# Calube.

# NEMESIS

## W. D. WASHBURNI

Which Literally Flays Bill Washburn in reply to it from Keith, the postmaster at

BR BERY TRACED DIRECTLY ing \$50, for which he was to support Gen-

304 Cases

SCATHING REVIEW OF EVIDENCE

Washburn Titman.

THE INTIMIDATION PRACTICED

apolis Workingmen

A RESUME OF THE RETURNS

Which Gives Donnelly a Majority of 230.

A VERY PRETTY PEN PICTURE his v

Of Washburnism in the Third Minnesota

District

District

District

Of Washburnism in the Third Minnesota

Ports to Washburn, or some one for hm, that the "arrangement" could not be en

THE CONCLUDING RESOLUTIONS

Declare that Washburn is Not and that

Presented to the State of Minnesota by the "Globe."

NOW COME TO THE FRONT

And Support the Damnable Corruption

### [Special Felegram to the Globe 1 WASHINGTON, March 18 -The House of

mittee on elections have made some progress but did not reach a vote to-day in the Dennelly-Washburn case as the 16th October, 1878, (p. 125), two men, the 16th October, 1878, (p. 125), two men, maned Arthur J. White and E. P. Webster, entered into a contract with the St. Paul & presented by Kiefer has not yet yet been printe?, and Washburn's friends made that an excuse for delay. The House finally ordered it printed and paid for out of the contingent fund, so that the convicted the contingent fund, so that the convicted corruptionist cannot complain of unfair

and has made a sensation here. It shows in such a clear and forcible manner the corsuch a clear and forcible manner the correct the correc ruption resorted to by Washbarn to secure ruption resorted to by Washburn to secure no proper ballot-boxes, [eigar boxes and his seat that it removes the last vestige of andle boxes without locks and keys, as rehope for his retaining it. The evidence is so quired by law, being used as ballot-boxes]; the judges were not sworn, and, in short, al-

his seat. He was called on by numerous friends, this afternoon and evening, and congratulated over his signal victory.

The testimony of George C. Morton (p. 125), John Mulvey (p. 120), Arthur J. White (p. 305), and E. P. Webster (p. 297) congratulated over his signal victory.

seat rightfully belongs to Donnelly. Though
the report is long I forward it to the
Globe entire, and your readers will find
it a document which is very interesting
it a document which is very interesting reading.

The Committee of Elections, to Whom wa The Committee of Elections, to Whom was pers their board for a week, on condition Referred the Contested Election Case of that they vote for Washburn; and they did Ignatius Donnelly Against William D Washburn, From the Third Congrestional District of Minnesota, Having Had the Same Under Advisement, Beg Leave to

Your committee have carefully examined the questions of law and fact involved in the case.

While, description of the firm, (see p. 127) by Major Hale, of Minneapolis, the business manager of the

The first question which they considered was the question of bribery. They find that bribery was committed on

district committee, and by personal, political, and business agents; that this bribery was not confined to any portion of the district, or to any one town or county, but that it extended throughout a region of country nearly four hundred miles long and one hundred miles wide; and they further find that dred miles wide; and they further find that the many cases the bribery has been traced in many cases the bribery has been traced to many cases the

Here it is clearly established that there

vas a negotiation between a Democratic

voter and Mr. Washburn, the sitting member, the one to sell his vote [for his vote is

money, or the money of Washburn's committee, in his pocket, to see the party and

no attempt to impeach Berens or Brower.

If Washburn had not been ready to use

money to corrupt the voters of his district he would have resented the proposition made to him by Berens as an insult; on the contrary, he appears to have been as ready to buy Berens as the proposition when the support of the suppo

rens' vote as Berens was to sell it. That

Brower was Washburn's agent clearly ap-pears; and when Brower told Berens that he

simply acted as agents for Washburn, the transaction may be thus briefly stated:

trict of Minnesota an unorganized county

named Kittson, situated in the northwestern

corner of the State, and adjoining the line

were probably, as appears from the testimony, not ten actual settlers in the entire county, (see pp. 125-144). Between the 8th and

pose, and were therefore not entitled under

the laws of Minnesota; [see Rev. Stat. Minn.

At one of these precincts, to-wit, Tama-

rack River, these eighty or ninety wood-choppers, hired by Webster and White, voted. There were only four actual settlers,

refused to vote at all unless they were paid, (p. 297). The total sum paid by Webster

and White to these men for their votes was

(p. 297) so paid out for these votes.

It also appears (see p. 121) that in addition to the eighty or ninety wood-choppers so bribed to vote for Washburn, the contractor.

tractors Webster and White gave two trap-

go ahead and it will be all right.

tered into.

nmate the transaction. It is of no

in many cases the bribery has been traced home directly to Mr. Washburn himself. The committee give herewith an abstract of the testimony in some of these cases.

Charles Berens, a Democrat, the postmaster of the village of North Prairie, Morrison county, [situated about one hundred miles of the village of North Prairie, Morrison county, [situated about one hundred miles]

Daily

from Minneapolis], testifies, (p. 300, printed SHAGREN'S SWAG. testimony, that prior to the election of Nov. Emil Shagren, a Swede, a Greenbacker, a laboring man, resided at the date of the elec-LY TO THE SITTING MEMBER, WASHBURN, in question at Minneapolis, Minn. (page 15). He was an active supporter of the contestant, Donnelly, and had been a delegate to the-Greenback Congressional convention.

