwin,	Lauderdale,	Nordlin,

Olson, L. E.,	Swanstrom,	Putnam,	Walworth,
Olson, Lars,	Sweitzer,	Samec,	Welch,
Pedersen,	Swenson, C.J.,	Scribner,	Wright,
Stahlke,	Swenson, E.,	Sluke,	
Stein,	Teigen,	Spelbrink,	
Strand,	Thorkelson,	Spindler,	

T. J. Greene, Haugland and Thompson had been excused and were absent.

Haugland and Thompson were opposed to the bill, while Greene had been sick and unable to attend nearly all the session.

I am going to venture a prediction that this bill will not settle the question.

It is too much like the cost-plus scheme.

There is little inducement to economy or efficiency in management or operation.

The whole theory of farming out to corporations a large part of the public functions of a city is all wrong.

Every necessary public function should be performed by the city itself, street railways, gas, water, electricity, just as much as sewer, sidewalks, paving or any other part of the public streets.

This, I predict, will be the only final solution.

#### **No Public Service Corporations.**

Where a grant of franchise is necessary to get any service into private or corporate hands that is a sure indication that such service is a public business and should be so conducted.

This is not socialism. I am as far from being a socialist as any man in Minnesota.

This is the age-old rule, recognized from the earliest dawn of history to the present day, that the common path is a public affair not a private or corporate affair.

Whenever a city has taken over and operated its own public utilities, in almost every case, there has been a great saving in the cost of service.

The city of Duluth owns its own plant and is now selling gas at lower rates than any public utility corporation in the world. So say the Duluth papers. Extensions have been made, where needed, they are erecting their own building to save rent. The bonded indebtedness has been reduced \$97,900 in the past four years, and all this without increasing the price of gas during this period of excessive costs.

For many years the cities of Seattle, Cleveland and Winnipeg have owned and operated their own electric systems and in all three have furnished electricity to the city itself and to patrons at a maximum of 3 cents a kilowat hour for light and much lower for power.

The same is true of the Province of Ontario which now owns and operates the entire electric system of the Province, having recently taken over the last private concern.

The Province has operated this system for 10 years, and in 1920 it was serving 235 cities and intervening territory. It had reduced the price of electricity from 9 cents to 3 a kilowat hour and was the most successful enterprise

of its kind on the continent. It is now the greatest electric light and power plant in the world.

#### MUNICIPAL LIGHTING GROWING STEADILY.

There are now 2,318 electric light and power plants municipally owned and operated in the United States, according to the last report of the Census.

This shows the usual steady gain of municipal ownership. In 1902 there were only 815 municipal plants while 2,805 were privately owned and operated. At that time municipal plants were only 24 per cent of the whole number. Since then the municipal plants have steadily gained upon the private both in number and in percentage. In 1917 the municipal plants constituted 35.43 per cent of the whole.

From 1902 to 1917 privately-owned plants increased from 2,805 to 4,224 or about 80 per cent. But during the same period municipally-owned plants increased from 815 to 2,318 or 180 per cent, over twice as fast. The following shows the growth in the number of municipally-owned plants as compared to that of the privately-owned plants:

#### Growth of Municipally and Privately-Owned Electric Light Plants

Year	Municipal	Private	Total	Per Cent of Municipal Plants
1881	1	7	8	
1890	137	872	1,009	13.50
1895	386	1,690	2,076	18.50
1900	710	2,514	3,224	22.02
1905	988	3,074	4,064	24.30
1907	1,252	3,462	4,714	26.40
1912	1,567	3,659	5,221	30.00
1916	1,580	3,458	5,038	31.30
1917	2,318	4,224	6,542	35.43

Lincoln, Nebraska, made a net profit of \$11,235.41 on the commercial branch of its municipal light plant alone last year. And the branch has not cost the taxpayers a single cent.

Illustrations of this kind could be extended indefinitely.

#### Municipal Street Railways.

Outside of the United States street railways are usually owned and operated by the municipality. Here we have just fairly got started.

San Francisco has successfully operated a part of the street railway system for several years, and I recently clipped the following from an official document:

"The municipally-owned street car lines of St. Petersburg, Fla., have increased the wages of their employes 25 per cent recently, still keep the 5-cent fare, and are making a slight profit besides. St. Petersburg owns all of its public utilities except its ice plant and is going after that."

The venture of Seattle in the ownership and operation of its street railway system has not proved so successful, owing to the fact that the city paid about \$5,000,000 too much for the plant during the administration of the more or less notorious Ole Hanson.

### Advantages of Publicly Owned Street Railways.

Publicly owned street railways present many advantages over the system of private or corporate ownership.

First, the cost of putting in the system and making extensions can be assessed against the benefited lot owners, just as we now assess for sewers, water mains, sidewalks, paving, drainage systems in the country and many other things that are paid for by those who reap the benefit any way whether they are asked to pay for it or not.

This has sometimes been done under private ownership by a system of voluntary contributions by benefited lot owners, and the Federal Public Utilities Commission has recommended special assessments to meet the cost of extensions even under private ownership.

Paid for in this way a street railway system would be free from bonded indebtedness and watered stock on which interest must be paid. The fares and charges can thus be fixed to cover only cost of service and the patrons relieved of a large part of the burden they must now bear.

Second, politics. There has probably been no more corrupting influence in politics than private and corporate ownership of public utilities. They are always in politics and it is impossible that it should be otherwise. Under proper civil service rules, the publicly owned utility would be in politics no more than is the paving or the sewer department of a city.

Third, Efficiency and Economy. Efficiency in public service can be secured as soon as we get wise enough to adopt the system of John Leitch, of a minimum wage and bonus for efficiency and economy in service.

Leitch put his system into operation in many private manufacturing plants with most remarkable results. His book describing these cases is well worth reading.

It will not be many years before public service corporations will be a thing of the past, and the people will be getting cheaper and better service.

Just how far public service may be necessary will depend largely on the ease with which individual and co-operative effort can supply general needs.

In some of the range towns of Northern Minnesota school teachers find it impossible to secure suitable living quarters.

The legislature passed a bill empowering school boards to build homes for teachers, as a part of their public school system; but the Governor failed to sign the bill. It was a "pocket veto" but just as effective.

In many small cities the milk supply is inadequate and unsafe.

A bill was passed permitting cities to establish public plants to pasteurize and distribute milk, but here again the Governor interfered with a "pocket veto."

Would it be different if we stopped penalizing industry?

Would private and co-operative effort then supply the demand?



## CHAPTER VI.

## TAXATION.

It is now quite generally conceded that taxation is the most vital public question yet unsolved.

The fact that both House and Senate appointed commissions to study the subject and report to the next legislature is pretty good evidence.

The intricate and complicated, not to say stupid and criminal, system of federal taxation has forced most business and professional men to inquire whether it is not possible to simplify our tax systems.

May it not be that there really is such a thing as a system of "Natural Taxation?"

Nearly forty years ago one of the most eminent of New York lawyers, Thomas G. Shearman, published a book by that title, which was widely read at the time and very favorably considered.

Shearman was a personal friend of Henry George and quite agreed with him on the subject of taxation.

**The Ability Theory.**

There are still many good people who insist that folks should pay taxes in proportion to their ABILITY.

Do people pay for anything else according to their ability?

When you go to the store for a suit of clothes, a sack of flour, a bushel of potatoes, a dozen eggs or a pound of butter, is the price fixed according to your ability?

Does the storekeeper ask you how much you are worth, before he fixes the price of the stuff you buy?

Did you ever pay for a seat in the movies according to your ability?

Some lawyers, doctors and surgeons, it is true, sometimes fix their charges according to the wealth of their victims; but in all the ordinary affairs of life we pay for what we get, without any regard at all to our ability.

And I suspect we ought to pay for the benefits of government according to what we get—not according to our ability.

As a matter of fact, under our present system of taxation, or rather lack of system, the common run of people pay taxes in proportion to their POVERTY—not their wealth—not their ability—not according to the benefits they receive. That is one great reason why they are poor.

Can you make a railroad or other public service corporation pay any taxes?

NEVER. The more taxes you put upon them the higher rate they must charge, and their patrons pay it—they pay it and that is the end of it, unless they pay it as a part of the necessary expense of a productive business. In that case they pass it along to the consumer—the end man—who can't pass it any further.

Can you make a merchant, or manufacturer, or banker, or any other middle-man pay any taxes?

Yes, what he pays on the land he occupies; but not what is levied on his buildings or stock in trade; these he passes on to the consumer.

The higher money is taxed, the higher will interest be; and there is no power on earth that can change that economic law.

Of course you might catch monied men, as they did the Jews in the middle ages, and put them on the rack or in prison till they were willing to lend at low interest. But somehow we think we are more civilized than that now, so we tax them and the poor borrower pays the whole bill—taxes, interest, profits and all.

#### THE MEASURE OF THE BENEFITS OF GOVERNMENT.

All the benefits of government are accurately measured—not by any man-made statutes—but by a law of nature as irresistible as the law of gravitation.

What is that measure?

The measure is this:

The benefits of all good government are accurately reflected in the value of land.

Why is a lot in one part of a city worth five—ten—a hundred—a thousand times as much as the same sized lot in another part of the same city?

Everybody knows the answer.

Where the streets are improved—paved and curbed, with sidewalks, water, gas, sewer, street car service, etc., there lots will be high priced, provided only that these improvements have been put in where they were needed—where the people congregate and need them to use.

Build a new school house and lots go up in price.

Run a paved road through the country and the farms will sell for more money.

But good government is not the only thing that increases the price of land in the country or lots in the city.

Every child born into the world adds to the value of land.

Every self-supporting immigrant adds about \$1,000 to the land value of the city when he leaves his ship.

This, then, is the natural law:

The value of land is created and sustained by the presence of the people; by their civilization, by their intelligence; by the services their government renders; by everything that makes a place more desirable for a home or a business location.

It therefore follows that people should pay for the support of our common needs—not according to their wealth or their poverty—not according to their physical or mental ability; but according to the value of the land they possess.

Most farmers and city home owners—most workers of all kinds, whether in country or city—are now paying three or four times as much taxes as they would under this theory.

The big land grabbers—those who own our mines, forests, water power, wharf and dock sites, and downtown city lots—they pay less than they would.

So, also, do the owners of valuable unused farm lands, and those “who add field to field till there is no place” as the Biblical writer puts it—till there is no place for the landless farmer or worker.

### The Legislature of 1921.

Did the legislature of 1921 do anything to relieve this situation?

Yes, considerable; but not nearly so much as they might have done, had they been less timid.

### THE IRON ORE TAX BILLS.

I am here presenting a brief story of the struggle of the people of Minnesota to get more taxes out of the owners of her incomparably rich mineral lands.

The struggle has been long and fierce.

Much of the time there has been lack of wisdom on both sides.

We can learn by the failures of those who honestly tried, but knew not how.

There is a story to the effect that when iron was first discovered in Minnesota, Charlemagne Tower, who owned some of the ore land, appeared before the legislature of the state and urged that something be done to encourage the infant industry of mining the ore.

Mr. Tower's plan was to exempt iron ore land from all taxation of every description. There were to be no taxes on the ore land for state, county, township, city, village, schools, roads or any other purpose until such time as ore was mined. Then there was to be a small tax of 1 cent a ton to be paid into the state treasury. The local communities got nothing—for any purpose. The brilliant idea was that so long as the mine was not used it would cost nothing in taxes to hold on to it.

Just how this would encourage the industry of mining ore is not very plain, but the legislature fell for it and the governor did not veto the bill.

The tax of 1 cent a ton when the ore was mined was the noted and notorious "tonnage tax" which the steel trust and other ore interests have been "hollering" about so much for the past two years. They have been telling us that this "tonnage tax" worked so disastrously that it was soon repealed, and we are solemnly warned never to enact another!

### How It Worked.

It is indeed very true that this system worked disastrously, but it was not soon repealed. The owners of mineral lands opposed its repeal most desperately, and it remained on the statute books for 16 years.

During all those years the people in the iron country couldn't get a dollar of tax out of the millions of iron property for schools, roads or any other purpose. The situation became so scandalous that it attracted attention all over the country, and the present writer was commissioned by an eastern magazine to visit the iron country, make a careful survey and prepare an article on the subject: "What Is the Matter With Northern Minnesota?"

The first man in the iron country to whom I put the question made this reply:

"Matter! This is what is the matter: The iron land owners and the two ore-carrying roads have got possession of the earth and the rest of us are their slaves!"

### **Ruined Towns.**

A careful examination verified his statement. There wasn't a decent schoolhouse in the entire iron country; not a foot of pavement; no water or sewer systems; no gas or electricity; hardly a rod of sidewalk; and the roads from one mining town to the next were so rough and dangerous that one could almost be buried in the swamps if he got off the end of the uncovered corduroy. It was safer to walk than to drive and I did walk over many miles of the worst country roads that I have ever seen.

Yes, I walked and I saw—I saw the disastrous effects of exempting iron land owners from all taxation so long as they kept their mines closed. I saw villages deserted, homes destroyed, stores empty, a few slouchy denizens of the ruined towns still lingering on, hoping against hope for the times when the mines would reopen and there would be work again.

I saw all these things and my blood boiled. I suppose I described what I saw with some vigor and perhaps in rather lurid language.

The eastern magazine in which my summary was published had a very wide circulation. A copy fell into the hands of S. A. Stockwell of Minneapolis, who had been a member of the state legislature and who determined to contest the district again on the issue of repealing the "tonnage tax" law, so that automatically the mining lands would be listed for taxation and the people of the range country would be able to have schools and roads and other accessories of civilization.

### **Stockwell Elected.**

Stockwell was elected in spite of the handicap of running as a Democrat in a strong Republican district—elected by a good substantial majority—showing that the people will respond when appealed to in the name of justice and fair play.

This was in the fall of 1896.

Shortly after the election Mr. Stockwell sent a letter to each member of the coming legislature briefly stating the facts in the case of the people of northern Minnesota against the mine owners and asking their support for the repeal of the foolish and stupid statute.

Large numbers responded favorably.

Attorney General Child and State Auditor "Bob" Dunn both gave it as their opinion that this peculiar statute was never constitutional and that it could have been knocked out at any time if only someone had taken the case into the courts.

### **Lobbyists Flocked.**

However, it now seemed the easier way to have the special law repealed, so a bill was drawn repealing the old law and introduced into the senate; and now the real fight began. The mining companies and other iron land owners got especially busy. They maintained a powerful lobby at the state capitol from the early part of the session. Trainloads of people were induced to come to St. Paul from Duluth and the mining districts to protest against the very act of the legislature that would give them money to educate

their children and to make their towns and cities fit places for civilized people to live. It is easy to secure delegations to come to St. Paul to favor or object to legislation when their railway fare and hotel bills are paid. One senator from Duluth declared that if the bill were to pass, northern Minnesota would secede from the state and set up a separate government of their own. The country would be utterly ruined because all the mines would close and there would be nothing for the people to do to earn a living.

The crisis came on Thursday, March 4, 1897. The next day was Friday, a short session, and then came the week-end recess.

The mining lobby took the noon train for Duluth, feeling safe that nothing would happen till the next week, but you know what sometimes happens to the "best laid plans."

### **Bill Called Up.**

Scarcely had the train, loaded with the mining magnates and their lobbyists, pulled out of the St. Paul Union depot, when Senator James T. Wyman of Minneapolis rose from his seat and solemnly moved that "the rules be so far suspended that Senate File No. 421 (the repeal bill) be given its second and third reading and placed on its final passage."

Right then pandemonium broke loose. The senator from Duluth and others who stood with him were desperate. They fought bitterly, but Wyman won. Only 12 senators voted against suspending the rules, and then the bill was passed with just four negative votes—Spencer of Duluth, Fuller of Little Falls, Culkin of Wright county and Greer of Wabasha.

In a few moments the bill reached the House, whereupon Jacobson of Lac qui Parle moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill. His motion was carried without a single negative vote. Then Governor Clough attached his signature and the first great victory of the people against the mine owners was an accomplished fact.

This was nearly 24 years ago.

It was 17 years between my first and my next visit to the iron country. The transformation was wonderful, and still continues. The towns and cities have paved streets, sidewalks, sewers, water, gas and electricity; the country roads are the best in the state; the villages are connected by miles of sidewalks all well lighted. The school buildings are among the finest in the world and are equipped with every modern appliance for manual training, cooking, sewing and all the mechanical and domestic arts, while the great assembly rooms are high and well lighted and ventilated, and some, at least, beautifully decorated with paintings and statuary.

Such are some of the results of a simple change in the tax laws—a change that took for public use a small part of the common inheritance, all of which the public ought to have had.

In most of the mining districts the taxes are very low, only a few mills on the dollar of valuation as compared with taxes outside of the mining locations.

This is a strong reason why the state ought to get a considerable additional tax when the ore is taken out, and the only crop that nature will ever produce is gone forever.

### **The Next Move.**

Hardly had the first great victory of the people over the mine owners been won by the repeal of the old inadequate "tonnage tax" law, when there arose a demand for a new kind of tonnage tax. This time it was not proposed to tax the ore at a certain amount per ton in lieu of all other taxes, as had been the case with the old law, but in ADDITION to all other taxes.

The plan for an ADDITIONAL tax when the ore was taken out was based on the fact that iron ore is different from farm crops. The farm will raise a crop each year and will stay with us for purposes of taxation as well, just as long as people need food to eat and clothes to wear; but there will never be but one crop of iron ore. When that one crop is gone it is gone forever, and the value of the mine for purposes of taxation is also gone, never to return.

For these reasons the movement for a new "tonnage tax" gained rapid headway among the farmers of the state, and by 1907 R. H. Jefferson of Cottonwood county and H. O. Bjorge of Becker county were joint authors of a bill that would have given the state about a million dollars a year in additional taxes when the ore was mined. This bill was killed and Mr. Jefferson was punished at the next election; but Bjorge came back to the legislature of 1909 more determined than ever. His bill provided that for every ton of ore taken out of the ground a tax of from 2 to 5 cents should be paid into the state treasury.

### **Johnson's Veto.**

The steel trust and other mine owners made a most bitter fight but the bill finally passed the House, 60 to 57, and went through the senate, 38 to 24, and was then vetoed by Governor Johnson.

Mr. Bjorge came back to each legislature until 1919, and each time except 1915 he introduced and tried to pass a "tonnage tax" bill. All of his bills were of the same general character. They all provided for a tax on the gross value of the ore at the mouth of the mine.

