

The Pioneer Express.

VOL. XXX. PEMBINA, N. D., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1908. NUMBER 21

Official Election Returns for 1908.

The Bank of Ottawa

Total Assets Exceed
Thirty-two Million Dollars.

Every one who earns money needs a Saving Account.
The time is sure to come when a reserve of cash will be badly needed to take advantage of an opportunity for profitable investment—to meet reverses—or to provide for old age.
A deposit of \$1.00 opens an account. Interest paid four times a year.

Emerson Branch. A. H. LOGAN
MANAGER.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF CITY AND COUNTY.

TERMS, \$2.00 PER ANNUM.

F. A. Wardwell. G. G. Thompson.
WARDWELL & THOMPSON.

A PROPOSED NEW FORM OF SENATORIAL BALLOT.

We have never favored the primary law either in theory or practice. For a long time at the beginning of the agitation for the primary law the Pioneer Express was about its only outspoken and argumentative opponent among the state press. Now hardly one so poor as to do it reverence.

But because the poor bungle has now so few friends, and is now "the under dog"—and, mostly because it is always easier to find fault than to build up—we are willing once to try our hand for its improvement, if that is possible.

Besides, we have always said, that if practicable it would be a good idea for the people to have an opportunity to express their choice for U. S. senator, because on this issue they had a positive choice.

Hence we suggest a new form of the "Little Senatorial Ballot" so-called, to be used by all voter at the general election when no 40 per cent choice has been made at the June primaries. To premise: The great fault with the present system at the general election is, that either the voter must tell with which party he "affiliates" which is really against the law and the secrecy of the ballot, or else voters of either party may interfere with and influence the choice of the candidate for senator of the other party or parties. It is a self-evident proposition that only republicans should vote for republican candidates and vice versa as to democrats.

It is also evident that no man ought to be compelled to tell in public for whom he intends to vote.

It is also an ordinary proposition that the legislators elect are and ought to be particularly responsible to their own constituents who have elected them, for their votes for U. S. senator and not to the whole state. This rule is established by long custom on other issues. Further, under our laws, the voter when he casts his vote for the local legislator is in effect also casting a vote for U. S. senator, because it will be the duty of that legislator if elected to vote for a senator. Following this, therefore, the voter should have the right to express his wishes in this important matter to his personal representative and the representative has an equal moral obligation to duly consider the wishes of his constituents.

The form of "senatorial ballot" that has occurred to us is about like the following. (The legal form of course would follow the usual names, squares, blank spaces, etc. but we abbreviate to fit newspaper columns. We also add the names of two Democratic candidates for senator as this may sometime happen.)

The principal feature is the taking of the names of the candidates for the legislature from the blank sheet and placing them instead on the little senatorial ballot, thus:

LEGISLATIVE AND SENATORIAL BALLOT.

For Senator, First District:

Judson LaMoure

A. D. McMurray

For Representatives First District:

Geo. A. McCrea

W. J. Watts

J. J. O'Connor

Walter Welford

My choice for U. S. Senator is:

M. N. Johnson

T. F. Marshall

J. L. Cashel

John Doe

From a perusal of the above ballot as marked, it is plain that the voter is a

straight republican at least as far as legislative matters go, and that he wants his representatives to vote for M. N. Johnson for U. S. senator. Nobody besides himself knows who voted the ballot, but he has clearly expressed himself a Republican on the ballot so far as it goes—and we don't know any better test—unless we can somehow get hold of his whole ticket, which of course is impossible.

If the voter had "crossed his ticket" and voted say for Mr. Welford the Democratic candidate, leaving out Mr. Watts, then his wishes as a Republican should be discounted just in proportion.

If the voter had voted say, for all the Republican legislators and then asked them to vote for Mr. Cashel or Mr. Doe or other opposition party senatorial candidate, then his wishes would count for nothing because it could not be expected that a Republican legislator would vote for a Democratic senator except under most extraordinary circumstances.

While we have taken the first legislative district and candidates for illustration the same remarks would be true of any other district or any other party if they were in the majority. We have also assumed that the selections at the primaries for senator followed the present method.

It may be objected, that even the marking on the proposed ballot will not definitely settle the question as to whether the voter is a Republican or not, because he might vote everything else Democratic. This is true, but this will come about as near as possible and still observe the secrecy of the ballot and perhaps will be about as fair a test as any other possible. If the voter is Republican on legislative matters he is more than likely to be so most, if not all matters, as there is more real partisanship involved in legislative affairs than in county candidates for instance.

But of course the discussion of that matter brings us up against the primary law as it involves the questions "what is a partisan," and "what is a party?" and these are questions answered only by each man's own conscience—and cannot be defined in law or by law.

Another thing about this form of ballot is that with the blank space below the senatorial names, the voters by stickers or writing might still express their preference for some third party as senator at the general election and not be forced to take the choice from two candidates neither of whom were their real choice, though they were the choice of the majority of the party in the state. (such state chosen candidates however to have the advantage of names printed on the ballot.) The voter also might write on his ballot something to the effect that he was willing to leave the matter of how the legislator should vote, to the judgement of the legislator himself when the time came for casting his vote in the legislature. And with this privilege there might be a good many votes so expressed. Anyway, we submit the suggestion. It may be a bungle, and if so, it will be no worse than the law which has suggested it.