About the 15th October, 1878, a friend of which he said he would give his support at the election to him, Washburn, for \$50. This letter evidently reached the sitting member, for Berens testifies that he received a letter Washburn, named William Chase, urged him to go to Washburn's office to see Major Hale, his business manager, (the same per son who paid for 80 or 90 bribed votes a Minneapolis, a political friend of the sitting member, in which Keith said, "he was glad Tamarack river), because Major Hale would "convince" him that he should vote for Washburn. Shagren declined to go. The invitation was several times repeated. At length Shagren went to Washburn's office. He was met by Major Hale, who was evidently prepared by Chase for the interview. Hale commenced by asking him if he wantthat Berens would work that way"; he, Keith, further stated that he would give Berens' letter to J. V. Brower, one of the Republican United States land officers at St. Cloud, and that Brower would attend to the matter. J. V. Brower testifies, (p. 246), "Charles Berens wrote a letter to Minneapolis demanding \$50, for which he was to support General Washburn, (the sitting member); the letter was sent to me by some one in connection with the campaign; I can't say whether by the carry wittee or by General Washburn, or by General Washburn, or by General Washburn or V. Brower testifies, (p. 246), "Charles Ber-DETAIL OF THE PURCHASES

can't say whether by the interview with Hale. Soon after Shagren committee, or by General Washburn, or by got out of work. Chase again urged him to go to see Hale and he, Hale, would give him a "job;" and he gave him a sealed letter to tee, and may have got more. Berens [p. 300]

Showing the Corrupt Use of Money in Showing Use purchase of Berens' support for \$50] "or words to that effect, that he should not enter into such arrangements with Charles Berens, there is the support of the support of

office the day after election and I would get my pay." Shagren made no answer. Then Having failed to rebut this evidence by office the day after election and 1 wound get my pay." Shagren made no answer. Then Hale took the \$5 bank note, which he had counter testimony, the presumption of law becomes conclusive that he did not do so becomes conclusive that he did not implied in his "support] for \$50, and the other to buy it. The letter is answered for Washburn by Keith, his friend; the propowith the brother of the sitting member, and delivered it to Shagren, saying: "Emil, here is \$5; go and use this among the toys, and drop in occasionally and I will give you more." It is true that Shagren voted, worked and made speeches for Donnelly subsequent to this interview; and in one of these speeches and before the election. sition is accepted with thanks, and the letter is delivered to a federal official who goes with the letter and with Washburn's moment that Berens finally declined to re-ceive the money. The offense of bribery was complete when one party offered to sell his vote and the other agreed to buy it. [See Russell on Crimes, vol. 1, p. 159; Hardings vs. Stokes, 1 M. & W., 233.] Brower re-There is no denial of this testimony and

sitting member.

John Flaherty, (p. 25), testifies: Is a saloon keeper in St. Paul; a Democrat. He went to Minneapolis two weeks before the eleccower was Washburn's agent catched arrest cower was Washburn and the (Brower) could "see him all right," it was in effect the ame as if Washburn himself had spoken bose words. In short, as Keith and Brower imply acted as agents for Washburn, the same party who acted as agents for Washburn he will sell bim his vote for \$50;

2. Washburn thanks him and tells him to 2. Washburn thanks him and tells him to 2. Washburn thanks him and tells him to 3. Washburn thanks him and tells him to 4. Washburn thanks him and tells him to should work for Washburn and he (Brower) would "see him all right," it was in effect the same as if Washburn himself had spoken those words. In short, as Keith and Brower Flaherty. The day before election, witness called on Barden and Barden paid him \$10. Witness pretends that he voted for Donnelly, but admits that he worked part of the

of the British possessions; it is more than 400 miles from Minneapolis. In the fall of 1878 this county was a wilderness; there mittee to be very conclusive; the party bribed mittee to be very conclusive; the party bribed was an active opponent of Washburn and warm supporter of Donnelly, and these facts were known to Washburn's business mana-ger. He belonged to a different political party from the sitting member. The bribery takes place in Washburn's office and in the presence of his brother. The witness, Sharen, was coaxed there under the promise of he was out of work and poor. A distinct and deliberate proposition is made to pay him a given sum for his vote and support, and part of the money is paid to him.

led to Kittson county to cut this CLOUTIER SEEN BY JOHNSON. pally harvest hands and tramps who had not been in the State long enough to vote; they were in Kittson county for a temporary pur-Bernard Cloutier, (see p. 211,) resided in Minneapolis at the time of the election, and sold farm machinery. He was, and had always been, a Democrat, and generally took an active part in politics. About a week or ten days before the election he met John Baxter, a friend of the sitting member. Cloutier told him, in answer to a question by Baxter, that he, Cloutier, did not intend to take any part in the election. He says, "I told him that I had made up my mind to take no part in the election, as I had heretofore been promised a good deal and neer got anything for it." Thereupon Baxter re-quested witness to see Charles W. Johnson, the judges were not sworn, and, in short, almost all the requirements of the laws of the State for the holding of elections were ig-(secretary of the Republican central commit-tee of the third Congressional district). Two or three days thereafter Baxter met Cloutier

sgain and asked him if he had seen John-son. Cloutier said no. Baxter said that was queer as Johnson had promised he would see Cloutier. Baxter then took Clou tier to the office of the sitting member, Washburn, and they told him there that Johnson had just gone out. An hour after-wards Cloutier was in Christian & Dean's office, when a gentleman came in and told him that "General Washburn, [the sitting member,] wanted to see me, [Cloutier,] at his [Washburn's] office." Cloutier went to Washburn's office, and there met Charles W. Johnson and Dr. Keith, (the postmaster of Minnearolis, and the same next who of Minneapolis, and the same party who thanked Charles Berens for his offer to sell his support to Washburn for \$50). Johnson wanted Cloutier to go out and electioneer for Washburn. Cloutier said he would do so if Washburn. Cloutier said he would do so if he was paid for his time and expenses. Thereupon Johnson told him to start out. The next day Johnson met Cloutier at the postoffice and paid him thirty dollars. The postoffice and paid him thirty dollars. The following Wednesday Cloutier met Johnson again at Washburn's office. "I told him I wanted some more money. He asked me vanted some more money. He asked me now much I wanted, and I told him I wanted twenty dollars. He, [Mr. Johnson,] went into the next room and commenced talking with Mr. Washburn, [the sitting member]. He came back and handed me twenty dol-

The witness, Cloudier, states in his cross so vote.