It was this GROSS value principle in the bill that prevented it from gaining support in the cities. Gross earnings taxes were very popular at this time, and Mr. Bjorge and his fellow supporters of these gross value bills should not be condemned too severely for failing to see the serious objection and correct it. Indeed Mr. Bjorge in 1913 admitted to the present writer that the bill ought to be based on the NET or NATURAL value of the ore, but he declared it was a pretty difficult thing to frame a bill on those lines.

The objections to GROSS value bills are real and valid:

1. A gross value bill would tax all ore the same amount, if it were worth the same at the mouth of the mine, regardless of the fact that some ore might cost 10 cents a ton to produce and other ore \$5 a ton.

2. The gross value bill taxes the labor, capital and enterprise employed in the business of mining, as well as taxing the heritage value inherent in the ore. For this reason nearly all business men opposed the bill. It was a tax on business—a special tax on one particular business—the business of mining ore. And there would be no knowing how soon the principle would be extended to other lines of business like milling, manufacturing, handling grain or any other particular business. The grain and mill men were especially afraid of it, for there were many members of the legislature who were trying to impose special taxes on the handling of grain.

3. For the same reason, careful students of taxation opposed the bill, because, being a tax on labor and production, it would surely add to the cost of the finished product and be passed on to the consumer. Labor members from the cities were therefore against it.

4. In some cases such a gross value tax would amount to more than the entire profit of mining. The plea was valid that those mines that were running on a close margin of profit would inevitably have to close. One mine producing high-grade ore was operated for four years at a constant loss, and closed down permanently. It has not opened since. A gross value tax would have closed it sooner. It was shown that another mine would have paid three times as much taxes under a 2 per cent gross value bill as all its profits amounted to.

It was considerations such as these that killed the 1917 bill in the Senate after it had passed the House by a vote of 69 to 61.

It was this line of argument that in 1919 induced Mr. Bendixen to withdraw his gross value bill and have it redrawn on the principle of taxing NET or NATURAL value of the ore.

#### Net Value Bill.

The first NET value bill was drawn by W. G. Roylance, legislative expert of the Non-Partisan League; in consultation with the present writer, who has always insisted that only a net value bill would be fair to all mine owners. If there were no net value in the ore, there would be no tax; if the net or natural value were small the tax would be small; if the net value were great, as in some mines, the tax would be heavy; and these are the mines that could stand a heavy tax.

Mr. Roylance, among other qualifications, was a mining expert and student of taxation. He quickly saw the necessity of basing the tax on the net or natural value of the ore. His bill was introduced into the House by Mr. Welch, but failed to pass, lacking two votes of getting the required 66. There were only 61 votes cast against it. This bill would undoubtedly have passed had it not been for the fact that it was dubbed a "Non-Partisan League" bill and many members were bitterly hostile to anything that had that label. Another objection to this bill was raised by some because it did not specifically direct the tax commission how to determine the NET value on which to base the tax.

At the extra session of 1919 Mr. Welch introduced his bill again. Mr. Bendixen also introduced his "net value" bill. This bill came up first and passed the House by a vote of 101 to 22. It later passed the Senate, 38 to 28, and was vetoed by Governor Burnquist.

#### **Burnquist Muddled.**

It is an interesting and rather amusing fact that the objections to this bill raised by the governor in his veto message can none of them be found in the bill as it passed. All these objections would have been valid against the GROSS value bill, but that bill had been abandoned by Mr. Bendixen in the general session in the winter, and the bill that passed at the extra session contained none of those objections.

It did, however, contain one serious objection. Royalty paid by a mining company to a mineral land owner for permission to remove ore was not deducted as an expense of mining.

This is especially desirable, as a bill to tax royalties received by landowners was introduced as a companion bill, and the royalty certainly should not be taxed against both the landowner and the operating company.

The Bendixen bill had one important advantage over the Welch bill; it gave the tax commission specific directions how to arrive at the net value of the ore as the basis of taxation. Mr. Roylance, who drafted the Welch net value bill, recommended that such specific directions be embodied in any bill that might be introduced.

Such, in brief, is the history of the movement for the proper taxation of Minnesota's iron land owners—most of whom are not even residents of the state. But suppose they were? What difference does it make to the plain people of Minnesota whether they are robbed by residents or outsiders?

I believed that the business men would be practically a unit for the taxation of both the royalties collected by such mineral land owners as preferred to lease out their mines; and secondly, an equal tax on the net or natural value of the ore taken out by the operating companies.

This belief was later fully verified; for when the matter was fairly presented to the heads of the leading business houses, wholesale, retail, jobbing, manufacturing, etc., they responded almost to a man.

I prepared bills providing for a tax of 10 per cent on both royalties and net value of ores and submitted them to thousands of leading business men.

They not only gave their approval, but furnished the money to meet all necessary expenses.

Petitions were circulated favoring a "tax of at least 10 per cent on the royalties and net profits of those who own and exploit our great iron ore deposits."

These petitions were signed by nearly every business house in Northfield, Faribault, Winona, every town and village in Le Sueur county, Mankato and St. Cloud, while practically every leading business house in Minneapolis, St. Paul,



Rochester, New Ulm, St. Peter, Alexandria, Sauk Center and other places contributed to the expense of the work which lasted nearly a year and a half.

All political parties declared for the passage of bills taxing iron ore.

The Non-Partisan League and the Working People's Non-Partisan Political League made this their leading issue, and their candidates proclaimed the doctrine at every meeting.

Mr. Hodgson, as Democratic candidate for governor, made the issue a vital part of his campaign.

The Republican elimination convention declared for a "fair and equitable tonnage tax," and Mr. Preus carefully examined the bills which I had prepared and approved them.

The Minneapolis Saturday Lunch Club put the question of a tax of at least 10 per cent up to every candidate in Hennepin county and received favorable replies from the following who were elected: Kozlak, Olson, Child, Nimocks, Washburn, West, Miner, Nellerroe, Lauderdale, Swenson and Girling. Hulbert, Nolan and Lennon had voted for the 5 per cent bill at the extra session and Hulbert had voted for the 10 per cent bill at the general session. Norton and Howard (who had voted against all bills in both 1919 sessions) and Cameron and Eaton made no reply to the Lunch Club's questions.

Mr. Preus was elected governor and fully 100 members of the House were elected pledged to vote affirmatively.

Speaker Nolan appointed a tax committee which was expected to be two to one for iron ore taxation.

Gov. Preus, in his message to the legislature, urged the passage of a fair and equitable bill and declared he would sign it.

#### SIX BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. Bendixen introduced a bill providing for a tax of 8 per cent to be "in lieu of all state taxes on iron ore and other ores."

This would have exempted all unused mines and all unmined ores in used mines from the state ad valorem tax and would have lost to the state about \$1,600,000 annually, besides being of doubtful constitutionality.

Mr. Welch then introduced the 10 per cent bill. This tax would be in lieu only of the state ad valorem tax on such ore as was subjected to the 10 per cent tax, and would be more likely to be sustained by the courts.

Mr. Trowbridge came forward with a bill putting a tax on iron ore, stone, gravel, sand, clay, peat, and any other resource when the same should be severed from its natural bed.

Mr. Warner presented a constitutional amendment, so as to clear up the question of the power of the legislature to impose such taxes.

Mr. Parker introduced his 5 per cent tax on mining royalties which had passed the House in 1919 by a vote of 92 to 25 and been lost in the Senate by one vote.

And finally Mr. Wilkinson put in a bill to double the state tax on iron ore, leaving the local taxes the same as at present.

## THE TAX COMMITTEE AND ITS WORK.

The tax committee now began to consider all these bills.

The attorney general was asked for an opinion as to constitutionality and reported that he believed the state had the power to levy an "occupation" tax on the business of mining ore.

This raised a new question. An occupation tax does not look good to business and professional men, and justly so.

It was contended that the bill favored by the attorney general, while labelled an **occupation** tax, yet eliminated practically every process of the real occupation, or business, of mining ore from the operation of the tax and left only the **net** or **natural** value of the ore as the basis of the tax, and was therefore in reality a tax on that part of the value of mined ore, in lieu of the state ad valorem tax which would have been paid if the ore had remained unmined.

When it came to fixing the rate of taxation the committee was greatly divided. Some who had voted for a tax of 10 per cent in 1919 now favored a rate as low as 5 per cent. Others favored 6 per cent, 7 per cent or 8 per cent. Only two, Welch and Nordlin, stood out for the tax of 10 per cent.

The following table shows the way each member of the committee had previously voted (All but Washburn had been members in 1919) and how they voted in committee:

	Welch 10% bill in 1919	Bendixen 5% bill Extra Session 1919	10% Rate for 1921	8% Rate for 1921	6% Rate for 1921
Wicker, chairman	yes	yes	no	no	yes
Bendixen .....	yes	yes	no	no	yes
Briggs .....	no	yes	no	no	no
Cullum .....	no	no	no	no	no
Dilley .....	no	no	no	no	no
Emmons .....	yes	yes	absent sick		
Haugland .....	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Jacobson .....	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Lennon .....	no	yes	absent		
McGivern .....	yes	yes	no	no	no
Murphy .....	no	no	no	no	no
Neuman .....	yes	yes	no	no	yes
Nimocks .....	no	absent			no
Nordlin .....	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Perry, T. ....	no	no	absent sick		
Putnam .....	no	yes	no	no	yes
Serline .....	yes	yes	no	no	yes
Warner .....	no	no	no	no	no
Washburn .....	not a member		not voting		
Welch .....	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

This bill was a special order on March 10th.

Neuman and Dorweiler offered an amendment to strike out the words "an occupation" leaving the bill simply a tax on those engaged in mining ore.

Only 11 voted for this amendment:

Cameron,	Dorweiler,	Lightner,	Sweitzer,
Child,	Goodspeed,	Miller,	Washburn.
Dilley,	Kozlak,	Neuman,	

Neuman had strongly urged against the use of the word "occupation," claiming that it created a wrong impression and that it was not necessary to the constitutionality of the bill. He had been supported by Wilkinson, Washburn and others.

"In all fairness to the man who must defend this law in the courts, let us leave it as it is," said Nordlin of St. Paul, and the Non-Partisan League and Labor forces stood with him.

Mr. Welch then attempted to increase the rate of taxation to be 10 per cent. He showed petitions from business men of Rice and Le Sueur counties, Winona, Mankato and St. Cloud asking for not less than 10 per cent, but he could get only 33 votes:

Anderson,	Gislason, C.M.,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Arens,	Gran,	Nordlin,	Stein,
Bensen,	Hemstad,	Olson, L. E.,	Thorkelson,
Brown,	Iverson,	Olson, Lars,	Walworth,
Burdorf,	Keller,	Pattison,	Welch,
Day,	Kelly,	Samec,	Wright.
Enstrom,	Kozlak,	Sluke,	
Flahaven,	Miner,	Spelbrink,	
Gartner,	Nellermoe,	Spindler,	

These are all Non-Partisans except Gran, Kelly, Pattison and Wright.

Mr. Spindler then tried to raise the rate to 8 per cent and secured 32 votes. He lost the votes of Gartner, Gran, Keller and Pattison, and gained Goodwin, Moen and Teigen.

Then the oratory began and lasted for three hours. Wicker briefly explained the bill and Bendixen made a long speech in its defense.

Hitchcock made a remarkably brilliant speech in opposition, which forcibly reminded me of the speech in Congress that brought out the famous retort of Senator Conkling of New York. "The shallows murmur while the deeps are dumb."

Eaton declared the bill in its present form to be unconstitutional. Occupation taxes, penalties and licenses can only be invoked under the police power, and this bill will not come under that power.

Murphy then took the floor and drew a dark picture of the dire desolation that would enshroud all northern Minnesota if this bill should pass.

It forcibly recalled the scenes in the state Senate twenty-four years ago, when the senator from Duluth drew the same dark picture if the bill should pass giving the people of the iron range towns power to tax the mineral land for schools and other local purposes.

The bill passed then and the dire results did not follow, and since that time people have doubted whether the iron country is not better fitted to produce profits than to raise prophets.

On final passage the vote stood 101 to 25.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Goodspeed,	Miner,	Sluke,
Arens,	Gran,	Moen,	Spelbrink,
Baxter,	Grant,	Nellermoe,	Spindler,
Bendixen,	Green, F. A.,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Bensen,	Grove,	Neuman,	Stein,
Brown,	Haugland,	Norby,	Strand,
Burdorf,	Hemstad,	Nordgren,	Swanstrom,
Carlson,	Hinds,	Nordlin,	Sweitzer,
Child,	Holmquist,	O'Keefe,	Swenson, C. J.,
Christensen, A.	Hompe,	Olsen, J. W.,	Swenson, E.,
Christianson, T.	Hulbert,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson, O. A.,
Conley,	Iverson,	Olson, Lars,	Taylor,
Curtis,	Jacobson,	Oren,	Teigen,
Darby,	Johnson,	Parker,	Thompson,
Day,	Keller,	Pattison,	Thorkelson,
DeLury,	Kelly,	Perry, J. T.,	Trowbridge,
Dorweiler,	Kozlak,	Praxel,	Walworth,
Emmons,	Lagersen,	Putnam,	Warner,
Enger,	Lauderdale,	Risse,	Welch,
Enstrom,	Lee,	Rodenberg,	Wicker,
Flahaven,	Lennon,	Ross,	Wilkinson,
Flaherty,	Levin,	Samec,	Wright,
Gerlich,	McGivern,	Selvig,	Mr. Speaker.
Girling,	McLaughlin,	Serline,	
Gislason, C. M.,	Melbye,	Shanks,	
Gislason, J. B.,	Miller,	Shonyo,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bernard,	Goodwin,	Long,	Rako,
Briggs,	Herried,	McPartlin,	Scribner,
Cameron,	Hitchcock,	Murphy,	Thomas,
Cullum,	Howard,	Nollet,	Washburn.
Dilley,	Kleffman,	Norton,	
Eaton,	Lightner,	Pedersen,	
Gartner,	Lockhart,	Perry, T.,	

Five did not vote: Cummings, Greene, T. J., Nimocks, Robinson and West. Greene, Nimocks, Robinson and West were sick. Cummings had been present during the day.

Eight of the opponents declared their opposition was not against the principle of heavier taxes on iron ore, but against the "occupation" tax.

This leaves only about 14 uncompromising opponents, nearly all from the iron country.

As soon as this bill had passed the house, the effect of the word "occupation" began to show itself more and more.

The opponents of iron ore taxation got exceedingly busy.

They sent their emissaries thru the southern part of the state holding meetings and arousing opposition.

Members of the senate began to receive circular letters protesting against "occupation" taxes, tho it was very plain

that the writers had neither studied the bill they were objecting to nor had they made any investigation of the legal aspects of the case. These letters were all alike and seemed to have all come from some central source.

It was mostly hysteria and this hysteria was greatly intensified when Mr. McPartlin introduced his bill to tax all occupations except common laborers and farmers, under ten different classes.

The tax committee reported his bill for indefinite postponement, and McPartlin made a long and impassioned speech to save it. He declared "If this bill passes there will be no need of one cent of tax on the farm lands of this state." (Nice thing for the vacant farm land speculators, wouldn't it?)

Parker declared Mr. McPartlin's speech "the biggest and poorest bluff since the days of the gentleman from Chippewa." "Shall we be scared out of our boots? The legislature has the power now to levy occupation taxes. It always has had the power. Has that power been used injuriously? Now when we propose to tax those who are depleting our iron ore, this false issue is raised. There is no need of all this excitement. It is all done for a purpose."

33 voted to save the McPartlin bill from indefinite postponement and give it a chance to be considered on its merits. Most of the 33 would probably vote against it on final passage.

#### THE SENATE TAX COMMITTEE.

The enemies of iron ore taxation did surely win a victory at the meeting of the senate tax committee Friday afternoon, April 1st.

This committee is composed of 15 members, ten of whom voted for the ore tax bill passed by the extra session of 1919.

Out of this group of ten two were in the building but did not attend the meeting of the committee. Orr of St. Paul and Hamer of Milaca.

Four members of the committee,—Adams, McGarry, Swanson and Vibert, are from the Northeast corner of the state and have always opposed any additional taxation of iron ore.

Fowler of Minneapolis has also been opposed to such taxation; but many supposed he would favor it now because of the declaration of the Republican party for a "fair and equitable tonnage tax."

As the bill came from the house it was, in all essentials, the same bill that was passed at the extra session, except that it was named

"An Occupation Tax."

Senator Nolan moved to strike out the words "an occupation" leaving the bill to provide for a tax of 6 per cent on the net, or natural value of the ore.

The bill provided for subtracting as far as possible, the cost of conducting the occupation of mining, leaving the tax to be levied only on that part of the value of the mined ore which was due to its natural location or quality.

It was generally agreed that the bill would get several more votes in the senate if the objectionable word "occupation" were stricken out.

It was also the opinion of some of the best lawyers of the Senate that the word did no good in the bill from a legal and constitutional point of view, but that it did subject the bill to unwarranted criticism from those who gave it little study.

These were the reasons for Nolan's motion to strike out the word "occupation"

#### **Adams to the Rescue of the Ore Men.**

Now come the brilliant tactics of Senator Adams of Duluth. He made a long and earnest speech against cutting out the word.

Of course it was expected that the enemies of the bill would vote to keep it as bad as possible. They didn't want it to gain votes; and Fowler could join with them, as he had always opposed iron ore taxes; but what about professed friends of the bill—Anderson, Baldwin and Hall—who joined with the enemies to defeat the Nolan amendment, and then voted to report the bill for passage?

#### **Final Passage.**

When the bill came up for final passage on the afternoon of Thursday, April 7th, Nolan again tried to take the word "occupation" out of the bill, but was opposed by Senator Carley and many friends of the bill who insisted that the Attorney General's wish should be heeded.

Coleman was the only senator who voted to cut out the objectionable word and then voted "no" on the bill.

#### **Carley's Great Speech.**

Senator Carley now took the floor and made a most logical and powerful speech in favor of the bill.

The bill was more fair even than the one this same senate had passed at the extra session of 1919.

The ore companies are taking out 38 to 44 million tons a year.

It is gone forever.

Neither the state nor the local communities will ever get another dollar of tax out of it.

96 per cent of this ore is owned by less than 20 big corporations; and only about 4 per cent is owned by the small men.

These corporations are making enormous profits on this ore.

In 1918 a profit of more than \$68,532,000 and only a little less in 1919 and 1920.

It is this profit that this bill taxes, and this new tax is small indeed only about equal to what the companies would pay in ad valorem taxes in 2 or 3 years if they were to leave the ore unmined.

It is nonsense to say that this tax will drive these corporations out of business when the enormously greater taxes paid to the federal government on their excess profits and their incomes have had no such results.

Mr. Carley also showed that there has been a vast volume of ore that has not been reached at all by the ad valorem taxes.