The fact that hereafter there will be five judges on the supreme bench, instead of three, will make a complication that will be somewhat difficult for that august body to decide. Heretofore, under the operation of the law, each judge was in turn chief justice during the last two years of his six year term, one judge going out of office every two years. Now, Gov. Burke will appoint two new judges to serve until the next general election. At that time, successors to these appointees will be voted for as well as for a third member, whose time expires by limitation. Thus, these three judges will have a co-ordinate six year term, all going out of office together. The question therefore arises, who will be eligible of these three to the chief justiceship? In other words, how can each of five judges be chief justice for two years when they all have six year terms?

The commissioners proceedings of last week were confined almost entirely to allowing bills, and most of these were election bills. Judges, clerks, and polling places were allowed \$4. each, and inspectors the same with some additional allowance for putting booths and sample ballots. Those who brought in the returns, were allowed per diem and mileage, according to time taken and distance.

Names of Candidates.	Akre	Advance	Bathgate Twp.	Beaulieu	Carleton	Cavalier Twp.	Crystal Twp.	Drayton Twp.	Elora	Gardar	Hamilton Twp.	Joliette	Lamoure	Lindcoln	Lodema	Midland	Neché Twp.	Park	Pembina Twp.	St. Joseph	St. Thomas	Thingvalla	Walhalla Twp.	Walhalla Village	Canton	Cavalier Village	Crystal City	Drayton City	Hamilton Village	Neché Village	Pembina, War	Pembina, War	Pembina, Ward 3	St. Thomas City	Walhalla Village	Total Vote	Majority			
Republican Electors—	49	40	23	32	32	62	28	17	31	79	27	31	21	29	29	24	31	33	30	90	40	62	39	36	10	83	33	51	18	64	29	37	30	54	65	1389	204			
Oluf Hagen	49	40	23	32	32	62	28	17	31	79	27	31	21	29	29	24	31	33	30	90	40	62	39	36	10	83	33	51	18	64	29	37	30	54	65	1389				
Herman Scheer	49	40	23	32	32	62	28	17	31	79	27	31	21	29	29	24	31	33	30	90	40	62	39	36	10	83	33	51	18	64	29	37	30	54	65	1389				
Ed. Nichols	49	40	23	32	32	62	28	17	31	79	27	31	21	29	29	24	31	33	30	90	40	62	39	36	10	83	33	51	18	64	29	37	30	54	65	1389				
Anton Hanson	49	40	23	32	32	62	28	17	31	79	27	31	21	29	29	24	31	33	30	90	40	62	39	36	10	83	33	51	18	64	29	37	30	54	65	1389				
Democratic Electors—	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
Joseph M. Kelly	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
John B. Fried	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
Edward E. Cole	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
F. L. Mackey	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
Socialist Electors—	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
Robert Grant	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
I. S. Lampman	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
N. H. Bjornstad	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
J. E. Kulstad	29	31	16	52	42	57	37	29	19	34	26	28	29	41	23	28	44	17	57	103	37	61	17	25	17	51	41	46	16	19	9	22	11	42	41	1185				
Prohibition Electors—	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
A. G. Covell	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
M. H. Kiff	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
N. A. Colby	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
John Severon	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Independence Electors—																																								
Charles U. Pierson																																								
B. A. Ledy																																								
M. J. Lyster																																								
B. F. Lathrop																																								
Representatives in Congress—																																								
Asle J. Gronna	48	42	20	29	33	68	27	15	28	76	27	35	22	32	29	23	31	32	31	88	43	64	36	39	13	83	31	48	21	63	28	31	30	53	66	1385	244			
L. B. Hanna	48	41	24	29	33	67	27	15	27	76	27	34	23	32	29	24	35	34	31	85	41	65	34	37	12	82	33	50	21	63	21	35	32	55	63	1385	254			
Tobias D. Casey	29	32	14	54	40	53	27	17	38	28	23	28	28	21	27	44	17	49	92	38	55	19	22	15	50	42	51	15	19	6	23	10	41	41	1141					
O. G. Major	29	31	14	54	42	58	26	17	38	28	23	28	28	21	27	42	17	47	93	37	55	18	21	13	47	42	39	14	19	5	18	10	40	41	1109					
Governor—																																								
C. A. Johnson	48	39	20	27	26	59	27	17	25	61	22	29	23	24	24	20	22	33	27	69	38	57	33	24	10	71	29	39	16	62	29	34	29	40	64	1217				
John Burke	29	35	22	56	54	63	31	32	27	51	35	34	29	50	27	34	57	18	60	128	48	64	25	37	18	69	49	73	23	21	8	25	13	62	46	1453	236			
Lieutenant Governor—																																								
R. S. Lewis	48	42	24	30	33	64	27	14	28	76	28	34	22	31	29	23	27	37	31	79	41	62	35	34	12	80	31													