George C. Morton testifies (p. 126) that examination that he was in favor of Mr. White told him in the presence of Webster that they, Webster and White, were to get Washburn in the first place; but it appears by his examination in chief that he had made up his mind to take no part in the elecapolis & St. Louis Railroad company, of have had without it. At least the which the contestee, Washburn, was and is that if the vote and support of this merce-which the contestee, Washburn, was and is president. White admits (p. 307) that he was repaid the sum of \$168 or \$172, being the money so paid for these 80 or 90 votes, by said George B. Webster, paymaster of The contract of bribery was made by the

retary of Washburn's committee in Washburn's office, and part of the money was paid in Washburn's office in his presence, and under circumstances which create a strong pre-sumption that it came from Washburn's pocket. That is to say, Cloutier asks John-son for \$20; Johnson goes to Washburn and returns with the money and pays it to Clou-

Here, then, we have four cases of bribery. nvolving 96 bribed votes, brought home to he sitting member in the clearest and most the secretary of Washburn's committee Washburn's office, and part of the money paid in Washburn's office, and part of the money paid in Washburn's office, and probably out of his pocket. It seems to your committee that this evidence is sufficient to convict Mr. Washburn of bribery in any court in the

And yet in the face of such an array of testimony Mr. Washburn is dumb. He had forty days in which to rebut this testimony; he could have taken the stand himself, to explain or deny the Berens matter; he cou ave procured the testimony of his business nanager, Hale, to contradict Shagren and Morton; he could have called Johnson to contradict Cloutier; he could have sworn his prother, Ex-Governor C. C. Washburn, to deny that he was present and conferred with Hale, and also to rebut the natural presumption that he, (C. C. Washburn), furnished the \$5 with which Hale bribed Shagren. He did nothing of this kind; he denied nothing; he called not a single witness to rebut this or anything else in the mass of testimony showing bribery. Certainly no lawyer, and no lay-man familiar with human nature, will pre-tend that it was Mr. Donnelly's duty to place and Brower [p. 256] both agree that Brower visited North Prairie, Morrison county, and called on Berens; Berens says: "Brower said I should work for Washburn and he would see me all right." He says Brower did not pay him any money because he, Brower, did not trust him—he thought he was supporting Donnelly. Brower testifies: "I advised General Washburn, [the sitting member] or some one for him, after I had been advised that no arrangements of that character could be entered into," [that is, the purchase of Berens' sapport for \$50] "or words to that effect, that he should not enter into such arrangements with Charles Berens, or anyone else.""

Went to Washburn's office again. He gave that dead went than the was Mr. Donnelly's duty to place then that it was Mr. Donnelly's duty to place the did mod went these parties who held such close and intitute and went into another room and conferred in whis-pers, which the witness overheard, with C. C. Washburn, benother of the sitting overheard, with the sittings and ex-governor of Wisconsin. Hall then tand went into another room and conferred in whis-pers, which the witness overheard, with the sittings asked to make Mr. Washburn in these relations with Mr. Washburn in the relations with Mr. Washburn in the service of the set on the set of the saked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the witness overheard, with the sittings asked to make Mr. Washburn in the vitness overheard, with the sittings asked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the sitting asked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the sitting with ask of the sitting with the sittings and the sit on the letter to Misconsin. Hagier and went and went and went into another room and conferred in whis-pers, with the witness overheard, with the sittings asked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the saked to make Mr. Washburn into another room of the set of the saked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the saked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the saked to make Mr. Washburn in the set of the saked to make Mr. Washburn in the these parties who held such close and inti-mate relations with Mr. Washburn on the witness stand. He might just as well be asked to make Mr. Washburn his witness. it would be \$36, besides my expenses and money to spend among the boys." "He told that he had not gained a seat in the House me to bring my bill there to Mr. Washburn's by unworthy, dishonorable, and criminal

> duct or language of another.' tated publicly the particulars of this attempt leaf on Evidence, vol. 1, sec. 27 and sec. to corrupt him and secure his vote; but the 197.) "If a material adverment, well pleadcrime of bribery was complete when Washburn, in his own office, through his business out denial, whether it be by confession, or by burn, in his own office, through his business manager, and in the presence of his brother, paid Shagren \$5 and promised him \$36 more; and Shagren accepted the \$5. It is of no moment whether Shagren intended to vote for Washburn or not, or whether he did or did not so vote.
>
> | Clida sec. 27. | And in this case the failure to rebut or impeach the testimony of these vincesses as to bribery, is a confession of the truth of their statements and of the guilt of the party.

of the party.

Your committee have dwelt at length up-We turn now to some briberies committed in St. Paul; and hore, again, the money paid is traced back to Minneapolis, and to the

showing bribery. THE CROOKEDNESS AT CROOKSTON.

Washburn. The men so paid to vote for Washburn were Democrats. They were a work shoveling dirt around the round-house Besides these, two hand-cars, loaded with railroad men, also voted—about sixteen of

William Johnson (see p. 190) was one of a gang of 17 railroad laborers; they were at work 14 miles away from Crookston, and outside the election precinct; they had no right to vote at Crookston, but 16 of them right to vote at Crookston, but 16 of them did so vote, and they were paid for their votes by the railroad company; the agents of the company furnished them with their tickets—Washburn tickets; and they voted for Washburn; they would not have voted at all if they had not been so paid, (p. 191).

D. M. Robbins (p. 34), of St. Paul, had a railroad contract to help build the railroad through Kittson county; had 150 men working for him 15 miles from Two Rivers, Kittson county; about 100 of these men went with him on a construction train to Two Rivers to vote; these men, except about 30

Rivers to vote; these men, except about 30 or 40, did vote; they were all paid for their votes the same amount they would have carned if they had continued to work; the railroad company ran the train for their acrational company ran the train for their ac-commodation; the voting-place was a rail-road-ear, which stood on a side track; there was no house at Two Rivers station of any kind. As the vote at Two Rivers was 74 for Washburn and 1 for Donnelly, the bribed Washburn and I for Donneys, the bridge voters must have voted for Washburn. It further appears, (p. 36,) that the railroad laborers working for this witness at Tamarack River voted there. These made up the alance of the 100 votes polled at that place.

Dennis Reardon testifies (p. 144) that he was one of a gang of more than 50 railroad hands that voted between Middle River and Tamarack River; at Two Rivers the voting-

dents of that locality.

This testimony establishes the fact that at Crookston, Tamarack River, and Two Rivers, there were 161 votes cast by railroad workmen, who were not residents of those localities, were there for a temporary purpose, and were not entitled to vote; and that they were all paid for their votes; that they voted for Washburn, and would not have voted if they had not been paid.