The following table shows this:

	Tons Taxed 1909	Mined and Shipped	Still left 1919	Amount Escaping Taxation
Steel Corporation	247,228,000	89,764,000	289,000,000	126,536,000
Pickens Matter ..	14,509,000	9,000,000	12,000,000	6,491,000
8 other companies	99,000,000	33,000,000	88,000,000	22,000,000
3 small companies	8,000,000	9,000,000	6,000,000	7,000,000
Total .....	368,737,000	140,764,000	395,000,000	162,027,000

George Sullivan made a long rambling speech against the bill, pleading for more time for study. Nobody really knows anything about this question. This occupation tax opens "Pandora's Box." The Republican party declared for a fair and equitable "Tonnage Tax" to save themselves from the rising tide of Bolshevism. They don't need to pass this bill now they have won.

Johnson made fun of Sullivan to the great enjoyment of the entire Senate.

Gjerset: "This is really the same bill in every essential particular as the one passed by this Senate in 1919.

The tax takes only a part of the net profit, and that once for all. The ore will never be here to tax again.

I don't care what you name it. The court will decide from the internal evidence of the act."

McGarry told a harrowing tale of the hardships of the early pioneers and explorers who found ore; but forgot to say that about all of these had been swallowed up long ago by the steel trust who were now reaping the profits of their pioneering.

The bill passed 38 to 27.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Gandrud,	Kuntz,	Rask,
Baldwin,	Gillam,	Lee,	Rockne,
Benson,	Gjerset,	Lindsley,	Romberg,
Blomgren,	Gooding,	Loonam,	Sageng,
Bonniwell,	Hall,	Millett,	Schmechel,
Carley,	Hamer,	Naplin,	Stepan,
Cashel,	Hopp,	Nolan,	Ward,
Cliff,	Jackson,	Orr,	Wold,
Cumming,	Johnson,	Peterson,	
Devold,	Kingsbury,	Putnam,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Cosgrove,	Hegnes,	Swanson,
Bessette,	Denegre,	Larson,	Turnham,
Boylan,	Dwyer,	McGarry,	Van Hoven,
Brooks,	Erickson,	Palmer,	Vibert,
Callahan,	Fowler,	Reed,	Widell,
Coleman,	Guilford,	Ribenack,	
Conroy,	Handlan,	Sullivan, G. H.,	

On the first roll call Anderson of Freeborn voted no while Kingsbury and Putnam did not vote.

Baldwin was out of the room, but voted "aye" as soon as he came in.

This made 35 votes—one more than enough to pass the bill.

Anderson then changed his vote to "aye" and Kingsbury and Putnam voted "aye."

Madigan was absent. He had been in the hospital for several weeks and could not be brought to the Senate to vote yes.

Kingsbury was the only senator who changed from no to yes since 1919. He had been presented with a petition favoring the tax signed by nearly every business man of Winona.

There were several others who had declared that they would vote for a tonnage tax bill, but who were probably driven away by the word "occupation."

Only one Hennepin Co. senator and only two from St. Paul voted yes, despite the fact that nearly every leading business man of both cities is on record favoring additional taxation of the enormous profits of the ore companies.

### CLAMPING DOWN THE LID.

As soon as this bill had been signed by the Governor, some things began to happen that shed much light on some dark places.

It had caused some wonder why the steel trust and the other big owners of rich mines had taken no part in the opposition; leaving all that to the small owners and the exploiters of low grade ores who would hardly be touched by the law just enacted.

The tax commission in their report and the Governor in his message had urged a reduction of ad valorem taxes if a "tonnage tax" should be adopted.

The legislature had not heeded this recommendation.

At 5 o'clock on the afternoon of April 14th, a bill was introduced by 24 leading members of the majority faction of the House providing for drastic reductions in the local taxes of the range towns.

These taxes are almost wholly derived from iron ore.

This bill was introduced by Messrs, Warner, Parker, Wicker, Nolan, Girling, Swenson, O. A., Child, Neuman, Briggs, Serline, Levin, Putnam, Kelly, Hulbert, Grant, Gislason, J. B., Curtis, Teigen, Lagersen, Nordgren, Enger, Johnson, Eaton and Nimocks, and was entitled H. F. No. 1178, A bill for an act to limit the annual levy of taxes in all cities, villages and school districts in the State of Minnesota.

Warner attempted to pass the bill immediately under suspension of the rules by unanimous consent.

Failing in this, the bill went to the tax committee, and was reported back at 7 o'clock for passage, tho no quorum of that committee was present at the meeting.

Next morning when this report came in, members from the range towns made vigorous protest, insisting on giving their people a chance for a public hearing. After considerable wrangling it was decided to hold a public hearing Saturday evening, April 16th.

The protest was most vigorous and the hearing lasted till midnight.



The mayors of Hibbing, Chisholm and Virginia defended their towns from the charge of extravagance by showing how vitally different were their local problems from those of the ordinary city which grows up with a slow and steady progress over a long period of years.

Up to eight years ago we had no city improvements at all—no sewer, no pavements, no water systems, very poor schools.

The mining companies controlled the towns and refused to incur the expense.

When the people got control all these things had to be done at once, and in some towns the public works had to be built two or three times over, due to the mining companies cutting out a water supply, destroying a sewer system, removing a road, or even moving an entire village, as in the case of Eveleth and Hibbing, both of which had been torn up and moved so the ore could be taken out.

Our educational problems are far different from yours. We have more than twenty-five different nationalities, who come to us not even able to speak English. The mining companies bring them, but we must provide for their education, for the education of adults as well as children.

In one town 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent of the entire population have been enrolled in the day and evening schools.

These foreigners have large families, averaging more than twice as many children as the ordinary American family in other cities.

Of course our expenses are heavy and we are forced to raise very large amounts of money; but our taxes average the lowest on the dollar of valuation of any cities in the state; and the number of mills on the dollar is the true and fair measure of the burden of taxation, not the total of what we raise nor the per capita amount of what we must spend.

We don't issue bonds as you do; we can't—we pay as we go retiring our temporary bond issues in two years.

We can't assess abutting and benefited property, as you do, for our permanent street improvements.

It all must come out of general taxes, and it greatly increases our per capita of expense as a matter of course; and still, let me emphasize again, our taxes are the lowest in the entire state, when fairly and properly measured.

Can't you trust us to manage our own affairs?

Are the mining companies so weak and innocent, are they so poor and ignorant and unsophisticated, that the state must come to their rescue with this new plan of restriction?

When, in all the history of the state has any community, or group of communities, been restricted by any per capita system of limitation?

Can't the legislature leave us to manage our local affairs in our own way like every other local community?

And especially why this mad rush, at the very end of the session, giving us only about one day in which to prepare our defense against these wholly unjust charges of graft and extravagance?

If this bill passes, you will ruin our towns and our schools, and who will get the benefit? No one but the iron interests. They would save many millions a year, far more than enough to pay the "tonnage tax," and the rest of the state would not get a dollar of it.

On Monday, April 18th, the House devoted nearly the entire day to the bill.

At first the fight centered around making it a special order, for in no other way could it be brought to a final vote.

On roll call only 64 voted aye and it required 66. Then Dilley insisted that Trowbridge be required to vote. He voted "aye."

One more vote was needed.

J. W. Olson and C. H. Warner consulted and Olson changed from no to aye.

Hinds, Rako and Praxel changed from no to aye and the record finally looked like this; 69 ayes, 53 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	Girling,	Levin,	Ross,
Bendixen,	Gislason, J. B.	Lightner,	Selvig,
Bernard,	Goodspeed,	Melbye,	Serline,
Briggs,	Gran,	Miller,	Shanks,
Brown,	Grant,	Moen,	Swanstrom,
Cameron,	Green, F. A.,	Neuman,	Swenson, O. A.,
Child,	Grove,	Nimocks,	Taylor,
Christensen, A.	Haugland,	Norby,	Teigen,
Christianson, T.	Hinds,	Nordgren,	Trowbridge,
Conley,	Holmquist,	Norton,	Warner,
Cullum,	Hompe,	O'Keefe,	Washburn,
Cummings,	Howard,	Olsen, J. W.,	West,
Curtis,	Hulbert,	Oren,	Wicker,
Darby,	Johnson,	Parker,	Wright,
Dilley,	Kelly,	Praxel,	Mr. Speaker.
Eaton,	Lagersen,	Putnam,	
Enger,	Lee,	Rako,	
Gerlich,	Lennon,	Rodenberg,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Hitchcock,	Nollet,	Spindler,
Bensen,	Iverson,	Nordlin,	Stahlke,
Burdorf,	Keller,	Olson, L. E.,	Stein,
Carlson,	Kleffman,	Olson, Lars.	Strand,
Day,	Koslak,	Pattison,	Sweitzer,
DeLury,	Lauderdale,	Pedersen,	Swenson, C. L.,
Enstrom,	Lockhart,	Perry, J. T.,	Swenson, E.,
Flahaven,	Long,	Perry, T.,	Thomas,
Flaherty,	McGivern,	Risse,	Thorkelson,
Gartner,	McLaughlin,	Samec,	Walworth,
Gislason, C. M.,	McPartlin,	Scribner,	Wilkinson,
Goodwin,	Murphy,	Shonyo,	
Hemstad,	Nellermoe,	Sluke,	
Herried,	Nelson,	Spelbrink,	

The special order was set for the afternoon. Warner defended the bill.

The opponents in the debate were Hitchcock, Murphy, McPartlin and Thomas from the northeast and Nellerroe from Minneapolis.

The bill was greatly amended, so as to give the range towns much more than at first—just double for general expenses, and 50 per cent more for schools, with other important concessions.

There was almost nothing left of the bill except the bad principle of interference with home rule, and a precedent that can later be invoked to the great annoyance of those who start it.

But only a few days before this four of the most strenuous champions of home rule as against this encroachment—Hitchcock, Murphy, Thomas and McPartlin—had voted for the Street Railway bill which rather more effectively destroyed the principle of home rule in the three largest cities of the state.

Consistency is a rare jewel, and few there be who possess it.

Having pretty completely denatured the bill the House passed it by a vote of 80 "ayes," 43 "nays."

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	Gislason, J. B.,	Levin,	Risse,
Bendixen,	Goodspeed,	Lightner,	Rodenberg,
Bernard,	Gran,	McLaughlin,	Ross,
Briggs,	Grant,	Melbye,	Scribner,
Brown,	Green, F. A.,	Miller,	Selvig,
Cameron,	Grove,	Moen,	Serline,
Child,	Haugland,	Neuman,	Shanks,
Christensen, A.	Herried,	Nimocks,	Shonyo,
Christianson, T.	Hinds,	Nollet,	Sweitzer,
Conley,	Holmquist,	Norby,	Swenson, C. J.,
Cullum,	Hompe,	Nordgren,	Swenson, O. A.,
Cummings,	Howard,	Norton,	Taylor,
Curtis,	Hulbert,	O'Keefe,	Teigen,
Darby,	Jacobson,	Olsen, J. W.,	Trowbridge,
Dilley,	Johnson,	Oren,	Warner,
Dorweiler,	Kelly,	Parker,	Washburn,
Eaton,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,	West,
Enger,	Lauderdale,	Perry, T.,	Wicker,
Gerlich,	Lee,	Praxel,	Wright,
Girling,	Lennon,	Putnam,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Goodwin,	Miner,	Spelbrink,
Bensen,	Hemstad,	Murphy,	Spindler,
Burdorf,	Hitchcock,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Carlson,	Iverson,	Nordlin,	Stein,
Day,	Keller,	Olson, L. E.,	Strand,
DeLury,	Kleffman,	Olson, Lars,	Swenson, E.,
Enstrom,	Koslak,	Pattison,	Thomas,
Flahaven,	Lockhart,	Pedersen,	Thorkelson,
Flaherty,	Long,	Rako,	Walworth,
Gartner,	McGivern,	Samec,	Wilkinson.
Gislason, C. M.,	McPartlin,	Sluke,	

**WARNER'S CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

Mr. Warner's Constitutional Amendment to provide for a certainty that additional taxes on iron ore could be imposed came to a vote on the same afternoon, March 10th, after the "occupational" tax bill had passed.

The amendment provided that an "occupational" tax of 6 per cent should be imposed on the same part of the value of iron ore as was subjected to the tax by the statutory bill.

It also provided that the rate could not be changed except by a vote of 60 per cent of the members of both houses followed by the signature of the governor, thus giving the governor an absolute veto.

Nordlin offered an amendment to cut out the word "occupational."

This would have simply provided for a tax on the value of the ore.

He contended that there was no excuse for such a provision in a constitutional amendment. The object was to make a tax on the ore constitutional not an "occupational" tax.

The vote stood 53 to 61.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Flaherty,	Moen,	Strand,
Arens,	Gartner,	Nellermoe,	Swanstrom,
Baxter,	Goodspeed,	Nelson,	Sweitzer,
Bensen,	Goodwin,	Norby,	Swenson, C. J.,
Brown,	Grove,	Nordlin,	Swenson, E.,
Burdorf,	Hemstad,	Olson, L. E.,	Teigen,
Carlson,	Holmquist,	Olson, Lars,	Thorkelson,
Child,	Hompe,	Oren,	Walworth,
Conley,	Iverson,	Praxel,	Washburn,
Day,	Keller,	Sluke,	Welch,
Dorweiler,	Kozlak,	Spelbrink,	Wright,
Emmons,	Lauderdale,	Spindler,	
Enstrom,	Lennon,	Stahlke,	
Flahaven,	Miner,	Stein,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bernard,	Grant,	McLaughlin,	Scribner,
Briggs,	Green, F. A.,	McPartlin,	Selvig,
Cameron,	Haugland,	Melbye,	Serline,
Christensen, A.	Herried,	Murphy,	Shanks,
Christianson, T.	Hinds,	Nollet,	Shonyo,
Cullum,	Howard,	Nordgren,	Swenson, O. A.,
Curtis,	Hulbert,	Olsen, J. W.,	Taylor,
Darby,	Jacobson,	Parker,	Thomas,
DeLury,	Johnson,	Pattison,	Thompson,
Dilley,	Kelly,	Pedersen,	Trowbridge,
Eaton,	Kleffman,	Perry, J. T.,	Warner,
Enger,	Lagersen,	Perry, T.,	Wicker,
Gerlich,	Lee,	Putnam,	Wilkinson,
Girling,	Levin,	Rako,	
Gislason, J. B.,	Long,	Risse,	
Gran,	McGivern,	Rodenberg,	

Nordlin then offered an amendment to leave blank the rate of taxation to be fixed by the legislature but received only 33 votes as follows:

Anderson,	Goodwin,	Nellermoe,	Stein,
Arens,	Hemstad,	Nelson,	Strand,
Bensen,	Iverson,	Nordlin,	Swenson, E.,
Burdorf,	Keller,	Olson, Lars,	Teigen,
Day,	Kozlak,	Samec,	Thorkelson,
Enstrom,	Lagersen,	Sluke,	Welch,
Flahaven,	Lauderdale,	Spelbrink,	
Gartner,	Lockhart,	Spindler,	
Gislason, C.M.,	Miner,	Stahlke,	

Having failed to get rid of the word "occupational" with its very objectionable psychological effect, the Non-Partisan League and Labor forces refused to vote for the amendment which, however, passed 81 to 33.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	Green, F. A.,	Miller,	Serline,
Bendixen,	Grove,	Moen,	Shanks,
Briggs,	Haugland,	Neuman,	Shonyo,
Carlson,	Hinds,	Norby,	Swanstrom,
Child,	Holmquist,	Nordgren,	Sweitzer,
Christensen, A.	Howard,	Norton,	Swenson, C. J.,
Christianson, T.	Hulbert,	O'Keefe,	Swenson, E.,
Conley,	Jacobson,	Olsen, J. W.,	Swenson, O.A.,
Curtis,	Johnson,	Oren,	Taylor,
Darby,	Kelly,	Parker,	Teigen,
DeLury,	Kleffman,	Pattison,	Thompson,
Dilley,	Kozlak,	Pedersen,	Trowbridge,
Dorweiler,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,	Walworth,
Emmons,	Lauderdale,	Perry, T.,	Warner,
Enger,	Lee,	Praxel,	Wicker,
Flaherty,	Lennon,	Putnam,	Wilkinson,
Gerlich,	Levin,	Rako,	Wright,
Girling,	Lightner,	Risse,	Mr. Speaker.
Gislason, J.B.,	McGivern,	Rodenberg,	
Goodspeed,	McLaughlin,	Ross,	
Grant,	Melbye,	Selvig,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Arens,	Enstrom,	McPartlin,	Stahlke,
Bensen,	Flahaven,	Miner,	Stein,
Bernard,	Goodwin,	Murphy,	Strand,
Brown,	Herried,	Nellermoe,	Thomas,
Burdorf,	Hitchcock,	Nelson,	Washburn,
Cameron,	Hompe,	Samec,	Welch,
Cullum,	Keller,	Sluke,	
Day,	Lockhart,	Spelbrink,	
Eaton,	Long,	Spindler,	

#### IN THE SENATE.

This proposed amendment came to a vote in the Senate April 13th, and presented a very remarkable example of political juggling.

Senator Carley offered an amendment to strike out the word "occupational" which had been used so dishonestly by enemies of iron ore taxation to create a false impression and to scare ignorant people into a senseless and hysterical opposition.

He showed that the nature of the tax was just the same no matter by what name called,—just a tax on the natural—

or "heritage" value of the ore,—not a tax at all on the labor and capital employed in the business of mining,—the very same kind of a tax that Senators had voted for in 1919,—the same kind of a tax that the people had been demanding all these years.

Carley withdrew his amendment to allow Senator Sageng to introduce a more comprehensive one not only taking out the word "occupational" but also leaving the legislature free to make changes in the rate and getting rid of the Governor's absolute veto, just the same thing that Nordlin had tried to do in the House.

Every Senator who wanted no such taxation—the Steel Trust Senators as they were called—insisted on keeping the word in and they were ably assisted by Putnam and Gjerset who had voted for the statutory bill for heavier taxation of iron ore.

Sageng was "surprised and pained at the spurious sophistry of the Senator from Chippewa" "who claims to favor heavier taxes on iron ore and yet joins with his enemies to put a club into their hands to knock his own brains out."

The roll call on this amendment to strike out the useless, and very dangerous word "occupational" is very instructive.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Devold,	Kuntz,	Peterson,
Benson,	Gandrud,	Lee,	Rockne,
Blomgren,	Gooding,	Lindsley,	Sageng,
Bonniwell,	Hall,	Loonam,	Schmechel,
Carley,	Hegnes,	Millet,	Stepan,
Cashel,	Hopp,	Naplin,	Ward,
Cliff,	Jackson,	Nolan,	Wold,
Cumming,	Johnson,	Orr,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Cosgrove,	Handlin,	Ribenack,
Baldwin,	Denegre,	Kingsbury,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Bessette,	Dwyer,	Larson,	Swanson,
Boylan,	Erickson,	McGarry,	Turnham,
Brooks,	Fowler,	Palmer,	Van Hoven,
Callahan,	Gjerset,	Putnam,	Vibert,
Coleman,	Guilford,	Rask,	Widell,
Conroy,	Hamer,	Reed,	

The vote shows a tie—31 to 31.

It stood 31 to 30 until Baldwin came in, voted no, and thus defeated the amendment.

Four Senators were absent. Gillam, Madigan and Romberg who were sick, would have voted aye and John Sullivan no.

It is hard to get the point of view of those Senators who claimed to be friendly to iron ore taxation and yet voted to keep this word "occupational" in the constitutional amendment, and thus, as Sageng so aptly said, "put a club in the hands of your enemies to knock your brains out."

Having fixed the amendment to suit themselves, more than half of the 27 who had voted against the ore tax bill a few days before now voted to put this unfair proposition up to the people.

Johnson, for years one of the most uncompromising supporters of iron ore taxation in the state, refused to vote for the amendment. Of the other 12 nay votes 8 are from the iron county and 3 from St. Paul.

The vote stood 49 ayes, 13 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Devold,	Kuntz,	Reed,
Baldwin,	Dwyer,	Larson,	Rockne,
Benson,	Fowler,	Lee,	Sageng,
Blomgren,	Gandrud,	Lindsley,	Schmechel,
Bonniwell,	Gjerset,	Loonam,	Stepan,
Brooks,	Gooding,	Millett,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Callahan,	Guilford,	Naplin,	Turnham,
Carley,	Hall,	Nolan,	Ward,
Cashel,	Hamer,	Orr,	Widell,
Cliff,	Hegnes,	Palmer,	Wold,
Cosgrove,	Hopp,	Peterson,	
Cumming,	Jackson,	Putnam,	
Denegre,	Kingsbury,	Rask,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Conroy,	McGarry,	Vibert,
Bessette,	Erickson,	Ribenack,	
Boylan,	Handlan,	Swanson,	
Coleman,	Johnson,	Van Hoven,	

Now watch the enemies of iron ore taxation shout about "occupation" taxes; if possible, scare the people into voting down this amendment and then come to the next legislature to repeal the iron ore taxes now enacted.

#### TAXING MINING ROYALTIES.

There are many owners of iron ore lands in Northern Minnesota, who have no idea of working the mines themselves.

Many of them owned the lands before ore was discovered. They had taken the pine off and made a pretty good thing out of it, and let the land revert to the state again rather than pay the few cents an acre of yearly tax that was imposed on their wild and worthless land.

When ore was discovered they got very busy paying up their back taxes so as to secure themselves in the ownership of the ore. In many cases these wild and worthless lands have made their owners rich in the royalties, or rents, they collect for letting others use the earth to explore and take out ore.

Of course not all present owners were so fortunate. Many of them have paid full price for the ore lands they now own.

Now these royalties are not taxable under any present law of the state. This is especially true of those whose owners live outside the state. They can not be reached either directly or indirectly.

Believing that the state ought to secure at least a small tax out of these enormous rentals a bill was drawn by Ex-Speaker Parker and introduced in the General Session of 1919, for a tax of 5 per cent on the rental itself—not on the value of the land from which the rental was drawn as you pay taxes on your home, or farm, or business—but just on the net rental or royalty received.

Wouldn't you like to pay taxes on your home, farm or business at the rate of 5 per cent only on the net rental you could get for it after deducting all expenses, repair, interest on the capital invested in the improvements, and all ordinary taxes on the property—for such taxes are always paid by the operating owners—wouldn't you rather enjoy a low tax of that kind on your property?

Well that is the kind of a royalty tax Mr. Parker proposed.

But the mineral land owners, instead of thanking him for letting them off so easy, sent up a tremendous wail and shed bitter tears over the "poor widows and orphans" who were to be taxed on the meager means of support that they were getting out of the common heritage of Minnesota.

But the House was hard-hearted and passed the bill by a vote of 92 to 25.

The Senate was more tender of the poor millionaire mine owners and defeated the bill by one vote.

At the extra session of 1919 the house again passed a bill 97 to 18, but the Senate adjourned before reaching it.

The same bill came up again in the House on March 2, 1921, and was passed 103 to 14.

Mr. Parker briefly explained the bill and no one raised his voice against it.

Those who voted in the affirmative were 103:

Anderson,	Goodspeed,	McLaughlin,	Shanks,
Arens,	Goodwin,	Melbye,	Shonyo,
Baxter,	Gran,	Miner,	Sluke,
Bendixen,	Grant,	Moen,	Spelbrink,
Bensen,	Green, F. A.,	Nellermoe,	Spindler,
Briggs,	Grove,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Brown,	Haugland,	Neuman,	Stein,
Burdorf,	Hemstad,	Norby,	Strand,
Cameron,	Hinds,	Nordgren,	Swanstrom,
Christensen,A.	Holmquist,	Nordlin,	Sweitzer,
Christianson,T	Hompe,	O'Keefe,	Swenson, C. J.,
Conley,	Hulbert,	Olsen, J. W.,	Swenson, E.,
Cummings,	Iverson,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson,O.A.,
Curtis,	Jacobson,	Olson, Lars,	Taylor,
Darby,	Johnson,	Oren,	Teigen,
Day,	Keller,	Parker,	Thompson,
DeLury,	Kelly,	Pattison,	Thorkelson,
Dorweiler,	Kozlak,	Pedersen,	Trowbridge,
Enstrom,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,	Walworth,
Flahaven,	Lauderdale,	Putnam,	Warner,
Flaherty,	Lee,	Risse,	Washburn,
Gartner,	Lennon,	Rodenberg,	Welch,
Gerlich;	Levin,	Ross,	Wicker,
Girling,	Lightner,	Samec,	Wilkinson,
Gislason,C.M.,	Lockhart,	Selvig,	Mr. Speaker.
Gislason, J. B.,	McGivern,	Serline,	

Those who voted in the negative were 14:

Bernard,	Herried,	Long,	Scribner,
Cullum,	Hitchcock,	McPartlin,	Thomas,
Dilley,	Howard,	Murphy,	
Eaton,	Kleffman,	Norton,	



The following members had been excused: Carlson, T. J. Greene, Emmons, Nimocks, Tim Perry, Praxel, Rako, Robinson, West and Wright.

Child and Nollet were called out and when they returned the vote had been announced. Miller was unavoidably absent and put into the Journal a statement that he would have voted for the bill.

Mr. Enger had voted against the bill at both sessions of the 1919 legislature; but said he should probably have voted "aye" this time. So it appears that 14 is about the total opposition vote out of the 131 members.

#### IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate this bill met quite a different fate.

At a public hearing the Merritt brothers told a pitiful story of the hardships of the pioneering days when they discovered ore in Northern Minnesota, and declared that all they now had to show for it was about \$4,000 or \$5,000 each yearly in royalties; but nothing was said about the Hill ore interests that collect about \$8,000,000 a year for letting other people dig ore out of Nature's great storehouse.

Great stress was laid on the fate of the poor widows and orphans, whose only "visible means of support" is the few thousands a year in royalties they are getting, but they forgot to mention the "poor widow" of Wabasha county who is reported to be getting \$1,000 a day, some say more, out of a forty acre tract that cost her next to nothing.

J. D. Sullivan was afraid the non-residents who get royalty, could not be reached, so only our own home people would be taxed.

All this was emphasized again on April 18th when the bill was up for final passage, and this time Gjerset and Rockne came to the rescue of the "widows and orphans", and reiterated Sullivan's plea of unconstitutionality.

Hopp made a valiant defense of the bill, claiming that our own supreme court had plainly indicated that they regarded royalty taxes constitutional. He also showed that it would be just as easy to collect from non-residents as to collect taxes on any other interest in land from outsiders. Our courts have declared these royalties to be an interest in land, why, then, can't we collect the tax? And it is surely the duty of this senate to resolve any doubts in the interest of the people, not in the interest of the monopolists. The courts are created to decide such questions. Let us not usurp their functions.

On the final roll call the bill was defeated. Yeas 28, nays 34.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Benson,	Gandrud,	Kuntz,	Peterson,
Bonniwell,	Gillam,	Lee,	Rask,
Carley,	Gooding,	Lindsley,	Romberg,
Cashel,	Hall,	Loonam,	Sageng,
Cliff,	Hopp,	Millett,	Schmechel,
Cumming,	Jackson,	Naplin,	Ward,
Devold,	Johnson,	Nolan,	Wold.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Cosgrove,	Hegnes,	Stepan,
Anderson,	Denegre,	Kingsbury,	Sullivan, J. D.
Bessette,	Dwyer,	Larson,	Swanson,
Blomgren,	Erickson,	McGarry,	Turnham,
Boylan,	Fowler,	Orr,	Van Hoven,
Brooks,	Gjerset,	Putnam,	Vibert,
Callahan,	Guilford,	Reed,	Widell.
Coleman,	Hamer,	Ribenack,	
Conroy,	Handlan,	Rockne,	

Devold and Hall had voted nay in 1919. They now changed and voted aye.

Anderson, Blomgren, Gjerset, Larson, Rockne and Stepan switched the other way and defeated the bill.

They must answer for any disastrous results that follow this defeat.

And such results may very likely follow.

Any mining company taking ore out of its own land and paying the "tonnage tax" on it, can now organize a dummy company, lease their mines to such company on the full royalty, and thus escape paying the "tonnage tax" on a large part or all of the value of their ore; for under the "tonnage tax" bill royalty paid to a land owner is a deductible item of expense, and is subtracted and not taxed.

It is possible that the state may lose half or more of the tax this way.

#### THE GIRLING BILL.

Mr. Girling introduced a bill to increase the personal property exemption to \$200 to each head of a family where there were two dependent children under 16 years of age.

At first he asked for \$100 exemption for each dependent child up to a limit of 5 children; but when it appeared that the state constitution limits exemption to not more than \$200 to each head of a family, he changed the bill to conform to that limitation.

Of course the object of the bill is plain. Home life and children should be encouraged. We now penalize home life and the rearing of children by excessive taxation on everything that must be purchased to maintain the home and rear the children.

Mr. Girling very briefly presented these reasons and urged the passage of his bill.

There was no real opposition. Many members were absent on committee work or otherwise and the vote was light but the bill passed 68 to 15, as follows:

Anderson,	Day,	Green, F. A.,	McPartlin,
Baxter,	DeLury,	Hemstad,	Melbye,
Bendixen,	Dilley,	Holmquist,	Miller,
Bensen,	Dorweiler,	Hulbert,	Miner,
Bernard,	Enger,	Johnson,	Nellermoe,
Briggs,	Enstrom,	Keller,	Nimocks,
Brown,	Gartner,	Kleffman,	Nordlin,
Cameron,	Girling,	Kozlak,	Norton,
Carlson,	Gislason, C.M.,	Lagersen,	O'Keefe,
Child,	Gislason, J.B.,	Lauderdale,	Olsen, J. W.,
Cullum,	Goodspeed,	Lee,	Olson, L. E.,
Cummings,	Goodwin,	Lennon,	Olson, Lars,

Pattison,	Samec,	Swanstrom,	Warner,
Perry, J. T.,	Scribner,	Sweitzer,	West,
Perry, T.,	Selvig,	Taylor,	Wicker,
Risse,	Stein,	Thompson,	Wright,
Rodenberg,	Strand,	Thorkelson,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Burdorf,	Gerlich,	Nelson,	Shonyo
Conley,	Haugland,	Norby,	Stahlke,
Flahaven,	Kelly,	Putnam,	Swenson, C. J.
Flaherty,	McGivern,	Rako,	

46 did not vote.

Arens,	Hitchcock,	Neuman,	Spindler,
Christensen, A.,	Hompe,	Nollett	Swenson, E.,
Christianson, T.	Howard,	Nordgrin,	Swenson, O. A.,
Curtis,	Iverson,	Oren,	Teigen,
Darby,	Jacobson,	Parker,	Thomas,
Eaton,	Levin,	Pedersen,	Trowbridge,
Gran,	Lightner,	Praxel,	Walworth,
Grant,	Lockhart,	Ross,	Washburn,
Green, T. J.,	Long,	Serlien,	Welch,
Grove,	McLoughlin,	Shanks,	Wilkinson,
Herried,	Moen,	Sluke,	
Hinds,	Murphy,	Spelbrink,	

Had these been present and voting the proportion would have been about the same.

This bill died in the Senate on general orders.

#### INCOME TAX AMENDMENT.

The legislature of 1919 had submitted to the people an amendment to the constitution providing for a tax on "incomes, occupations and privileges" and permitting the legislature to exempt from all taxation household goods, farm products in the hands of the original producer and certain tools, implements and machinery.

This amendment failed at the November election.

The same amendment was proposed again in 1921, only that it proposed a tax on "gains, profits and incomes" and not on occupations and privileges.

Just why "privileges" was left out was not explained.

It would seem that "privileges" should be taxed to their full value.

When the proposed amendment for a tax on incomes came up in the House on March 16, Neuman and Cullum proposed to amend so as to permit the legislature to exempt "dwelling houses, used exclusively for residence purposes, not to exceed two thousand dollars (\$2,000) of the full and true value thereof."

In spite of the shortage of homes—in spite of the strong feeling that the building of homes ought to be encouraged,—in spite of the fact that homes are now so heavily taxed it is about as cheap to rent as to own a home, this amendment met with determined opposition.

Mr. Wicker and others feared it would endanger the adoption of the income tax by the voters.

McPartlin declared that certain towns and villages would have nothing to tax if the houses were exempt up to \$2,000.

Neuman replied that they could get plenty of revenue by increasing the tax on lots now greatly undervalued.

Washburn insisted that the home owner would get no benefit. What was taken off his house would go right back on his lot. He didn't seem to grasp the fact that a part of what was taken off houses would fall on vacant lots, thus adding to the cost of holding lots idle, thus reducing the selling price of lots, and further helping the people to get homes.

Theodore Christianson brought out the single tax boggy and wanted to know if the legislature was prepared to encourage that theory.

As a result of all these objections the Cullum and Neuman amendment failed by a vote of 50 to 62.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Gartner,	Miner,	Samec,
Bendixen,	Girling,	Murphy,	Scribner,
Bensen,	Goodwin,	Nellermoe,	Sluke,
Bernard,	Gran,	Nelson,	Spelbrink,
Brown,	Hemstad,	Neuman,	Spindler,
Burdorf,	Holmquist,	Nordlin,	Stahlke,
Cullum,	Iverson,	Olsen, J. W.	Stein,
Cummings,	Johnson,	Olson, L. E.,	Swanstrom,
Day,	Keller,	Olson, Lars,	Sewitzer,
DeLury,	Kozlak,	Perry, T.,	Swenson, E.,
Dorweiler,	Lauderdale,	Risse,	Thorkelson,
Enstrom,	Lennon,	Rodenberg,	Welch,
Flahaven,	Long,	Ross,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Gislason, J. B.	Levin,	Selvig,
Baxter,	Goodspeed,	Lightner,	Shonyo,
Briggs,	Grant,	McLaughlin,	Swenson, C. J.,
Cameron,	Green, F. A.,	McPartlin,	Swenson, O. A.,
Carlson,	Grove,	Melbye,	Teigen,
Child,	Haugland,	Miller,	Thomas,
Christensen, A.,	Herried,	Norby,	Thompson,
Christianson, T.	Hitchcock,	Nordgren,	Trowbridge,
Conley,	Hompe,	Oren,	Warner,
Curtis,	Howard,	Parker,	Washburn,
Darby,	Hulbert,	Pattison,	West,
Dilley,	Jacobson,	Pedersen,	Wicker,
Eaton,	Kelly,	Perry, J. T.,	Wilkinson,
Enger,	Kleffman,	Praxel,	
Flaherty,	Lagersen,	Putnam,	
Gerlich,	Lee,	Rako,	

Two years ago this same question arose in the form of an act to reduce taxes on houses, and received a vote of 73 to 45.

The following then voted yes who now voted no: Anderson, Briggs, Darby, Dilley, Enger, Goodspeed, Grant, Levin, McPartlin, Pedersen, Praxel, Rako, Swenson, O. A. Warner and Wilkinson.

The following then voted no who now voted yes: Cullum, Holmquist, Long, Murphy, Lars Olson, Spelbrink.

Dilley, Lightner and Levin were the only St. Paul men to vote no.

This bill failed in the Senate.

## CHAPTER VII. ELECTION LAWS.

Ever since the primary election was made statewide in 1912, to save Eberhart and the reactionary element of the Republican party, there has been considerable demand for its amendment or repeal.

At first it did save Eberhart and the reactionaries and disappointed the progressives. Then it worked to the advantage of the progressives and a very loud protest went up from the reactionaries.

Then the Nonpartisan League came in and tried to capture the Republican party in Minnesota as they had already done in North Dakota.

This drew the conservative wing of the Republicans more closely together and added greatly to their strength by accessions from the progressives and the Democrats.

The primary and the election of 1920 were accompanied by more than usual factional bitterness. The Nonpartisan League and Labor groups had united and placed on the Republican primary ballot Dr. Henrik Shipstead, a lifelong Republican who had served one term in the legislature—1917—and had made what the progressive people of the state called an excellent record. He had also been a Republican candidate for Congress in 1918 and had barely missed nomination. With Dr. Shipstead they filed a full Republican ticket composed of Nonpartisan League and labor men.

The conservative element of the Republican party met in convention and selected State Auditor J. A. O. Preus as their candidate for governor and filled out the ticket with men of their choice.

Thomas Frankson, who had served two terms in the legislature as a progressive Republican and had twice been elected lieutenant governor, was also a candidate. Two others filed as Republicans, Ex-State Auditor Iverson and Thomas Keefe.

The primary contest was intensely bitter and resulted in the nomination of Preus and his ticket.

The followers of Shipstead declared they had been slandered and cheated out of the nomination. They held another convention and determined to run Shipstead, Mallon and Sullivan as independents for the same places on the ballot they had lost in the primary.

To this much objection was raised. These men had first filed as Republicans, they said, and had been defeated. Now they come up as Independents. They had their chance once. They should retire and keep out.

Their backers reiterated the claim that they had been unfairly defeated, and were justified in making another try. In the November election Preus received 415,805 votes, Shipstead 281,402.