### FORGETFUL BROWER. We have seen that J. V. Brower, (p. 244),

one of the United States land officers at Saint Cloud, Minn., was furnished with the letter of Charles Berens to Washburn, in which Berens offered to sell his vote to Washburn for \$50. It further appears that Brower re-ceived from Washburn, or his committee, money to visit Berens and to make a canvass of certain counties; how much does not apear, as Brower's memory is very oblivious f these details. Brower admits, (p. 245), or these details. Brown Rullis, (p. 243), that he left money at different places in Todd and Morrison counties during his canvass for "legitimate political purposes;" that he did this in the interest of Mr. Washburn; and he, White told him in the presence.

White, were to get \$200 for their services at the election, in behalf of Washburn. The money paid out by them for votes was repaid to White, one of the firm, (see p. 127) by Major Hale, of Minneapolis, the business manager of the contestee, Washburn, eight days after, the election, by a check for \$182; and the election, by a check for \$182; and the check was cashed for White by one George B. Webster, the paymaster of the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad company, of apolis & St. Louis Railroad company, of apolis & St. Louis Railroad company, of that position of neutrality and indifference into a warm supporter of the sitting member how many; it may have been twenty bave had without it. It is fair to presume that if the vote and support of this mercetian the contest of Mr. Washburn as in behalf of the Republican party. He hired a number of men in this way; he cannot remember how many; it may have been twenty have had without it. It is fair to presume that if the vote and support of this mercetian the contest of Mr. Washburn as the interest of Mr. Washburn as in behalf of the Republican party. He hired a number of men in this way; he cannot remember how many; it may have been twenty have had without it. It is fair to presume of men in this estimate that if the vote and support of this mercetian the interest of Mr. Washburn and there is a distinct that if the vote and support of the support and influence which he would not have had without it. It is fair to presume of Morrison and Todd counties. This testified of Morrison and Todd counties. This testi-mony shows that an agent of the sitting member, acting at his request, with his knowledge and by his authority, and fur-

that he bought up probably 100 voters and

weeks before his testimony was taken, he pretends that he does not remember the names of the voters he bought, the amount he paid out, or the number of persons bribed. The bribery was accomplished under the thin disguise of employing Democrats to work at the polls for the sitting member. He admits that one of the parties so bought was George Coincel of North Prairie; he paid him a sum the sitting member in the clearest and most conclusive manner. In the first case the negotiation is with Mr. Washburn himself; in the next, the money which bought the votes is repaid in his (Washburn's) office by his business manager; in the third, the bribe is offered and the money paid in Washburn's office by his business manager and in the fourth case, the bribe is offered and the money paid by the secretary of Washburn's committee in Washburn's office, and part of the money rotation. Washburn's office, and part of the money crat.

Having established the close relations of Brower with the sitting member, and his au-thorized agency for him, let us follow him

in his canvass: John Fleckenstein, (p. 291), of Rich Prai John Fleekenstein, (p. 291), of Rich Prairie, Morrison county, a farmer; his "politics ain't much"; Brower called to see him; he told Brower he had decided to take no part in the election. He subsequently received, he thinks, from Brower, \$10 with a lot of Democratic tickets with the sitting member's name on them. He kept part of the money; he bought crackers and beer with part and paid \$5 to Peter Virnig. The witness pretends that he voted for Donnelly, but the tone of his testimony renders this doubtful.

Brower then went to see Peter Virnig Brower then went to see Peter Virnig, (p. 299) another farmer of Rich Prairie, a Democrat. John Fleckenstein was with him. Fleckenstein paid him, Virnig, \$5, "for his team and day's work" at the election. With the \$5 was a lot of Democratic tickets with Washburn's name on them. Virnig also pretends that he voted the straight Democratic ticket.

cratic ticket.

Brower also called to see Henry Armstrong, (p. 303) of Two Rivers, Morrison county, a farmer and a Democrat. He testifies that Brower paid him \$20 to work at the polls for Washburn. He did work for Washburn, distributed his tickets, and the presumption of law is that he voted for him.

Thomas Kitowski was subpoened to testify, but refused to appear. Charles Berens testifies, however, (p. 300) that Kitowski told him that Brower had paid him \$50. Brower

admitted he had paid him some money, it may have been \$25 or \$30.

These briberies, having been committed by an authorized agent of the sitting member, were, in effect, committed by the sitting

These ornorers, naving been committed by an authorized agent of the sitting member, were, in effect, committed by the sitting member himself; and the agent, Brower, says that he will not swear that he did not bribe one hundred persons in the same way during his canvass of Todd and Morrison counties, and spend \$500 in doing so.

Milo Porter, (p. 292), mail carrier, of Little Falls, Todd county, was a supporter of Donnelly. The Republican county treasurer of Todd county, Mr. Buss, offered him \$50 if he would abandon Donnelly and support Washburn. He, Buss, said he had himself received, or was about to receive, \$500. Porter declined to take the \$50, and published a card at once, before the election, in the Little Falls Transcript, reciting the offer made him, and warning the people of the kind of means that were being employed to elect Washburn. There was no attempt made to contradict Porter's testimony. Buss was to contradict Porter's testimony. Buss wa not called to the witness stand. SABIN'S PAYMENT.

We pass from the northern part of the district to the southern part.

William M. Leyde, (p. 48,) lives at Cottage Grove, Washington county, engaged in threshing machine business-a Republican. He saw Washburn in St. Paul shortly before the election. He went to Minneapolis, to the room of the Republican Central commit-tee, or a room adjoing. He was there furnished with a letter, (he does not rememmuch he paid them.

We supplement Leyde's testimony by the

testimony of F. S. Meilicke, (p. 52), the county commissioners of Washington county, to whom Leyde stated that he (Leyde) had talked with Washburn, and Washburn told him "to go to Sabin, and that the money had been placed in Sabin's hands and he would make it all right with him;" and that they had raised \$600 in Stillwater, "besides the amount that Mr. Washburn had placed there." He (Leyde) said he had spent all the money so furnished him but \$15 in hiring men to work at the polls for Washburn he gave the name of one man, Henry Mon-roe, of Newport, to whom he had paid \$5 to "work at the polls for Washburn." All the \$600 raised at Stillwater, and the money contributed by Washburn, was to be spent in

behalf of Washburn.