### **The Benson Bill—Senate File 7.**

Senator Benson introduced a bill providing "that a person who has been a candidate for an office at the primary election in any year shall not be eligible for nomination for the same office in that year by petition or certificate under this section."

This bill was hotly contested in the Senate by the Non-partisan League and Labor forces, but was passed by 43 to 9, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Cosgrove,	Hegnes,	Putnam,
Baldwin,	Cumming,	Hopp,	Rask,
Benson,	Denegre,	Jackson,	Sageng,
Bessette,	Dwyer,	Kingsbury,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Blomgren,	Fowler,	Kuntz,	Swanson,
Bonniwell,	Gandrud,	Larson,	Turnham,
Boylan,	Gillam,	Lindsley,	Vibert,
Brooks,	Gjerset,	Nolan,	Ward,
Cashel,	Gooding,	Orr,	Widell,
Cliff,	Guilford,	Palmer,	Wold.
Conroy,	Hamer,	Peterson,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Devold,	Johnson,	Loonam,	Romberg,
Erickson,	Lee,	Naplin,	Schmechel,
			Stepan.

15 senators did not vote: Anderson, Calahan, Carley, Coleman, Hall, Handlan, McGarry, Madigan, Millet, Nord, Reed, Ribenack, Rockne, Sullivan, G. H., Van Hoven.

Eight of these usually affiliate with the Democratic party in national politics and seem to have regarded this as a Republican factional fight.

When this bill reached the House and came up on general orders, Mr. Nordlin declared it would offer a premium on fraud, corruption and violation of law; for if a candidate at the primary could once be defeated, no matter by what means, he could not have another chance. "The Supreme Court decided that Congressman Volstead had been defeated at the primary by unlawful means. He was afterward nominated by a Republican conference, put on the ticket by certificate and elected on the 2nd of November. If this law had been in force he and his supporters would have had no recourse. Many of us have been elected on a pledge not to change the primary. We shall vote against this bill. Do you want to pass it?"

Wilkinson and Warner on two occasions asked for time to prepare amendments, but no amendments were prepared, and the bill was finally passed, Friday, Feb. 18, in spite of Nordlin's protests, by 81 to 36.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	DeLury,	Grove,	Lagersen,
Bendixen,	Dilley,	Haugland,	Lauderdale,
Bernard,	Dorweiler,	Herried,	Lee,
Briggs,	Eaton,	Hinds,	Levin,
Cameron,	Enger,	Hitchcock,	Lightner,
Carlson,	Gerlich,	Holmquist,	McGivern,
Child,	Girling,	Hompe,	McLaughlin,
Christensen, A.,	Gislason, J. B.,	Howard,	McPartlin,
Christianson, T.	Goodspeed,	Hulbert,	Melbye,
Conley,	Gran,	Jacobson,	Miller,
Cullum,	Grant,	Johnson,	Moen,
Curtis,	Green, F. A.,	Kelly,	Murphy,

Neuman,	Putnam,	Shonyo,	Trowbridge,
Nimocks.	Rako,	Swanstrom,	Warner,
Norby,	Risse,	Sweitzer,	Washburn,
Nordgren,	Robinson,	Swenson,C.J.,	Wilkinson,
Oren,	Rodenberg,	Swenson,O.A.,	Wright,
Parker,	Scribner,	Taylor,	Mr. Speaker.
Pattison,	Selvig,	Teigen,	
Perry, J. T.,	Serline,	Thomas,	
Praxel,	Shanks,	Thompson,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Flahaven,	Lennon,	Spelbrink,
Arens,	Flaherty,	Lockhart,	Spindler,
Bensen,	Gartner,	Nellermoe,	Stahlke,
Brown,	Gislason,C.M.,	Nelson,	Stein,
Burdorf,	Goodwin,	Nordlin,	Strand,
Cummings,	Hemstad,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson, E.,
Darby,	Iverson,	Olson, Lars,	Thorkelson,
Day,	Keller,	Samec,	Walworth,
Enstrom,	Kozlak,	Sluke,	Welch.

It was afterward found that the law would probably not prevent a candidate defeated by unlawful means, from being nominated to the same office by a party convention in case of a vacancy, as was the situation with reference to Congressman Volstead in the 7th Congressional district in 1920.

#### The Next Move.

About the time the legislature met a good many members seemed to favor measures to establish by statute party conventions, but petitions began to pour in from all parts of the state demanding that the primary law be left as it is.

At first it appeared that these petitions all came from the Nonpartisan League and little attention was given them by those back of the convention plan; but they soon began to come in from other sources and members were fairly flooded with them.

#### The Rockne Bill.

This bill, as at first introduced, provided for party conventions for each political party, but made no regulations as to time or place for holding caucuses or selecting delegates. All this was left to the voluntary action of the party committees.

#### A New Turn of Affairs.

But other counsels prevailed and this bill was rewritten so as to provide for caucuses and conventions to **recommend** candidates for all offices instead of **nominating** them. It provided that candidates so recommended or endorsed need not accept the endorsement.

It did not openly restore all officers to the party basis; but by allowing parties to recommend for all offices and legalizing their conventions it practically accomplished the same results.

Senators Gandrud, J. D. Sullivan and Guilford offered amendments that took all city, county, legislative and judicial officers out of the bill entirely.

The first amendment supported by Gandrud and Sullivan cut out all of those but city officers and here was the nub of the contest.

Sullivan led the fight to keep the Nonpartisan features in the primary law. "I believe in party government, but I don't approve of a law that will build political machines for either Republican, Democratic, or any other party. Have you got poorer township officers because they have been elected without party designation? The same of county, city and village? It is better for the judiciary to be non-partisan, so with the legislature. Could you improve this legislature by electing us as party men? The legislature should be a business body. All who are now elected on a nonpartisan basis should stay there."

Jackson declared that the main question at a convention is to select and recommend a candidate for governor. If you permit the endorsement of nonpartisan officers, they will control your conventions and the governor will be lost sight of.

Benson: "Conventions are desirable. Let us regulate them by law."

Carley: "This is an indirect attempt to do the thing that the elections committee did not have the nerve to do. It would put the state primary out of business and hang its carcass on the fence. The old political boss has been relegated to the discard in Minnesota and this legislature is not going to stand for his return."

The Gandrud amendment was carried 42 to 18.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Bessette,	Erickson,	Kingsbury,	Ribenack,
Blomgren,	Fowler,	Kuntz,	Rockne,
Bonniwell,	Gandrud,	Larson,	Romberg,
Boylan,	Gillam,	Lee,	Sageng,
Brooks,	Gjerset,	Lindsley,	Schmechel,
Cashel,	Guilford,	Loonam,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Conroy,	Hall,	McGarry,	Swanson,
Cosgrove,	Hegnes,	Orr,	Turnham,
Cumming,	Hopp,	Palmer,	Wold.
Devold,	Jackson,	Peterson,	
Dwyer,	Johnson,	Rask,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Carley,	Handlan,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Anderson,	Cliff,	Naplin,	Vibert,
Baldwin,	Coleman,	Nolan,	Ward.
Benson,	Denegre,	Reed,	
Callahan,	Gooding,	Stepan,	

The Guilford amendment carried with only 6 negative votes—Callahan, Carley, Coleman, Handlan, Naplin, Stepan.

Some of those who opposed amendment wanted to keep all the offices partisan, others opposed the whole scheme of legal regulation of parties, holding that parties are voluntary organizations of citizens that should no more be regulated by statute than any other private affairs of citizens.

Any who voted against the amendments and for the bill should be put in the first class.

Those who voted against amendment and against the bill belong in the second group. They would keep the bill as bad as possible the more surely to kill it.



Most, or all of the 25 who finally voted against the bill probably take the ground that parties should not be subject to public regulation.

As finally amended, this bill provides for a delegate election on the second Tuesday of March, the usual town meeting day, when delegates will be elected to a county convention of each political party.

The county convention will elect delegates to congressional district conventions and to a state convention of each party. The congressional district conventions will indorse candidates for Congress.

The state convention will indorse candidates for elective state offices and will adopt party platforms. The bill does not apply to county officials, or to members of the legislature and judicial offices.

Any indorsement voted by a convention will be recorded opposite the name of the candidate so indorsed on the primary election ballot.

The names of such candidates will be printed at the top of the ballot and will not be subject to rotation.

The bill passed the Senate 38 to 25.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Denegre,	Kingsbury,	Sullivan,G.H.,
Anderson,	Fowler,	Larson,	Sullivan,J.D.,
Baldwin,	Gandrud,	Nolan,	Swanson,
Benson,	Gjerset,	Palmer,	Turnham,
Blomgren,	Gooding,	Peterson,	Vibert,
Brooks,	Guilford,	Putnam,	Ward,
Callahan,	Hall,	Rask,	Widell,
Cliff,	Hamer,	Reed,	Wold,
Coleman,	Hegnes,	Rockne,	
Cosgrove,	Hopp,	Sageng,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bessette,	Devold,	Kuntz,	Ribenack,
Bonniwell,	Dwyer,	Lee,	Romberg,
Boylan,	Erickson,	Lindsley,	Schmechel,
Carley,	Gillam,	Loonam,	Stepan,
Cashel,	Handlan,	Millett,	
Conroy,	Jackson,	Naplin,	
Cumming,	Johnson,	Orr,	

McGarry, Madigan and Van Hoven did not vote. Madigan and Van Hoven had been excused.

The advocates of this bill claim that it will secure fair and representative party conventions which political bosses cannot control.

Its opponents raise several objections:

1. Putting the candidates endorsed by the conventions at the head of the ticket, not subject to rotation, gives them an undue advantage over their competitors on the ticket at the primary. This was cut out in the House.

2. It tends to force all citizens to join parties or lose their political influence. It destroys independent voting.

3. It will solidify parties and intensify party prejudice.

4. It will greatly increase the expense of elections to the state and to candidates.

5. It will lengthen the political campaign and stretch it from the first of March or earlier to November.

6. It will tend to increase the activity of candidates by practically making three campaigns necessary: one to secure delegates, one to secure the nomination at the primaries, and third, to gain the final election in November.

Some vigorously persisted that parties are private affairs and should not be subject to statutory regulation.

Many would like to see all parties cut out, so far as state officers are concerned, declaring that there is no connection between national parties and state affairs. Let the two highest at the primary be the candidates at the November election and let the best win without regard to party.

#### **In the House.**

When this bill came up in the House on April 12, Mr. Warner amended to cut out the feature giving party candidates endorsed by conventions the head of the ticket and not subject to rotation.

This removed the most serious objection to the bill and probably saved it from defeat.

The bill was ably defended by Warner, Washburn, Parker, Bendixen, J. W. Olson and Girling, and forcibly opposed by Hompe, Nordlin and Minor.

It was hard to get the necessary 66 votes, but after that number had been recorded several others who had refused to vote, answered "Aye."

The last to vote "aye" were Christensen, A., Darby, Holmquist, Neuman, Pedersen, C. J. Swenson, Thompson and West and those votes passed the bill.

The roll call finally showed 69 ayes and 50 noes.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	Goodspeed,	McPartlin,	Ross,
Bendixen,	Green, F. A.,	Melbye,	Serline,
Briggs,	Grove,	Miller,	Shonyo,
Cameron,	Haugland,	Murphy,	Swenson, C. J.,
Child,	Herried,	Neuman,	Swenson, O. A.,
Christensen, A.,	Hinds,	Nimocks,	Taylor,
Christianson, T.,	Holmquist,	Nordgren,	Thomas,
Conley,	Hulbert,	Norton,	Thompson,
Cullum,	Jacobson,	O'Keefe,	Trowbridge,
Curtis,	Johnson,	Olsen, J. W.,	Warner,
Darby,	Kelly,	Oren,	Washburn,
Dilley,	Lagersen,	Parker,	West,
Dorweiler,	Lauderdale,	Pattison,	Wicker,
Eaton,	Lee,	Pedersen,	Wilkinson,
Enger,	Levin,	Perry, T.,	Mr. Speaker.
Flaherty,	Lightner,	Rako,	
Gerlich,	Long,	Risse,	
Girling,	McGivern,	Rodenberg,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Carlson,	Gartner,	Hemstad,
Arens,	Cummings,	Gislason, C. M.,	Hitchcock,
Bensen,	Day,	Gislason, J. B.,	Hompe,
Bernard,	DeLury,	Goodwin,	Keller,
Brown,	Enstrom,	Gran,	Kleffman,
Burdorf,	Flahaven,	Grant,	Lennon,

Lockhart,	Olson, L. E.,	Sluke,	Swenson, E.,
McLaughlin,	Olson, Lars,	Spelbrink,	Teigen,
Miner,	Perry, J. T.,	Spindler,	Thorkelson,
Moen,	Putnam,	Stahlke,	Walworth,
Nellermoe,	Samec,	Strand,	Welch.
Nelson,	Scribner,	Swanstrom,	
Nordlin,	Shanks,	Sweitzer,	

Ten did not vote: T. J. Green, Howard, Iverson, Kozlak, Nollet, Norby, T. J. Perry, Praxel, Selvig and Stein.

This bill does not directly interfere with the primary itself. It makes party conventions compulsory, requires them to adopt platforms and endorse candidates, and thus tends to strengthen partisanship and discourage independent action.

It is really very mild and harmless compared with the original Senate bill which practically put every state and local office on a partisan basis, and gave the political bosses about all they could ask.

### The Gjerset Bill.

The third bill which was expected to help the Republican party, as now organized, to keep hold of the reins and prevent the Nonpartisan League from "stealing it," as some put it, was introduced by Senator Gjerset and provided that "every organization" of the following kinds must become a political party subject to all the statutes governing political parties under the corrupt practices act.

1. Any which has held conventions or recommended candidates for any elective office.

2. Any organization which "urges or promulgates \* \* principles or doctrines of industrial or governmental policy distinct or different from" other political parties.

3. All organizations which "by means of committees, conventions or by means of any form of organization to control or influence government, or to influence or determine the election of any elective executive, judicial or legislative officer."

The above language is not very definite and caused considerable comment and criticism.

Senator Magnus Johnson, Nonpartisan league floor leader, said he realized that the bill was especially aimed at the Nonpartisans, but asked the author if the measure would not apply with equal force to the activities of the Anti-Saloon league, the State Federation of Labor, the Farm Bureau Federation and the various women's organizations.

Senator Gjerset denied this. "These organizations sail under their own colors," he said. "They promulgate their own principles and attempt no fraud. They do not attempt to influence government."

Senator Johnson said he failed to see where the line could be drawn between the Nonpartisan league and the Anti-Saloon league. He held that the Farm bureau was doing the same thing as the Nonpartisan league.

"We are a political organization and we try to influence legislation, but in Minnesota a majority of us are Republicans," he said. "This bill is intended for the sole purpose

of making a political organization of the Nonpartisan league, and that's all right as far as I am concerned."

Senator Arch Coleman of Minneapolis challenged Senator Johnson's claim that the Nonpartisans were Republicans.

"An adherent to the principles of Townleyism is no more a Republican than a turnip is a Baldwin apple," he said.

"There are a good many things advocated by Townley that I won't stand for," shouted Senator Johnson. "We disagree about every time we meet. What I am after is to remedy the evils in the Republican party but every time we try to discuss these evils you shout Townleyism and free love and flying machines and Socialism. And we would have corrected some of these evils in the last election if we had the money to get the women votes."

#### Sees Harm to Innocents.

"I care nothing about the Nonpartisan league," said Senator Joe Jackson of St. Paul, "but I believe that in striking at it in this bill a lot of innocent spectators will be knocked over."

Senator Ole Sageng suggested that the bill should include organizations supporting the platforms and policies of the regular political parties as well as those advocating different principles and candidates.

"These organizations under this bill would be permitted to spend unlimited amounts of money," said Senator Sageng. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

On final passage the bill received 35 votes, one more than enough.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Coleman,	Kingsbury,	Ribenack,
Anderson,	Cosgrove,	McGarry,	Rockne,
Baldwin,	Cumming,	Nolan,	Sageng,
Benson,	Denegre,	Orr,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Bessette,	Gjerset,	Palmer,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Blomgren,	Gooding,	Peterson,	Van Hoven,
Brooks,	Guilford,	Putnam,	Vibert,
Callahan,	Hall,	Rask,	Ward.
Cliff,	Hopp,	Reed,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Bonniwell,	Erickson,	Kuntz,	Romberg,
Boylan,	Gandrud,	Larson,	Schmechel,
Carley,	Gillam,	Lindsley,	Stepan,
Conroy,	Handlan,	Loonam,	Swanson.
Devold,	Jackson,	Millett,	
Dwyer,	Johnson,	Naplin,	

Nine did not vote: Cashel, Fowler, Hamer, Hegnes, Lee, Madigan, Turnham, Widell and Wold.

This bill died in the House.

A resolution for a constitutional amendment permitting proportion representation for the legislature and for local representative bodies was reported favorably by the House elections committee, but got no further, owing to press of business. It was on a special order but was not reached the last night.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT.

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, tho 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 the temperance people prepared and passed three bills for the more complete enforcement of the prohibition law.

House File 956 proposed to greatly improve the prohibition laws of 1919 as they relate to all matters of enforcement except transportation, increasing penalties for violation, and providing jail sentences for first offense.

House File 958 covered problems within the field of transportation and authorizing seizure of vehicles.

House File 1157 extended to municipalities all powers enjoyed by the state in all matters of enforcement of prohibition laws.

These three bills all passed the House on special order April 7th by very large majorities.

Dilley attempted to amend 956 so as to legalize 4 per cent beer.

This amendment aroused much discussion.

Keller said "Alcohol has more enemies in public and more friends in private than any other substance."

Norton called Dilley's amendment a joke, and Dilley declared that it is no joke to some of us who can't get beer in Minnesota, when in all other parts of the union 4 per cent can be had.

Kozlak quoted a certain professor's exploded argument who claimed as much food value in a stein of beer as in a loaf of bread. "The people want beer and light wines. If they can't get them, moonshine will be worse than ever."

Norton demanded a roll call, but Oscar Swenson and a number of others objected.

It was quite plain that Dilley's amendment would get more votes without a roll call. There would be no record of the vote.

Norton finally won, and Dilley was defeated. The record shows 32 ayes, 88 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Gartner,	Miner,	Rodenberg,
Briggs,	Keller,	Nellermoe,	Samec,
Brown,	Kleffman,	Nordlin,	Spelbrink,
Burdorf,	Kozlak,	O'Keefe,	Stahlke,
Christensen,A.,	Lennon,	Pattison,	Stein,
Cummings,	Long,	Perry, T.,	Swenson, E.,
Dilley,	McGivern,	Rako,	Walworth,
Flahaven,	McLaughlin,	Risse,	Welch.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Goodspeed,	Lightner,	Serline,
Baxter,	Goodwin,	Lockhart,	Shanks,
Bendixen,	Gran,	Melbye,	Shonyo,
Bensen,	Grant,	Miller,	Spindler,
Bernard,	Green, F. A.,	Moen,	Strand,
Cameron,	Grove,	Murphy,	Swanstrom,
Carlson,	Haugland,	Nelson,	Sweitzer,
Child,	Hemstad,	Neuman,	Swenson,C.J.,
Christianson,A.	Herried,	Nollet,	Swenson,O.A.,
Conley,	Hinds,	Norby,	Taylor,
Curtis,	Hitchcock,	Nordgren,	Teigen,
Day,	Holmquist,	Norton,	Thomas,
DeLury,	Hompe,	Olsen, J. W.,	Thompson,
Dorweiler,	Howard,	Olson, L. E.,	Thorkelson,
Eaton,	Hulbert,	Olson, Lars,	Trowbridge,
Enger,	Iverson,	Oren,	Warner,
Enstrom,	Jacobson,	Parker,	West,
Flaherty,	Johnson,	Pedersen,	Wicker,
Gerlich,	Kelly,	Perry, J. T.,	Wilkinson,
Girling,	Lagersen,	Putnam,	Wright,
Gislason,C.M.,	Lauderdale,	Ross,	Mr. Speaker.
Gislason,J.B.,	Lee,	Scribner,	
	Levin,	Selvig,	

Nearly all who voted for the amendment come from districts that would probably favor beer and wine.

McPartlin objected to voting: "In all seriousness I don't want to vote on these questions. This legislation is useless. I am a conscientious objector."

Miner moved that McPartlin be recorded as voting in the affirmative on the Dilley amendment.

The motion prevailed, and the corrected record shows Mr. McPartlin voting "aye."

Nellermoe declared he had not answered to the call of the House and so was not bound to vote, but the House refused to excuse him and he voted "aye."

On final passage House File 956 secured 78 ayes as against 36 nays.

H. F. 958 passed 72 to 31. House File 1157, 82 to 21.

The arguments in opposition were mostly on the ground that this legislation was too drastic and would defeat itself; but if the prohibition laws are to be enforced, lawbreakers must be made to feel a heavy hand.

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 foundation 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 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.

If all children, and adults, too, for that matter, could be impressed with the fact that thousands of men die in the very prime of life each year as the result of unnatural habits of eating, drinking and living—habits that sap their vitality and breed disease, we should soon be on the way toward a race of men and women, strong and clean of body, keen and intelligent in mind, pure and high minded.

#### In the Senate.

956 was somewhat amended on motion of Senator Geo. H. Sullivan (who was formerly a wet, but now took the lead for law enforcement) and passed with only three nay votes,—Boylan, Handlan, and Loonam.

17 did not vote. All others voted "aye."

958 was passed with not a vote to spare.

Nine voted "no": Boylan, Brooks, Calahan, Conroy, Dwyer, Handlan, Loonam, Stepan, Van Hoven. Nineteen did not vote.

Here follow the 34 "aye" votes:

Anderson,	Gjerset,	Lee,	Sageng,
Benson,	Gooding,	Lindsley,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Blomgren,	Guilford,	Naplin,	Swanson,
Carley,	Hall,	Nolan,	Turnham,
Cashel,	Hamer,	Palmer,	Ward,
Cliff,	Hegnes,	Peterson,	Widell,
Coleman,	Hopp,	Rask,	Wold.
Cumming,	Jackson,	Reed,	
Gandrud,	Johnson,	Rockne,	

These 34 are the center of support. There were many others whose support could have been obtained if needed.

H. F. 1157 passed 41 to 5, Boylan, Conroy, Dwyer, Handlan and Loonam voting "no."

It was evidently the intention of the Senate to pass these bills with as little opposition as possible. This was emphasized by the fact that former wets took a leading part in their support.

The open saloon is gone never to return.

Its ever present temptation has been removed.

But with all its evils the saloon was a sort of social center. It was called the poor man's club.

What will take its place?

Why can't the churches and the schools rise to the occasion? Why can't they furnish a more elevating and ennobling environment where all may meet in social intercourse and enjoy the simple harmless recreation so vital to our civilization?

What a grand thing it would be if the churches could be used seven days in the week to minister to the social and intellectual wants of the people instead of being closed, locked, dark and dismal a good part of the time.

Why can't the churches and the schools become living centers of joy and gladness, where lessons of health, long life and high ideals may be learned by old and young alike, and where true democracy and brotherly kindness may be fostered and encouraged?



## CHAPTER IX. ROAD LEGISLATION.

When the people, at the general election of 1920, adopted the Babcock good roads amendment to the constitution, they put upon the legislature one of the biggest jobs any legislature ever had to undertake.

And yet it was a job that very many members wanted to take part in. Nearly half the members requested places on the roads committee.

After a vast amount of careful work the committee reported out the necessary bills for carrying forward the work of building hard surfaced roads according to the plan adopted by the people.

The only serious point of disagreement related to the control of the work.

The committee had provided in their bill for one commissioner, to be appointed by the governor for a period of 2 years, to have sole charge of the building of the roads.

Many members regarded this "one man" system as autocratic and demanded a commission of three instead of one commissioner.

Haugland and Jacobson offered an amendment to the bill providing for three commissioners, one for two years, one for four years, one for six years, to be appointed by the governor, and removable by him at his pleasure, except for a political reason.

The discussion was long drawn out, the advocates of the commission of three claiming it to be more democratic, while the advocates of one commissioner insisted that one head to a great work of this kind, with concentration of responsibility—would result in better work, greater efficiency and more economy. "If things don't go right you will know who is at fault."

Thirty-seven voted for the amendment, 84 against.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Dorweiler,	Kelly,	Olson, Lars,
Baxter,	Eaton,	Kozlak,	Sluke,
Bendixen,	Gislason, C.M.,	Lagersen,	Spelbrink,
Burdorf,	Gislason, J.B.,	Miner,	Spindler,
Cameron,	Grove,	Nellermoe,	Teigen,
Carlson,	Haugland,	Nelson,	Thompson,
Child,	Howard,	Neuman,	Washburn,
Christianson, T.,	Hulbert,	Nimocks,	
Conley,	Iverson,	Olsen, J. W.,	
Day,	Jacobson,	Olson, L. E.,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Arens,	Enger,	Grant,	Lauderdale,
Bensen,	Enstrom,	Green, F. A.,	Lee,
Bernard,	Flahaven,	Herried,	Levin,
Briggs,	Flaherty,	Hinds,	Lightner,
Brown,	Gartner,	Hitchcock,	Lockhart,
Christensen, A.,	Gerlich,	Holmquist,	Long,
Cullum,	Girling,	Hompe,	McGivern,
Cummings,	Goodspeed,	Johnson,	McLaughlin,
DeLury,	Goodwin,	Keller,	McPartlin,
Dilley,	Gran,	Kleffman,	Melbye,

Miller,	Pedersen,	Selvig,	Taylor,
Moen,	Perry, J. T.,	Serline,	Thomas,
Murphy,	Praxel,	Shanks,	Thorkelson,
Nollet,	Putnam,	Shonyo,	Trowbridge,
Norby,	Rako,	Stahlke,	Walworth,
Nordgren,	Risse,	Strand,	Warner,
Nordlin,	Robinson,	Swanstrom,	Welch,
O'Keefe,	Rodenberg,	Sweitzer,	Wicker,
Oren,	Ross,	Swenson, C.J.,	Wilkinson,
Parker,	Samec,	Swenson, E.,	Wright,
Pattison,	Scribner,	Swenson, O.A.,	Mr. Speaker.

Ten did not vote. Emmons, T. J. Greene, Lennon, Norton, Tim Perry, Steen and West had been excused. Curtis, Darby and Hemstad had answered to roll call.

This special order was then put over till Feb. 17.

Theodore Christianson then proposed an amendment creating a Highway Advisory board, composed of the governor, secretary of state and attorney general, and greatly limiting the powers of the commissioner.

Those favoring "a more democratic" system gained considerable support, securing the vote of nearly all the Non-partisan league and labor votes.

The roll call showed 52 for the Christianson amendment and 69 against.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Flahaven,	Kozlak,	Olsen, J. W.,
Arens,	Gartner,	Lagersen,	Olson, L. E.,
Baxter,	Gislason, C.M.,	Lennon,	Olson, Lars,
Bendixen,	Gislason, J.B.,	Lockhart,	Oren,
Bensen,	Goodwin,	Miner,	Samec,
Burdorf,	Grant,	Melbye,	Sluke,
Child,	Grove,	Moen,	Spelbrink,
Christianson, T.	Haugland,	Nellermoe,	Stahlke,
Conley,	Hemstad,	Nelson,	Teigen,
Curtis,	Iverson,	Neuman,	Thompson,
Day,	Jacobson,	Nimocks,	Thorkelson,
Eaton,	Keller,	Nordlin,	Welch,
Enstrom,	Kelly,	Norton,	Wicker.

Again there were 10 not voting: Cameron, Emmons, Green, T. J., Pederson, Perry T., West, had been excused. Howard, Strand, Washburn and the Speaker had all answered to roll call.

#### In the Senate.

When this bill reached the Senate another fight was put up by Senator McGarry, chairman of the road committee, to secure a three-member commission instead of a single commissioner.

The debate lasted for three hours on the afternoon of March 30th.

McGarry was helped by Senators Nolan, Boylan, Lee, Putnam and Cliff. They urged that a commission of three would make the road work more safe, stable and continuous as to policy; that the rural and back districts would be more likely to get good service; that a commission of three was in harmony with the general policy of the state, for we have

commissions of three in all other departments, Tax commission, Railway and Warehouse commission, Board of Control, Industrial commission, and Securities commission.

Benson, Schmechel, Hall, Johnson, Baldwin, Sageng and J. D. Sullivan defended the bill as it had come from the House. If you want a job well done set one man to do it and hold him responsible, just as you do with your Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Banks, Insurance, Public Examiner and Education. Centralize responsibility and you will know who to praise or blame for the results you get.

The vote stood 25 for the three men, and 40 for the one commissioner.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Bessette,	Devold,	Jackson,	Romberg,
Boylan,	Dwyer,	Lee,	Stepan,
Brooks,	Erickson,	McGarry,	Sullivan, G.H.,
Callahan,	Fowler,	Naplin,	Van Hoven.
Cliff,	Guilford,	Nolan,	
Conroy,	Handlan,	Putnam,	
Cosgrove,	Hegnes,	Rockne,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Adams,	Denegre,	Kuntz,	Ribenack,
Anderson,	Gandrud,	Larson,	Sageng,
Baldwin,	Gillam,	Lindsley,	Schmechel,
Benson,	Gjerset,	Loonam,	Sullivan, J.D.,
Blomgren,	Gooding,	Millett,	Swanson,
Bonniwell,	Hall,	Orr,	Turnham,
Carley,	Hamer,	Palmer,	Vibert,
Cashel,	Hopp,	Peterson,	Ward,
Coleman,	Johnson,	Rask,	Widell,
Cumming,	Kingsbury,	Reed,	Wold.

After this question had been settled the further consideration of the bill was put over till the next day, when it was given the most careful study and consideration.

It was really rather remarkable with what earnestness the entire Senate spent the whole day, both morning and afternoon, considering, one after another, many proposed amendments, all honestly aimed at making the law more efficient as an instrument for securing the best possible results.

The work of the Senate on this bill is worthy of great commendation.

On final passage there were no negative votes.

Three did not vote: Hamer and Madigan were sick and Naplin had been excused for the day.

## CHAPTER X.

## GUARANTY OF BANK DEPOSITS.

It has always been conceded that **Banking** is in its very nature more or less a public matter.

Whether it must always be a public matter is another question. Perhaps we might conceive of a society so organized that banking would be a purely private business, but that is not yet.

At present, everywhere in the civilized world banking is subject to legislative regulation.

In many countries banks are publicly owned and operated, and this has been the case more or less in all civilized ages.

In our country the tendency has been toward publicly regulated banks privately owned and operated.

For some years there has been considerable demand for a statute requiring all state banks to unite to guarantee depositors in all state banks.

This has been resisted by the strong banks on the ground that well administered, strong, safe banks ought not to be taxed to help sustain the credit of weaker banks or those poorly administered.

Several states have passed compulsory laws requiring all banks chartered by the state to join in a fund to guarantee all depositors in all state banks.

Perhaps the best of these is the law in South Dakota.

In the Minnesota legislature of 1919 the House passed a bill based on the South Dakota law by a vote of 79 to 30, but it failed in the Senate.

Then an interim commission was appointed to study the banking question and report to the next session of the legislature.

The result was a bill introduced into the Senate by Mr. Nolan, of Mower county, chairman of the banking committee.

This bill provided for a voluntary system to go into effect when 200 banks had accepted the law and its obligation. These 200 or more banks would unite in a voluntary co-operative association to protect all their depositors.

In the House, 5 guaranty bills were introduced. Two of them were compulsory:

H. F. 4, by Wilkinson.

H. F. 52, by Welch, Enstrom and Burdorf.

Three were voluntary:

H. F. 191, by Briggs, Girling, Trowbridge, Wicker, and Sweitzer.

H. F. 648, by Melbye.

H. F. 937, by the committee on Banks and Banking.

All these bills were on a special order in the House Wednesday, March 23, 1921.

First, the committee bill was discussed at great length by advocates and opponents of the voluntary guaranty system, Briggs and Melbye being the chief advocates, and Wilkinson, Welch and Iverson the leading opponents.

The bill received only 65 votes and failed to pass.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	Gran.	Lennon,	Putnam,
Bernard,	Grant,	Long,	Rako,
Briggs,	Green, F. A.,	McGivern,	Risse,
Brown,	Grove.	McLaughlin,	Ross,
Child,	Herried,	Melbye,	Scribner,
Christensen, A.	Haugland.	Miller,	Serline,
Conley,	Hinds,	Moen,	Shonyo,
Cullum,	Hitchcock,	Neuman,	Swanstrom,
Curtis,	Holmquist,	Nollet,	Sweitzer,
Darby,	Hompe,	Norby,	Taylor,
DeLury,	Howard,	Norton,	Trowbridge,
Dorweiler,	Hulbert,	O'Keefe,	Washburn,
Eaton,	Jacobson,	Olsen, J. W.,	Wicker.
Enger,	Johnson.	Pattison,	Mr. Speaker.
Gerlich,	Kozlak,	Pedersen,	
Girling,	Lauderdale,	Perry, T.,	
Goodspeed,	Lee,	Praxel,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Nordgren,	Strand,	Swenson, C. J.,
Arens,	Goodwin,	Nordlin,	Swenson, E.,
Bensen,	Hemstad,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson, O. A.,
Burdorf,	Iverson,	Olson, Lars,	Teigen,
Carlson,	Keller,	Oren,	Thomas,
Christianson, T.	Kleffman,	Parker,	Thompson,
Cummings,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,	Thorkelson,
Day,	Levin,	Rodenberg,	Walworth,
Dilley,	Lightner,	Samec,	Warner.
Enstrom,	Lockhart,	Selvig,	Welch,
Flahaven,	McPartlin,	Sluke,	West,
Flaherty,	Miner,	Spelbrink,	Wilkinson,
Gartner,	Murphy,	Spindler,	
Gislason, C. M.,	Nellermoe,	Stahlke,	
Gislason, J. B.,	Nelson,	Stein,	

After the noon recess Mr. Oren, who had voted against the bill, moved to reconsider and it was brought back to life by a vote of 64 to 50.

The following who had been against the bill in the morning now voted to give it a new chance:

Carlson, Oren, Selvig, Swenson, C. J., Swenson, O. A., Thomas and West.

DeLury, Howard and Putnam who had voted for the bill in the morning, now refused to go any further and voted no.

This vote of 64 to 50 having brought the bill up for another chance it was then passed by a vote of 66 to 54.

It had gained Carlson, Oren, Selvig, Swenson, C. J., Swenson, O. A., and it had lost Brown, DeLury and Kozlak, and also Wicker who did not vote on the last roll call.

A gain of 5 and a loss of 4 gave it the one vote needed.

Mr. Dilley now started in to kill the other bills, but he got no farther than to indefinitely postpone the Melbye bill which was almost a duplicate of the one just passed.

When he tried to kill the Welch bill he was defeated 51 to 57.

The house then passed the Welch bill 68 to 55.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Gerlich,	Lennon,	Samec,
Arens.	Girling,	Levin,	Sluke,
Bensen,	Gislason, C.M.,	Lockhart,	Spelbrink,
Brown,	Gislason, J. B.,	McGivern,	Spindler,
Burdorf,	Goodwin,	McPartlin,	Stahlke,
Child,	Grove,	Miner,	Stein,
Christianson, T	Haugland,	Moen,	Strand,
Conley,	Hemstad,	Nellermoe,	Swanstrom,
Cummings,	Herried,	Nelson,	Swenson, E.,
Darby,	Hitchcock,	Norby,	Thompson,
Day,	Holmquist,	Nordgren,	Thorkelson,
DeLury.	Hompe,	Nordlin,	Walworth,
Dilley,	Iverson,	Olson, L. E.,	Warner,
Enstrom,	Keller,	Olson, Lars,	Welch,
Flahaven,	Kleffman,	Perry, J. T.,	West,
Flaherty,	Kozlak,	Putnam,	Wilkinson,
Gartner,	Lauderdale,	Rodenberg,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baxter,	Hinds,	Nollet,	Selvig,
Bernard,	Howard,	Norton,	Serline,
Briggs,	Hulbert,	O'Keefe,	Shonyo,
Carlson,	Jacobson,	Olsen, J. W.,	Sweitzer,
Christensen, A.	Johnson,	Oren,	Swenson, C.J.,
Cullum,	Lagersen,	Parker,	Swenson, O.A.,
Curtis,	Lee,	Pattison,	Taylor,
Dorweiler,	Lightner,	Pedersen,	Teigen,
Eaton,	Long,	Perry, T.,	Thomas,
Enger,	McLaughlin,	Praxel,	Trowbridge,
Goodspeed,	Melbye,	Rako,	Washburn,
Gran,	Miller,	Risse,	Wicker,
Grant,	Murphy,	Ross,	
Green, F. A.,	Neuman,	Scribner,	

As this bill is the opposite of the one just passed, it seems that there were several members who were willing to give the Senate a variety to choose from; and this was considerably emphasized when 50 members voted for No. 191,—another voluntary bill.