Abraham Werrick, (p. 28,) of St. Paul, machinist, testifies that he also went to Min-neapolis in October, before the election. He made it his special business to see Washburn, and saw and conversed with him; he asked Washburn "who was his friend down there," (in St. Paul). Washburn told him there," (in St. Paul). Washburn told him
"he expected the committees would take
some interest in him"; "that Mr. Barden,"
(the same party mentioned by Flaherty,)
"was on some committee," and he gave him
a letter of introduction to Mr. Barden; the
letter stated that Werrick was his, Washburn's, friend. Witness presented Washburn's letter to Barden; forgets what conversation took place; but the committee,
(presumably the committee of which Barden presumably the committee of which Barde (presumably the commutee of which Dated was a member,) asked him to hire two men to work at the polls. He received \$30—\$10 for himself and \$20 to hire two men. He hired Oluf Larson and Julius Bjornstad, and paid them \$10 each. He worked for the whole Republican ticket. Prior to seeing Washburn and being paid this \$30, he had Tamarack River; at Two Rivers the voting place was a box-car, the ballot box was a candle-box; there were no tickets there but Washburn and being paid this \$30, he had not been supporting Washburn, (p. 31); the work progressed. They were all paid for voting by the railroad company; many of them were Democrats. There were no houses in sight at that place, and of course no results of that locality. testifies to same effect; he worked for the whole Republican ticket; received \$10 from Werrick: he claims to have voted for Don

nelly.

O. B. Wergedahl, (p. 20), of St Paul, testifies that Werrick told him he wanted him to work for the Republican ticket; and said that he Werrick are Westide and was in that he, Werrick, saw Washburn twice in Minneapolis, and that Washburn sent him, Werrick, to Barden, and told him that he. Washburn, "HAD GIVEN MONEY TO BARDEN TO SPEND IN ST. PAUL FOR HIS ELECTION." He wanted Wergedahl to work for Washburn and told him he had got money for Bjorn-

Washburn.
This testimony seems conclusive. Wash-This testimony seems conclusive. Wash-burn had placed corruption funds in the hands of R. Barden, and he and Johnson, secretary of his committee, refer parties to Barden for money; and Barden, or some member of the committee, pays out money to these parties; they pay in turn to others, and all of them work at the polls for Wash-burn's decision. burn's election.

Another St. Paul party, John Gairy (page

22), admits the receipt of \$25 from a Republican candidate for a local office (State Senate) to work at the polls and peddle Republican candidate for a local office (State Senate) to work at the polls and peddle Republic publican tickets. He pretends to have voted for Donnelly. LIQUIDATING A CHURCH DEET. Christian Heyer, a Democratic German

farmer, of Afton, Washington county, testifies (p. 54, printed testimony,) that he was Warren Getchel, a Republican paid on by warren Getchel, a hepublican politician and particular friend of the sitting member. Getchel asked him if he could support Washburn. Witness said he would. Getchel said he was "a particular

nished with his money, or the money of this party, went into the counties of Todd and Morrison, 120 and 150 miles from Minneapolis.

friend of Washburn," and "he wanted me to help all I could; he asked me if there were any debts on our German church, and that after election he would hand me \$10 to use spent probably \$500 in the work; and although the events transpired but a few Afton, about half Democrats. He worked

> testes with washburn's name on them. He told Cooper that he was not a politician; doesn't know but he expressed kimself in favor of Mr. Donnelly during the campaign. At the time Cooper paid him the \$20 he was neutral as between Donnelly and Washburn. He visited two or three towns; used his own team; was gone one day; expenses \$1, profits, \$19. DEMOCRATIC EDITOR ROUGHT.

The testimony of Nathan Richardson, o

Little Falls, Morrison county, (p. 285), leading Republican and politician by trade shows that the editor of the Democrati paper at that place was bought up to support Washburn; that the sum paid was probably \$125, (p. 286); that it came from Minneap-\$125, (p. 286); that it came from Minneap olis, from Loren Fletcher, an active friend of the sitting member and a prominent Republican, (p. 44); and that after the payment of that sum the said newspaper sup-ported Washburn and denounced Donnelly. The witness Richardson, who conducted the sale of this Democrat and his newspaper, supported Washburn, made a canvass of the county in his behalf, spent \$25. He admits the payment of \$7 to William Witherall; he did not expect to be repaid; thinks Witherall voted for Washburn; he also paid \$2 or \$3 to a man named Sloan; money has no been repaid; thinks Sloan voted for Wash-burn.

It will be observed that in nearly every It will be observed that in nearly every one of these cases of bribery committed throughout a region of country half as large as the State of New York, the money paid is traced back to the city of Minneapolis, the residence of the sitting member. From this point as a common center, the corruption radiated in all directions over the district; and when we come to Minneapolis, the and when we come to Minneapolis all the estimony shows that it was a very hotbed of oribery. We give brief abstracts of the cases bribery. SUDDEN CONVERSION.

. M. Schaak, a Scandinavian, was publish-

It is shown, (p. 80,) that a Democrat named

nga Scandinavian newspaper in Minneapolis ing a Scandinavian newspaper in Minneapolis during the campaign and supported Donnally for Congress up to the night before the election; that night he was announced to speak at a Scandinavian Democratic meeting at Minneapolis in favor of contestant, Donnelly. Instead of speaking for Donnelly, he came out strongly for Washburn, and the next day he admitted to witness that he had been paid \$150 for doing so. He held a new been paid \$150 for doing so. He had a new suit of clothes and a pocket full of money. There was no attempt to contradict this witness; in fact, counsel for the contestee, in their cross-examination, seem to argue that it was perfectly right and legal to bribe Democrats to speak in favor of Republican candidates. It may be said that this testing the state of Schoat is beared with the country of Schoat is beared with the country of Schoat is beared with the state of the state of Schoat is beared with the state of th candidates. It may be said that this testimony as to Schaak is hearsay evidence. The declaration of a voter as to his qualification or disqualification to vote is always received in evidence; he is regarded as a party to the proceedings. This is a well-settled and uniform practice, (see 27, N. Y. Rep., People vs. Pease; 3 McCord's Rep., p. 230, foot-note; contested election case, Vallandigham and Campbell, Cong. Globe, vol. 41, p. 2,317; and in the case of Milborne Port, 1, Douglas election cases, 67, 76, 129, 150, &c., (see 3, McCord, 230), it was decided that the admissions of a voter that he was bribed are alsions of a voter that he was bribed are al-ways receivable in evidence. They rest also on the broader ground that confessions of orime are receivable against the party "as the highest and most satisfactory proof;" (Russell on Crimes, vol. 2, p. 823). Here the admissions are confirmed by all the sur-rounding circumstances; the sudden conversion on the eve of the election, the new

othes, money, &c. William R. Metcalf (p. 182), a farmer rewilliam R. Metcair (p. 102), a larmer residing in Crystal Lake township, near Minneapolis, testifies that he was paid \$15 to work at the polls in Crystal Lake township for the Republican ticket. Corser, one of the parties who hired him to work at the poils, was a nepublican candidate for State senator, asked him to support Washburn; he refused; subsequently he was engaged to work at the polls for the Republicans. The \$15 was paid him by Charles W. Johnson, sto was paid him by Charles W. Johnson, secretary of Washburn's committee, the same party who bribed Shagren, Flaherty, etc. He went to Johnson's office two days after the election; he simply presented his name and Johnson paid him the \$15 without a word. He declines to say who he voted for for Congress; will not swear that he did not vote for Washburn. JOHNSON'S REPUDIATION OF HALE'S HOUNDS

Hale attempted to bribe Shagren, he told Shagren to come the day after election to Washburn's office, and he be paid. We find, Metcalf's testimony, that Johnson also an arrangement to pay off his bribed voters the day after election; and in this connection we would refer to to the testimony of Ed. A. Stevens, (p. 105), whose office was in the Stevens, (p. 105), whose office was in the same building with Johnson's office, who swears that as he passed Johnson's office, several men were standing in front of it, and a party said to Stevens, "You ought to hear Charley Johnson swear; there is a big crowd below after their pay, and Charley says, "Major Hale can pay his own hounds. I have Jor hate can pay his own hounds. I have all I can do to pay those I hired myself." The testimony of Metcalf and Shagren shows what they were being paid for.

It will be remembered that when Major

APPEAL FOR CORRUPTION FUNDS. This same man, Johnson, issued, Septem-

per 19, 1878, as secretary of the Republican Congressional Committee, an appeal (see p. 43), in the form of a circular, to Republicans to contribute funds to the success of the Republican cause in the district. The ircular is in these words:

Minneapolis, Sept. 19.—"Sir: The Con-

pressional committee, charged with laboring for the success of the Republican cause in this district, call with confidence upon you, as a Republican, for such a contributi as a Republican, for such a contribution in money as you may feel willing to make, hoping it will not be less than \$\( \text{S}\)—.

"The committee deem it proper in thus speaking to Republicans, to remind them of the importance of the impending cumpaign. That the United States Senate is to be Democratic fitter the 4th of March, 1879, is when ready certain. In view of this, the

very nearly certain. In view of this, the election of a Democratic House of Representatives would precipitate upon the country dangerous burdens. Among these schemes is the intention to attempt the revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office, the payment of the rebel claims and war debt, the payment of the full value of all emancipated slaves, and the unlimited issue of irreleamable paper currency, in place of of irredeemable paper currency, in place of of irrespension paper currency, in piace of the present redeemable paper money, which was issued by authority of a Republican Congress, and by the same party has been sustained, thereby preserving the national honor and credit. "Please remit at once." etc.

SMALL FRY BRIBES.

Johnson admits, (p. 42), that copies of this circular was sent out to about fifty persons, and that money was received in reply, but he refuses to state who it was sent to, and he does not remember what amount was received in response to this appeal.

Louis Kundson, of Minneapolis, testifies, (p. 161, printed testimony), that he was paid five dollars by his employers, Barnard &

five dollars by his employers, Barnard & bribery and attempted bribery are proven, Cope, active Republicans, to work for Washburn. He worked and voted for him. His case that was, by accident, and the indiscrefellow-workman, Louis Paulson, did the same kind of work, and also received five dollars; he, Paulson, saw it paid.

duced Shagren to go to Washburn's office in search of "a job."

in search of "a job."

Emil Shagren testifies, (p. 16), that Ole Mahla admitted to him that he got \$25 to vote for Washburn. Mahla denies this in part, (p. 117), but admits that he did ecive \$25 from some one for working at the polls. He declines to say whether he peddled tickets with Washburn's name on them. He refuses to say who paid him the money. He pretends that he voted for Donnelly.

Shagren also testifies, (p. 16), that Sevit Mahla told him he had been paid to vote for Washburn, but did not state the amount. Also that Daniel Getchell told him that he Also that Daniel Getchell told him that he had received \$20 for voting for Washburn. Getchell denies this, (p. 86), but he refuses to say what he did say to Shagren. He admits that he received money for his services at the election, but claims that it was not from Mr. Washburn, and that he voted for Donnelly. He refuses to tell who paid him. Dominick M. Graptin (p. 91) testifies that Dominick M. Guertin (p. 94) testifies that Karl Fintler told him that he had received a sack of Washburn flour for voting for Wash-

Louis N. Gaynor, of Minneapolis, (p. 206), admits that he received money for his ser-vices on election day, but declines to say who paid it to him; and he declines to an-

swer whether he voted for Mr. Washburn o swer whether he voted for Mr. Washburn or worked for him; but he admits he peddled tickets with his name on them.

Peter Engberg, of Minneapolis, (p. 207), admits that he received money for election purposes; that he voted for Washburn, that he worked for him, and that he was paid for his services on election day.

John Smith, of Minneapolis, (p. 131), swears that Peter Quady a saloon keeper.

John Smith, of Minneapolis, (p. 131), swears that Peter Quady, a saloon keeper, told him he had received \$35 for voting his boarders for Mr. Washburn.

Peter Quady (p. 201) admits that he told Smith that he received \$5 and was to receive \$20 more; that he induced Smith to vote \$20 more in the saloon salo and gave him a Washburn ticket: several of his boarders voted for Washburn; but he pretends the money was not paid in the in-terest of Washburn; he voted for Wash-

Winfield S. Leach (p. 158) testifies that Quady offered him \$10 if he would vote for Washburn. Leach refused the offer.