The following members voted for both the first voluntary bill and the Welch compulsory bill: Brown, Child, DeLury, Gerlich, Girling, Grove, Haugland, Herried, Hitchcock, Holmquist, Hompe, Kozlak, Lauderdale, Lennon, Long, McGivern, Moen, Norby, Putnam and Speaker Nolan.

And here are 8 who voted for all three: Gerlich, Girling, Hitchcock, Hompe, Lauderdale, McGivern, Norby, Speaker Nolan.

Nothing like giving the Senate plenty of choice. But the Senate killed both by indefinite postponement.

## CHAPTER XI. SOME SUGGESTIVE SIDELIGHTS.

Things that appear to be of small importance often serve to illustrate a great principle.

Men will divide on small questions according to their views on big questions.

Not that men are always logical,—far from it,—but that, in a general way, a man's predilections and prejudices can be guessed from his stand on a subject whether the matter be of little or great importance.

Many such cases arise during every session.

### OIL AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The legislature of 1919 amended the oil inspection law so as to provide more safe and sure tests for the purposes of inspection and then provided that all inspection should be placed under the civil service rules of the dairy and food department.

Senator Coleman of Minneapolis introduced a bill to repeal this civil service provision of the 1919 statute and put all the oil inspectors back onto a political basis where they would all be appointed by the governor.

Tuesday, February 8th, the bill was on general order and Coleman had moved that the Senate recommend it to pass.

Senator Carley made a strong speech against the bill. "For the past two years we have had the oil inspection department out of politics and we have had efficient inspection—not the kind where the political inspector simply copied the oil companies' records and drew pay for inspecting a hundred cars of oil.

Putnam and John D. Sullivan favored repeal on the ground that civil service examinations were held but once a year, that most of the candidates came from the cities, and this resulted in sending carpet baggers into the districts to inspect the oil.

Benson urged amendment not repeal.

Dwyer said, "If this bill will repeal the Civil Service, I am for it. I don't want things taken out of politics."

Gillam, "Are we getting good inspection? Yes. We didn't get it before. Let us amend the law, not kill it."

Hamer secured the reading of a set of resolutions from the Automobile Owners' Convention opposing repeal.

Carley closed with another appeal not to go back to the "old, corrupt system. Neilson is a good inspector. Let us keep him and the efficient system he has established."

Devold was pleased that both the Democrats and Republicans were having trouble to make their machines run smoothly.

The bill was indefinitely postponed without a roll call.

For the bill and against Civil Service:

Anderson,	Coleman,	Gooding,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Baldwin,	Conroy,	Hall,	Turnham,
Boylan,	Denegre,	Kingsbury,	Ward,
Brooks,	Dwyer,	Nolan,	
Calahan,	Erickson,	Putnam,	
Cliff,	Fowler,	Reed,	

Against the bill and for Civil Service:

Benson,	Gandrud,	Lindsay,	Peterson,
Blomgren,	Gillam,	Loonam,	Romberg,
Bonniwell,	Guilford,	McGarry,	Sageng,
Carley,	Hamer,	Madigan,	Schmechel,
Cashel,	Jackson,	Naplin,	Stepan,
Cosgrove,	Johnson,	Nord,	Swanson,
Cumming,	Larson,	Orr,	
Devold,	Lee,	Palmer,	

**LEGISLATORS AND THEIR PAY.**

Many members of the legislature honestly feel that the \$1,000 that they receive for a two years' term is a wholly inadequate compensation.

They must spend nearly four months in St. Paul away from home, family and business.

In most cases their election has of necessity cost considerable money, perhaps a third or more of the entire compensation, in addition to the time they had to spend in the campaign for which they never can receive any pay.

The cost of living in St. Paul is such that it is a usual thing for a member to spend all or more than all of his salary before the term is over.

And then there is always the probability of an extra session for which he receives nothing except his mileage.

It is true he receives 15 cents a mile for one trip from home to St. Paul and return; but he will probably be obliged to go home and come back several times during the session; yet he will only get once paid by the state.

So from a financial point of view there is very little inducement for a busy man to take up the burden of a law maker, unless he has some special interest to serve that will take care of him.

Often, then, there are other than financial reasons.

At the present time most members are honestly desirous to give faithful service to the people according to their lights and their conception of what constitutes such service.

Many members regard a term or two in the legislature as having great educational advantages; and probably many hope for further and more lucrative political preferment; but very few such hopes can ever be realized.

**The Railroads and Their Rates.**

Again members say the railroads are getting too much for carrying passengers. 3.6 cents per mile is nearly double what we formerly paid and something should be done.

"Now let us compel the roads to carry us free when we are traveling on 'public business.' Let us pass a law requiring the roads to give us members free passes to be used when we are serving the public in our official capacity."

**The Nimocks Bill.**

So Mr. Nimocks introduces a bill for this purpose and defends it with the above arguments.

Nimocks said it would enable members to "run home now and then" during the session and find out what constituents wanted.

"I was the first person to introduce an anti-free pass bill in the legislature, years ago," said Bendixen. "It was



recognized railroads were in politics then and free passes placed legislators under obligations to railroad corporations. Without charging that house members are corrupt at present, I still believe it is human nature to want to return favors, and that this bill is bad."

Teigen of Jackson forcibly supported Bendixen in opposition to the bill.

All this took place in committee of the whole on January 13th.

The motion made by Mr. Haugland was to indefinitely postpone the bill, and resulted in 61 to kill the bill, 62 to keep it alive and give it another chance.

Several who voted no supposed they were voting to kill the bill, and did not realize their error until it was too late to change. A considerable number of others voted deliberately to keep the bill alive so it could be voted down more emphatically when it should come up for final passage.

#### Editorials Against the Bills.

Several newspapers published leading editorials against the bill, among them the Mpls. Tribune, the Daily Star and the Non-Partisan Leader.

It soon became apparent that the support for the bill was waning. Members who had voted against indefinite postponement began to see that they were in for much explaining if they were to vote for the bill on final passage.

The bill stayed at the head of the Calendar till Tuesday afternoon, January 18th, when Mr. Nimocks, explaining that he desired to be executioner, grave digger and undertaker, moved to indefinitely postpone. This was done with a great chorus of ayes, and a few surly no's and thus was killed and buried the attempt to revive the free pass graft.

#### SALARY INCREASE BILL.

Later Nimocks had another bill to increase the salary of members to \$1,500 for the two years' term.

This bill ran the gauntlet of the Committee and also the Committee of the Whole House and came upon the Calendar for final passage February 16th, then things began to happen.

John B. Gislason, who had been claimed by Nimocks as a supporter of his bill, took the lead in opposition. He declared, "Our salaries are not measured by dollars and cents. If we pass this bill we will deprive ourselves of our best argument against a general increase of salaries and all around extravagance."

Nimocks declared his opponents were a pack of cowards and peanut politicians.

L. E. Olson: "This is no time to raise salaries either for ourselves or our successors."

Nellermoe: "I promised to vote for this bill and I shall keep my promise."

Moen: "The pay is not adequate, I admit, but conditions will change. Can we say no to our officials at home if we raise our own salaries. The time is not now. Wait for normal times."

The bill was badly defeated, tho Nimocks claimed that he had 84 affirmative pledges.

Those who voted in the affirmative were 54:

Arens,	Gerlich,	Murphy,	Scribner,
Bernard,	Girling,	Nellermoe,	Selvig,
Briggs,	Goodwin,	Nimocks,	Strand,
Brown,	Herried,	Nollet,	Swanstrom,
Cameron,	Hitchcock,	Norton,	Sweitzer,
Child,	Keller,	O'Keefe,	Swenson, E.,
Cullum,	Kleffman,	Olsen, J. W.,	Thomas,
Cummings,	Kozlak,	Pattison,	Walworth,
Dilley,	Lauderdale,	Praxel,	Warner,
Dorweiler,	Lennon,	Rako,	Washburn,
Enger,	Levin,	Robinson,	Wicker,
Enstrom,	Lockhart,	Rodenberg,	Mr. Speaker.
Flaherty,	McPartlin,	Ross,	
Gartner,	Miner,	Samec,	

Those who voted in the negative were 66:

Anderson,	Goodspeed,	Lightner,	Risse,
Baxter,	Gran,	McGivern,	Serline,
Bendixen,	Grant,	McLaughlin,	Shanks,
Bensen,	Green, F. A.,	Melbye,	Shonyo,
Burdorf,	Grove,	Miller,	Spelbrink,
Carlson,	Haugland,	Moen,	Spindler,
Christensen, A.	Hemstad,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Christianson, T.	Hinds,	Neuman,	Swensen, C. J.,
Conley,	Holmquist,	Norby,	Swenson, O. A.,
Curtis,	Hompe,	Nordgren,	Taylor,
Darby,	Hulbert,	Nordlin,	Teigen,
Day,	Iverson,	Olson, L. E.,	Thompson,
DeLury,	Jacobson,	Olson, Lars,	Thorkelson,
Eaton,	Johnson,	Oren,	Welch,
Flahaven,	Kelly,	Parker,	Wright.
Gislason, C. M.,	Lagersen,	Perry, J. T.,	
Gislason, J. B.,	Lee,	Putnam,	

28 of these 54 were from three large cities. The only city members voting no were Eaton, Lightner and Nordlin. Howard and West of Minneapolis and T. J. Greene of St. Paul did not vote.

#### THE PRIZE FIGHT BILL.

A bill had been introduced to permit "boxing matches" (prize fights) in all cities large and small, and all villages of more than 5,000 people (Hibbing and Chisholm). Baxter led the opposition. "This is a moral question. Pugilism has been demoralizing in every age and every nation."

Nollet defended present day pugilists.

Tim Perry declared that city boys who had enjoyed the advantages of athletics were made into soldiers more quickly than country boys.

Pattison declared that boxing matches are now held in all parts of the state. This would make them legal and give the state 10 per cent of the receipts.

The bill was defeated, 56 yeas, 59 noes.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Briggs,	Cullum,	Eaton,	Gerlich,
Brown,	Cummings,	Enstrom,	Girling,
Christensen, A.,	Dilley,	Flaherty,	Goodwin,
Conley,	Dorweiler,	Gartner,	Green, F. A.,

Herried,	Long,	Pattison,	Spindler,
Hinds,	McLaughlin,	Perry, T.,	Strand,
Hitchcock,	McPartlin,	Praxel,	Sweitzer,
Howard,	Miner,	Risse,	Swenson, E.,
Keller,	Murphy,	Rodenberg,	Taylor,
Kleffman,	Nellermoe,	Ross,	Thomas,
Kozlak,	Neuman,	Samec,	Trowbridge,
Lauderdale,	Nollet,	Scribner,	Walworth,
Lee,	Nordlin,	Shonyo,	Welch,
Levin,	Olsen, J. W.,	Spelbrink,	Wilkinson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Enger,	Lightner,	Selvig,
Arens,	Flahaven,	Melbye,	Serline,
Baxter,	Gislason, J. B.,	Miller,	Shanks,
Bendixen,	Goodspeed,	Moen,	Sluke,
Bensen,	Gran,	Nelson,	Stahlke,
Bernard,	Grant,	Norby,	Stein,
Burdorf,	Grove,	Nordgren,	Swanstrom,
Cameron,	Haugland,	Norton,	Swenson, C. J.,
Carlson,	Hemstad,	Olson, L. E.,	Swenson, O. A.,
Child,	Hompe,	Olson, Lars,	Teigen,
Christianson, T.,	Hulbert,	Oren,	Thompson,
Curtis,	Jacobson,	Parker,	Thorkelson,
Darby,	Johnson,	Pedersen,	Warner,
Day,	Kelly,	Perry, J. T.,	Wicker.
DeLury,	Lagersen,	Pntnam,	

McPartlin had declared that if this bill were defeated he would introduce a bill to repeal the present law that permits 10-round prize fights in the three large cities. Miner now asked him if he intended to keep his promise.

Not satisfied with defeat in the House, the friends of this law to extend boxing matches to all the small cities and big villages in the state, pushed their bill to a vote in the Senate Saturday, April 2, and were there defeated 24 yeas, 26 nays.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Cashel,	Erickson,	Reed,
Anderson,	Conroy,	Hegnes,	Ribenack,
Bessette,	Cosgrove,	Kuntz,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Boylan,	Denegre,	Loonam,	Swanson,
Brooks,	Devold,	McGarry,	Van Hoven,
Callahan,	Dwyer,	Rask,	Vibert.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Benson,	Gandrud,	Nolan,	Stepan,
Blomgren,	Gillam,	Peterson,	Sullivan, G. H.,
Bonniwell,	Gooding,	Putnam,	Turnham,
Carley,	Guilford,	Rockne,	Ward,
Cliff,	Hall,	Romberg,	Wold.
Cumming,	Jackson,	Sageng,	
Fowler,	Lindsley,	Schmechel,	

This leaves 16 senators not voting: Larson, Baldwin, Kingsbury and Lee had been excused, Madigan had been sick for a long time. Coleman, Gjesset, Hamer, Handlan, Hopp, Johnson, Millett, Naplin, Orr, Palmer and Widell did not vote.

**HIBBING, CHISHOLM AND MR. KLEFFMAN.**

Hibbing and Chisholm are great, sprawling villages in the iron country.

The first has more than 15,000 people and the second more than 9,000.

For years they were ruled, or rather misruled by the agents and influences of the Steel trust.

Then they revolted, elected men of the people to office, and began to govern in the interest of the people.

But they have never adopted city charters.

They have always remained villages, and, as villages, there has been no system of registration of voters, before elections, nor any of the other safeguards that surround the polls in third and fourth class cities of the state.

It has been easy to send repeaters from one precinct to another on election day, and to stuff the ballot boxes with fraudulent votes.

**Enter Kleffman.**

In the election of 1920 the workers and common people of the district sent A. H. Kleffman to represent them in the legislature.

The first thing Kleffman did was to introduce a bill to throw around the elections in those two villages the same safeguards that apply in cities of the same size throughout the state.

The mining interests did not like this bill a little bit, but they didn't dare oppose it; and on Friday, Jan. 21, Mr. Kleffman had the rules suspended and his bill passed by a vote of 108 to none.

Mr. Kleffman handled this matter with great skill and it went through without a hitch.

Jan. 25, on motion of Senator Bessette, the Senate passed this bill without a dissenting vote.

The range villages may now have decent elections.

**"GROWING THE HOODLUM."**

Put a boy born of gentle white parents among Indians and he will grow up like an Indian.

Let a child born of criminal parents have a setting of morality, integrity and love and the chances are that he will not grow up into a criminal, but into an upright man.

If a child with a vicious temper be placed in an environment of peace and quiet the temper will change.

I am as certain of those great truths as I am of the great truths in the plant world. Put a plant into close quarters without sunshine and room to grow normally and you'll get a hoodlum plant!

The only place hoodlums grow is in dark, dry, cramped surroundings. Change those surroundings; put a little love and care and sunshine into their lives and you get opposite results.—Luther Burbank in *Association Men*.

The whole history of mankind proves that the more brutal the punishment, the greater the number of criminals.

Crime is not the result of innate depravity.

Crime, as Burbank says, is the result of bad environment.

Change the environment—improve living conditions—make it possible to earn an honest living easily—and crime will diminish and possibly disappear.

But there are always those who cling to the discredited idea of punishment.

Senator Hall introduced a bill to restore the death penalty, but the committee killed it.

Nimocks had a similar bill as H. F. No. 1, but it died when Hall's bill was killed.

Nimocks, also, in H. F. No. 2, proposed to establish the electric chair.

Again, in H. F. No. 3, Nimocks proposed to increase punishment for robbery in the first degree.

#### Fraudulent Checks.

On the afternoon of Jan. 21, Rep. J. O. Levin tried to pass a bill amending the statute relative to issuing checks without sufficient funds. He would make a certificate of protest from a bank in another state against a check issued in Minnesota prima facie evidence in this state that the drawer of the check had no funds in the bank when the check was drawn.

O'Keefe of Dakota county and Nordlin of St. Paul objected on the ground that such a law would be quite as likely to catch the innocent as the guilty. Of course it is quite desirable to prevent thieves and swindlers from issuing fraudulent checks on banks outside the state and getting away with it, but this bill will not accomplish that result, while it might, and undoubtedly would subject innocent persons to great hardship, especially as the bill makes an innocent holder of a fraudulent check equally guilty with the person who has fraudulently drawn and issued the check.

This is trying to do a good thing in a bad way. However, the following 16 members voted for the bill:

Briggs,	Hitchcock,	Melbye,	Shonyo,
Dilley,	Jacobson,	Nimocks,	Sweitzer,
Eaton,	Levin,	Parker,	Taylor,
Flaherty,	Lightner,	Praxel,	West.

On the afternoon of Feb. 16, one of the educational bills was up which prohibited changing the boundaries of consolidated school districts without the consent of the State Department of Education. Iverson tried to amend out the prohibition and provide that the State Department need only be notified. Teigen then took the floor and briefly pointed out his objections to the bill—that it strengthened the centralized control of our schools in the state department and deprived the local authorities of a little more of their initiative. The bill was killed very dead, only 18 voting for it and 75 against.

On the same afternoon, Jan. 21, they had up a bill to permit farmers' mutual insurance companies to extend their operations into the field of automobile insurance.

Mr. Eaton had opposed this bill in the insurance committee, and in the committee of the whole House, and now continued his opposition on the ground that automobile insurance is especially hazardous, that the mutual companies

are inadequately equipped to handle the business and assume the great risks and that, therefore, such companies are likely to go broke and sacrifice the farmers' investment.

Baxter, Jacobson and Wilkinson defended the ability of the mutuals to handle the business and assume the risks. "In the first place the risks in the country are only about one-eighth as great as in the cities. The old line companies have always tried to stop the progress of the farmers' mutuals and have always raised the same cry that only the old line companies could safely handle the business; but we have demonstrated our ability to furnish insurance to farmers in every line cheaper than they, and now we propose to protect our automobiles against accident, theft and fire at half the cost they demand of us."

"Really they are very kind to offer to act as guardians to protect us from ourselves," said Wilkinson.

The bill passed with only two votes against it: Guy E. Dilley, real estate and insurance, St. Paul; Leo K. Eaton, attorney, of Minneapolis.

Nimocks of Minneapolis had a bill greatly increasing the penalty for "taking an automobile without the consent of the owner" and "driving it across a county line."

Nimocks lauded the bill as a means of preventing the stealing of automobiles for joyriding or ordinary thievery.

Nordlin objected that it opened the door to the worst kind of malicious prosecution. What constitutes "consent of the owner?" "and why should it be a far greater offense to drive 'across a county line' than to just drive around in the same county?"