Hon. Charles Hoag, a leading Democrat of Hennepin county, (see p. 90) was requested by a Democratic worker for Washburn to state what sum of money, put into his hands, would induce him to vote for Washburn. Hoag refused the bribe and veted for Don-

Thomas G. Rees, of Minneapolis, (p. 146) testifies that Frederick Puhler told him that he was hired to canvass, "travel, and treat," for Washburn, and was paid \$35 per week and \$10 a day for money spent in treating; and that there was a man similarly employed in each of the fifteen precincts of the city of Minneapolis.

Thomas Halloran, hotel the city of the legal votes cast and returned.

It appears that many of the votes and the cast their Minneapolis.

Thomas Halloran, hotel keeper, Minneapolis, testifies (p. 119) that he is a Democrat; that he was paid \$5 by a Dr. Evans, with which "to treat the boys," and he agreed to work and vote for a Republican candidate named by Dr. Evans, it was not

candidate named by Dr. Evans; it was not Mr, Washburn; and he claims that he, Halloran, voted for Donnelly. The following is a summary of the cases of bribery or attempted bribery referred to in the foregoing testion

in the foregoing testimony: WHERE MONEY WAS PAID. where the money was paid by the sitting member, or his business manager or the clerk of his Congressional committee, or some friend

and the parties voted for the sitting member:

Webster and winte, the constraint Cloutier.

Railroad hands at work at round house, Crookston, Polk county.

Railroad hands who came to Crookston on

who vote at Tamarack river...
V. Brower and the men he bribed, to-wit
George Geissel, Thomas Kittowski and

Henry Monroe Abraham Werrick Oluf Lar

Louis N. Gaynor.
Peter Engherg.
Peter Quady.
Fred. Publer, and the 14 canvassers similarfred. Publer, and the 14 precincts of ly engaged in the other 14 precincts of Minneapolis... Mr. Bass, treasurer of Todd county....

Cases where bribes were offered but not accepted: or, where if accepted, the party bribed clai

that he voted for Donnelly. Emil Shagren
John Fleckenstein O. B. Wergedahl
John Guiry
Julius Bjornstad
Daniel Getchell
Winfield S. Leach
Charles Hoag
Thomas Halloran

STARTLING REVOLUTION.

But this is not all. The testimony re-

veals the names of only six of the parties who were bribed by J. V. Brower, of Saint Cloud, in his canvass of Todd and Morrison counties, and to these six men he paid out only \$100, but he testifies that he may have similarly employed a hundred parties, and he does not know whether he paid out \$50 or \$500. In the case of William M. Leyde, another of the agents sent out by Washburn, we have the name of only one of the men he hired to work at the polls, Henry Monroe, while it is in evidence that he canvasse nearly every town in the county and hired number of men whose names he refused to disclose. We find that at Crookston there were 173 illegal votes, and the testimony shows that 68 of these were railroad hands who were all paid for their votes. The probwho were all paid for their votes. The probability is very great that the larger part of the other 105 votes were cast by railroad hands similarly paid for their votes.

In Minneapolis the whole atmosphere was clouded with bribery. The evidence shows that large sums of money, many thousands of dollars, had been spent for corrupt purposes. A startling revolution in the politic

poses. A startling revolution in the politi-cal feelings of the voters was accomplished on the eve of the election, and all the testimony indicates that this was brought about by bribery and intimidation. There was no attempt on the part of the sitting member to account for this extraordinary revolution A SECRET CRIME.

bribegiver before the money was offered; or that they voted for his opponent; or that the money was paid by some one else, some nameless party, for some other purpose.

Under these circumstances when it is shown that in an election over 300 cases of

tion of the parties, brought to the light there were others that were never revealed. dollars; he, Paulson, saw it paid.

John C. Oleson, testifies, (p. 92), that
Wm. Chase asked him to vote for Washburn.
He paid him \$2 to work at the polls for
Washburn, and he did so work and vote.
This Wm. Chase was the same party who in-

voters to forego their principles; the partie who received the bribes in many instances boasted to their neighbors of the money they had received, and seemed to be proud of the high price for which they had sold them selves; and the sitting member did not think selves; and the sitting memoer did not think it at all necessary to call witnesses to deny or oxplain away this overwhelming mass of corruption. Nothing could testify more strongly to the degeneracy of the age and the depths to which popular suffrage has fallen than the revelations made in this extraordinary case.

THE LAW OF BRIBERY.

[See Felton vs. Easthorpe, Rogers' Law and Practice of Elections, 221.]

In England bribery is an offense of so heinous a character, and so utterly subversive of the freedom of elections, that, when proved to have been committed, though in one instance only, and though a majority of unbribed voters remain, the election will be absolutely void. (Cushing's Par. Law, p. 70, sec. 189; St. Ires, Douglass, 11, 389; Coventry, Peckwell, 1, 97; Maine on Elections, 345.)

Freedom of election is violated by external violence, by which the electors are constrained, or by bribery by which their will is corrupted; and, in all cases, where the election will be void without reference to the number of votes affected thereby. (Cushing's Par. Law, p. 68, §181.)

The same doctrine was affirmed by the House of Representatives in the recent case

House of Representatives in the recent case of Platt vs. Goode, second Congressional dis-trict, Virginia. [See Contested Elect., 1871-'76, page 650.]
The report, adopted by the House,

clares: These bribed votes should not be counted.

These bribed votes should not be counted. The record furnishes no method for their elimination. Their acceptance can only be avoided by applying the rule of law, so well known and of such general adoption that it need scarcely be repeated here, that when !!!egal and fraudulent votes have been proven, and the poll can not be purged with reasonable certainty, the whole vote must be rejected.