The opposition might have been stated more fully and fairly. The bill passed with one vote to spare.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Arens,	Green, T.J.,	McPartlin,	Serline,
Bernard,	Grove,	Melbye,	Shanks,
Briggs,	Herried,	Miller,	Shonyo,
Cameron,	Hinds,	Neuman,	Swanstrom,
Carlson,	Howard,	Nimocks,	Sweitzer,
Christianson, T.,	Hulbert,	Nollet,	Swenson, C.J.,
Cullum,	Jacobson,	Norby,	Swenson, O.A.,
Darby,	Johnson,	Nordgren,	Taylor,
Dorweiler,	Kelly,	Norton,	Trowbridge,
Eaton,	Lauderdale,	Parker,	Walworth,
Enger,	Lee,	Pattison,	Warner,
Gerlich,	Lennon,	Perry, T.,	Washburn,
Girling,	Levin,	Praxel,	West,
Gislason, J.B.,	Lightner,	Rako,	Wicker,
Goodspeed,	Long,	Risse,	Wilkinson,
Gran,	McGivern,	Rodenberg,	Mr. Speaker.
Grant,	McLaughlin,	Selvig,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Burdorf,	Day,	Flahaven,
Baxter,	Christensen, A.,	DeLury,	Flaherty,
Bendixen,	Conley,	Dilley,	Gartner,
Bensen,	Cummings,	Emmons,	Gislason, C.M.,
Brown,	Curtis,	Enstrom,	Goodwin,

Green, F.A.,	Lockhart,	Perry, J.T.,	Strand,
Haugland,	Miner.	Putnam.	Swenson, E.,
Hemstad,	Moen,	Robinson,	Teigen,
Hitchcock,	Nellermoe,	Samec,	Thomas,
Holmquist,	Nelson,	Scribner,	Thompson,
Hompe,	Nordlin,	Sluke,	Thorkelson,
Keller,	Olsen, J.W.,	Spelbrink,	Welch,
Kleffman.	Olson, L.E.,	Spindler,	Wright.
Kozlak,	Olson, Lars,	Stahlke,	
Lagersen,	Oren,	Stein,	

The negative votes on this bill are mostly members who use care that a bill to punish the guilty doesn't also catch the innocent.

This bill afterward passed the Senate.

In H. F. 31 and 113 by Mr. Nimocks an attempt was made to make it harder for owners of property to collect rents. The first bills were returned to the author.

Again in H. F. 41, Nimocks attempted to regulate the entire milk business by means of fines and penalties, in place of the process of education and co-operation so successfully employed by the city of St. Paul.

The bill was opposed by the Health Department of St. Paul and was killed.

So it did no harm except to clutter up the records of the legislature.

In H. F. 379, Nimocks and others provided strong penalties for carrying pistols and revolvers.

Indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Nimocks later introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to re-establish the death penalty but that was returned to its author.

It would not be correct—to suppose that Mr. Nimocks was the only member who introduced bills to make people good through fear of punishment, but he has more such bills to his credit, or discredit, than any other member; neither would it be true to suppose that he confined his energies entirely to this kind of legislation.

Mr. Nimocks was the author of several other measures, only two of which passed.

#### AMENDING THE EIGHT HOUR LAW.

The legislature of 1919 passed a bill providing for the eight hour day for employes in all state institutions and on all state work.

This law aroused great opposition among the farmers who claimed that they could not operate their farms on an eight hour basis, that eight hours in the state institutions set the standards, and that they could not get help. Moreover if the great program of state roads was to be put thru on an eight hour basis, it would be still more difficult for them to keep workers on the farms, besides adding greatly to the cost of the roads.

They brought in a bill to amend the eight hour law so that all outside workers for the state should not be confined to the eight hour standard.

This bill was bitterly opposed by the forces of organized

labor both in committee and on the floor of the house where it was passed Wednesday, March 30th, by just the necessary 66 votes.

Representative Theo. Christianson strongly urged passage of the bill. It would save the state many thousands of dollars on road work alone, and that employes of the state on the state farms and on other outdoor state work should not be given any advantage over those employed by private farmers.

John B. Pattison in opposing the bill said, "This bill is not backed by friends of labor nor has the state board of control asked for this change."

"The University farm school and other state departments, and T. E. Cashman of the Farm Bureau are urging the passage of the bill," declared Representative Neuman.

Miner denounced the bill as having all the earmarks of the "open shop" movement.

"The big unemployment problem can't be solved by lengthening the work day," declared O. D. Nellermoe of Minneapolis and B. J. Keller of St. Paul took the same stand.

It took a long time to get the necessary 66 to pass the bill.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Baxter,	Gislason, J. B.,	Lagersen,	Selvig,
Bendixen,	Goodspeed,	Lee,	Serline,
Briggs,	Gran,	Levin,	Shanks,
Cameron,	Grant,	Lightner,	Shonyo,
Carlson,	Green, F. A.,	Melbye,	Spindler,
Christensen, A.	Grove,	Miller,	Swenson, C. J.,
Christianson, T.	Haugland,	Moen,	Swenson, O. A.,
Conley,	Herried,	Neuman,	Teigen,
Cullum,	Hinds,	Norby,	Thompson,
Curtis,	Holmquist,	Nordgren,	Trowbridge,
Darby,	Hompe,	Oren,	Warner,
Dorweiler,	Howard,	Parker,	West,
Eaton,	Hulbert,	Pedersen,	Wicker,
Enger,	Iverson,	Perry, J. T.,	Wilkinson,
Flaherty,	Jacobson,	Perry, T.,	Wright,
Gerlich,	Johnson,	Putnam,	
Girling,	Kelly,	Risse,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Gislason, C. M.,	Miner	Sluke,
Arens,	Goodwin,	Murphy,	Spelbrink,
Bensen,	Hemstad,	Nellermoe,	Stahlke,
Bernard,	Hitchcock,	Nelson,	Stein,
Brown,	Keller,	Nollet,	Strand,
Burdorf,	Kleffman,	Nordlin,	Swanstrom,
Child,	Kozlak,	O'Keefe,	Sweitzer,
Cummings,	Lauderdale,	Olsen, J. W.,	Swenson, E.,
Day,	Lennon,	Olson, L. E.,	Thomas,
DeLury,	Lockhart,	Pattison,	Thorkelson,
Dilley,	Long,	Rako,	Walworth,
Enstrom,	McGivern,	Rodenberg,	Welch,
Flahaven,	McLaughlin,	Samec,	
Gartner,	McPartlin,	Scribner,	



Ten did not vote: Emmons, T. J. Green, Nimocks, Norton, Lars Olson, Praxel, Ross, Taylor, Washburn and Speaker Nolan.

April 18th this bill passed the Senate 46 to 14.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams,	Cumming,	Kingsbury,	Sageng,
Anderson,	Denegre,	Kuntz,	Schimechel,
Baldwin,	Fowler,	Larson,	Stepan,
Benson,	Gandrud,	Lindsley,	Sullivan, J. D.,
Blomgren,	Gillam,	McGarry,	Turnham,
Bonniwell,	Gjerset,	Nolan,	Van Hoven,
Brooks,	Gooding,	Putnam,	Vibert,
Carley,	Guilford,	Rask,	Ward,
Cashel,	Hall,	Reed,	Widell,
Cliff,	Hamer,	Ribenack,	Wold,
Coleman,	Hegnes,	Rockne,	
Cosgrove,	Hopp,	Romberg,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boylan,	Dwyer,	Johnson,	Orr,
Callahan,	Erickson,	Lee,	Swanson,
Conroy,	Handlan,	Loonam,	
Devold,	Jackson,	Naplin,	

#### THE RODENBERG SHERIFF'S PAY BILL.

Tuesday, Feb. 1, this bill was before the House for passage.

Mr. Rodenberg explained that the bill simply authorized the counties of Ramsey and Koochiching to pay to their sheriffs the salaries which had been withheld from them during the time they had been suspended by Gov. Burnquist.

"There was a street car strike in St. Paul. Sheriff Wagner had called out all his deputies to keep order and protect property. The police department had done the same. The sheriff had not asked for the calling out of the Home Guards.

"Some roughs and hoodlums had committed damage to street cars. This lasted an hour or two. Then peace and quiet prevailed, without the least disorder.

"Governor Burnquist suspended Sheriff Wagner and appointed in his place E. H. Davidson of the Home Guards.

"The Home Guards were immediately called out and marched up and down the streets and Davidson is said to have declared that he would 'hang crepe on the door of any working man who showed his head out of his window.'

"Davidson promised not to accept any pay; but he did draw full pay and turned it over to the Home Guards.

"Later Sheriff Wagner had a full and impartial trial before the Governor. It was admitted that he had been suspended without just cause, and the Governor reinstated him. Later the people re-elected him by the biggest majority he ever received.

"He was deprived of his pay for that period of his suspension.

"We simply ask that the legislature authorize the county of Ramsey to pay Mr. Wagner what is justly due him."

Mr. Lightner objected to the bill.

"It is a bad precedent to pay men who had been suspended and thus did not serve. Mr. Wagner lived in the sheriff's house, and made what profit there was in feeding the prisoners. The Governor reinstated him 'during good behavior.' I hope the bill will not pass."

Mr. McPartlin of Koochiching described the situation in his county.

"A certain great corporation, for purposes of its own, had made complaint against the sheriff, and the governor had suspended him.

"This sheriff was a poor man with a family to support. He could not seek other employment for he was expecting to be vindicated and reinstated.

"Finally, after a fair and complete investigation by the Governor, he was found guilty of no offense and was restored to his office.

"He should have his pay. I hope the bill will pass."

Mr. Briggs: "I occupy an impartial position. These men were suspended. They were tried and reinstated. I favor this bill."

Mr. Lennon: "These men had a fair trial before the Governor. The verdict was not guilty. The charges were untrue. We should pass this bill."

Washburn said: "This is a Ramsey county affair. Why should a man be deprived of his salary when he had been removed from his office and then reinstated after a fair trial and no guilt proved?" The bill passed the house with a large majority.

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson,	Girling,	Miner,	Selvig,
Bendixen,	Gislason,C.M.,	Murphy,	Sluke,
Bensen,	Gislason,J.B.,	Nelson,	Spelbrink,
Bernard,	Gran,	Neuman,	Spindler,
Briggs,	Green,F.A.,	Nimocks,	Stahlke,
Brown,	Grove,	Norby,	Stein,
Burdorf,	Hemstad,	Nordlin,	Strand,
Cameron,	Hitchcock,	O'Keefe,	Swanstrom,
Christensen,A.,	Holmquist,	Olsen,J.W.,	Swenson,E.,
Cullum,	Hompe,	Olson,L.E.,	Swenson,O.A.,
Cummings,	Keller,	Oren,	Thomas,
DeLury,	Kozlak,	Pattison,	Thompson,
Dilley,	Lennon,	Perry,J.T.,	Thorkelson,
Emmons,	Lockhart,	Rako,	Walworth,
Enstrom,	Long,	Robinson,	Washburn,
Flahaven,	McGivern,	Rodenberg,	West,
Flaherty,	McLaughlin,	Ross,	Wilkinson,
Gartner,	McPartlin,	Samec,	Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Baxter,	Haugland,	Olson,Lars,	Warner,
Child,	Jacobson,	Putnam,	Wicker,
Christianson,T.	Kelly,	Sweitzer,	Wright.
Curtis,	Lagersen,	Taylor,	
Grant,	Lightner,	Teigen,	
Hulbert,	Moen,	Trowbridge,	

## A FEW MODEST SUGGESTIONS.

### More Local Responsibility.

In every session much time is wasted on legislation relating to purely local matters,—relating to the affairs of townships, cities school districts and counties.

If the principle of home rule and local self government could be extended so that all these affairs could be taken care of by the localities affected much time would be saved and better results reached.

"The remedy for the ills of democracy is more democracy."

Put the responsibility for local affairs on the local people. Nothing will so stimulate civic interest. Nothing will so arouse the citizens of any community as to feel that the burden is upon themselves.

In a democratic republic the management of affairs should rest with the people—not be handed down from a legislature sitting at St. Paul.

### The Question of Salaries.

A provision should be put into the constitution making it impossible for the legislature to grant any increase in salaries to any officials during their present term of office.

Every candidate for any office knows what the pay is when he files for nomination.

It is bad faith to ask for an increase before the end of the term.

Spindler and Kelley introduced a bill for a constitutional amendment to this effect, but it was defeated.

### Proportional Representation.

If members of the legislature were elected by a proportional system, so that no considerable minority would ever lack representation, it would be a very great improvement all around.

It would result in the nomination and election of the ablest men within the various groups.

Ideas would be represented rather than certain territorial boundaries.

Suppose each congressional district in the state were to elect six senators and twelve representatives at large. Then any group of people comprising about one-sixth of the population of any district would be sure to have a senator. They would put forward their ablest man and devote their energies to explaining their ideas so as to get votes.

There would be no considerable minorities unrepresented to breed discontent.

This system is being rapidly adopted for the election of city councils and other legislative bodies everywhere in the civilized world and is working well.

An amendment to the constitution permitting proportional representation was reported favorably by the Elections Committee of the house but died on special order.

### The State Auditor.

The state auditor should be auditor and nothing else. Then the various departments of the state government should be co-ordinated, each with a responsible head.

HOUSE MEMBERS	Super Tax on Iron Ore	"Occupational" Out of Ore Tax Amend.	To Tax Royalties	Per Capita Tax Limitation	Lower Taxes on Homes	St. Railway Bill	For State Police	For Political Conventions	To Extend Boxing Matches to all Cities	Haugland Amend. ment to Road Bill	To Repeal 8 hr. Day on State Roads	Dilley's 4% Beer Amendment	Welch Bank Guaranty Bill	To Increase Pay of Legislators
Anderson.....	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Arens.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Baxter.....	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Bendixen.....	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N		N
Bensen.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Bernard.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Briggs.....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Brown.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Burdorf.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Cameron.....	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Carlson.....	Y	Y		N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Child.....	Y	Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Christensen, A.	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Christianson, T.	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Conley.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Cullum.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		N	Y
Cummings.....			Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Curtis.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	Y	N
Darby.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	N		Y	N	Y	N
Day.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
DeLury.....	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Dilley.....	N		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Dorweiler.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Eaton.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Emmons.....	Y	Y	SMR EMMONS DIED APRIL 8TH, 1921											
Enger.....	Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Enstrom.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Flahaven.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Flaherty.....	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Gartner.....	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Gerlich.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Girling.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Gislason, C.M.	Y		Y	N		N	N	N		Y	N	N	Y	N
Gislason, J. B.	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Goodspeed.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Goodwin.....	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Gran.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Grant.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Green, F. A.	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Greene, T. J.			WAS ABSENT SICK NEARLY ALL THE SESSION											
Grove.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Haugland.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Hemstad.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	N	Y	N
Herried.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Hinds.....	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Hitchcock.....	N		N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Holmquist.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y	N
Hompe.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Howard.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Hulbert.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Iverson.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N			N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Jacobson.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Johnson.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Keller.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Kelly.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Kleffman.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Kozlak.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Lagersen.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Lauderdale.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Lee.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Lennon.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y
Levin.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Lightner.....	N		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Lockhart.....	N		Y	N		N	N	N		N	N	N	Y	Y
Long.....	N	N	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	

HOUSE MEMBERS	Super Tax on Iron Ore	"Occupational" Out of Ore Tax Amend.	To Tax Royalties	Per Capita Tax Limitation	Lower Taxes on Homes	St. Railway Bill	For State Police	For Political Conventions	To Extend Boxing Matches to all Cities	Haugland Amendment to Road Bill	To Repeal 8 hr. Day on State Roads	Dilleys 4% Beer Amendment	Welch Bank Guaranty Bill	To Increase Pay of Legislators
McGivern.....	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
McLaughlin.....	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
McPartlin.....	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Melbye.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Miller.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Miner.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Moen.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Murphy.....	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Nellermoe.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Nelson.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Neuman.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Nimocks.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Nollet.....	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Norby.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Nordgren.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Nordlin.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Norton.....	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
O'Keefe.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Olson, J. W.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Olson, L. E.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Olson, L. O.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Oren.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Parker.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Pattison.....	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Pedersen.....	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Perry, J. T.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Perry, T.....	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Praxel.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Putnam.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Rako.....	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Risse.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Robinson.....	MR. ROBINSON DIED MARCH 11TH, 1921.													
Rodenberg.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Ross.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Samco.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Scribner.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Selvig.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Serline.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Shanks.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Shonyo.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Sluke.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Spelbrink.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Spindler.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Stahlke.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Stein.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Strand.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Swanstrom.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Switzer.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Swenson, C. J.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Swenson, E.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Swenson, O. A.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Taylor.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Teigen.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Thomas.....	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Thompson.....	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Thorkelson.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Trowbridge.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Walworth.....	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Warner.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Washburn.....	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Welch.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
West.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Wicker.....	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Wilkinson.....	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Wright.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Mr. Speaker.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y

SENATORS	Ore Tax Bill	"Occupational" Out of Ore Tax Amend.	Royalty Tax Bill	Per Capita Tax Limitation	Income Tax Amend. to Suspend Rules	St. Railway Bill	For State Police	For Political Conventions	Gjerset Political Party Bill	Prohibition Enforcement	To Abolish Civil Serv. in Oil Dept.	McGarry Amend. ment to Road Law	To Extend Boxing Matches to all Cities	To Repeal 8 hr. Day on Road Work
Adams.....	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Anderson.....	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Baldwin.....	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Benson.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bessette.....	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Blomgren.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bonniwell.....	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Boylan.....	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Brooks.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Callahan.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Carley.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Cashel.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Cliff.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Coleman.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Conroy.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Coogrove.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cumming.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Denegre.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Devold.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Dwyer.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Erickson.....	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fowler.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Gandrud.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Gillam.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Gjerset.....	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Gooding.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Guilford.....	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Hall.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Hamer.....	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Handlan.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Hegnes.....	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Hopp.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Jackson.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Johnson.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Kingsbury.....	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Kuntz.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Larson.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Lee.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Lindsley.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Loonam.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
McGarry.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Madigan.....	WAS ABSENT SICK NEARLY ALL THE SESSION													
Millett.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Naplin.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Nolan.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Nord.....	SENATOR NORD DIED MARCH 5TH, 1921													
Orr.....	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Palmer.....	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Peterson.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Putnam.....	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Rask.....	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Reed.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Ribenack.....	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Rockne.....	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Romberg.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Sageng.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Schmechel.....	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Stepan.....	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Sullivan, G. H.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Sullivan, J. D.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Swanson.....	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Turnham.....	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Van Hoven.....	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vibert.....	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Ward.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Widell.....	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Wold.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y