But your committee do not think it was

But your committee do not think it necessary to rest the decision of this case upon this principle of law, although they believe that the evidence shows conclusively not only that bribery was committed in a multitude of instances, but that a great number of these accounts traced home to the site.

ber were intimidated and coerced into doing so. The testimony of Albert Church [pp. 224, 227] shows that the railroad hands who voted for Washburn, at Crookston, told him that they were compelled "to vote the way their boss, the railroad company, told them to;" \* \* \* "they had to vote the ticket of their own boss." They were led up in a body to the polls [p. 226] by their foreman, Jacobus, and he gave them the tickets they were to vote. Many of these men were Democrats, [p. 224] and would probably have voted the Democratic ticket if they had been free from the coercion of the railroad company. In Minneap olis this

SYSTEM OF COERCION AND INTIMIDATION was carried out systematically. The testi mony shows that the employers of labor in 16 that city united to raise money to buy votes for Washburn [page 23]; a circular was issued by the chairman of the Republican county committee, urging business men to lay aside their business and devote one day at the polls [page 106]; large numbers of employers of labor, including many who usually took no part in such work, were at the polls working for Washburn [p. 106]; the workmen were sent for and brought to the polls by their employers and ballots were there placed in their hands, folded, and voted by the employes without being opened [p. 108], the employer or his foreman follow ing them to the polls to see that they deposited any of the clared that they believed they would lose their means of subsistence if they did not vote for Washburn [p. 110]; the employes

of the North Star Woolen mill WERE BROUGHT TO THE POLLS IN SQUADS by the son of the proprietor, Philip Gibson; when a frieud of contestant tried to give these men ballots, Gibson jumped between them and tried to force the canvasser away, declaring that he had brought the men there and that most voted as their employers wanted them to [p.

96]. The foreman of this mill told one of the workmen [p. 97], that an employe of the mill had, at a previous election, voted in op-position to his wishes, and that he would take the same man to the polls the next day, to wit, to the Congressional election in ques-tion, and if he did not vote as he wanted him tion, and if he did not vote as he wanted him to he would discharge him. When witness-es were called by contestant from among the employes of this mill to testify in this case, the said foreman followed them to the no-tary's office and remained there while they were testifying [p. 98]. "The workmen in the Minnaapolis Harvester works who were known to be Washburn men were carried to the polls and returned; while those who could not be induced to vote for could not be induced to vote for Washburn were not allowed to go, unless by losing their day's work, and probably their situations, [p. 98.] In one case, a witness, a workman in a fur-niture shop, swears that he was suspended from work the day after election because he had voted for Donnelly, and because it was had voted for Donnelly, and because it was reported to his employer that he had oxpressed the belief that if Donnelly was elected the workmen would get better wages; ten days after election he was finally discharged, [see pp. 101-2.] It appears that "the vote of the city was very light. \* \* A large number of workmen did not vote at all. They were afraid of leging their its it.

all. They were afraid of losing their jobs if they voted for Donnelly, and they would not vote for Washburn, [p. 113.]" NUMBERED BALLOTS. In seven precincts of Minneapolis the judges of election placed a number on the back of each ballot to correspond with the number of the voter on the poll-list. Let us consider the purpose of this numbering of

ns consider the purpose
the ballots:
At the session of the legislature of Minnssots, in January and February, 1878, a
special law had been enacted, providing that special law had been enacted, providing that in cities containing more than 12,000 inhab-itants the ballots should be numbered. This law applied, and was intended to apply, only to the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, were the workingmen was very numerous, and where alone the required population existed. It was felt by many that the provis-It must not be forgotten that bribery is a secret crime; both the parties to it are equally interested in keeping it secret; and when detected both are ready to give ingenious explanations of it. If they have acknowledged to third parties the receipt of the bribe they are ready to declare, when called to the witness stand, that they were in favor of the bribe they are ready to declare, when called to the bribe they are ready to declare the bribe they And is situated, to test the variatity of the act. The court decided, [see Brisbin vs. Cleary et al., printed test., p. 74], that the act was unconstitutional, inasmuch as the constitution of Minnesota, sec. 6, Art. VII, provides that "all elections shall be by ballot;" that the ballot implies secreey, and that this law requires every man "to vote, in effect, a ticket with his name indorsed on it;" and in case of a contest the ballots are to be made public. "This law," says the court, "furnishes the means of ascertaining exactly how every elector voted; that is its acknowl-

> WEIGHT OF THE DECISION. This decision of the district court of Ramsey county was the unanimous decision of a

## burn, by his friends, by members of his

OVERTAKES in many cases the bribery has been traced Charles Berens, a Democrat, the postmaster of the village of North Prairie, Morrison county, [situated about one hundred miles

### THE BRIBE GIVER. 5, 1878, he wrote and mailed a letter DIRECT.

REPORT HOUSE SUB-COMMITTEE.

Alive. SOME OF THE CORRUPTION

Which the Committee Elucidate in Re viewing the Testimony.

To the Office and Person of Mr. Washburn.

Which Fastens the Corruption on the

Which Secured the Votes of the Minne

THOSE NUMBERED BALLOTS Which Were Marked in Defiance of Law Thrown Out.

District.

Donnelly is Entitled to the Seat. A FULL COPY OF THE REPORT

of Bill Washburn, if You Dare.

The report of the majority of the subcommittee, composed of Manning of Missippi, Armfield of North Carolina and Beltzhoover of Pennsylvania, was presented to the full committee and made public in the county ten days before the election, to day. It is a masterly review of the case and were therefore legally not election pre-

strong that it fairly overwhelms him. The full committee will positively vote on the report of the sub-committee on Tuesday and there is no doubt of its adoption. Neither is there any doubt of the result in the House. It is now only a question of a the House. It is now only a question of a very short time when Mr. Donnelly will take this cost. He was called an his property of the work was 109 for Washburn and 1 for Donhis seat. He was called on by numerous

Washburn is terribly crest fallen and his countenance shows that he feels the disgrace | Washburn is terribly crest fallen and his countenance shows that he feels the disgrace | Washburn is terribly crest fallen and his countenance shows that he feels the disgrace | Washburn is terribly crest fallen and his countenance shows that he wood-contractors, to vote

which has so justly overtaken him.

The report concludes with two 125,) from \$1.65 to \$2.20 each for their which has so justly overtaken him. resolutions, the first declaring that Washburn, and they were so paid; and they Washburn is not entitled to his seat, and the second declaring that the (p. 297). seat rightfully belongs to Donnelly, Though it a document which is very interesting

### THE REPORT.

BRIBERY BERENS AND BROWER.

behalf of the sitting member, Mr. Wash-