The Work of the Minnesota Legislature Reviewed.

THE record made by the Minnesota legislature which adjourns to-day is the best in the history of the state. A high mark has been set for succeeding legislatures to emulate.

Never were so many important measures presented to a Minnesota legislature, and never were measures given more thorough consideration. The record of bills passed is a splendid one.

To one unfamiliar with the work of the session, it is only necessary to glance at the following statement of work accomplished. The legislature which adjourned to-day

Elected two United States senators.

Reapportioned the state into nine congressional districts.

Provided for a commission to revise and codify the tax laws of the state.

Provided for a commission to revise and codify the statutes.

Passed a primary election law, by which party nominees will be chosen directly by the people.

Created a state board of control to supplant separate boards in the management of the charitable, penal and correctional institutions of the state.

Passed a bill raising the gross earnings tax on railway properties to 4 per cent, to be approved by the people at the next general election.

Placed the office of state oil inspector on a salary basis, commencing Jan. 1, 1903.

Raised the gross earnings tax on express companies from 3 to 6 per cent.

Gave the Torrens system of land title registration a start by applying it to the three largest counties.

Passed an inheritance tax act.

And did all this in a short session of seventy-nine working days, which will permit an extra session without extra expense. This extra session will next year enact the work of the tax commission into law.

Had the legislature done these things, and no more, the members would have earned their hire. The state can well afford every cent the session cost.

Many other measures of more or less importance and necessity were ground through the legislative mill, but the solons of 1901 may well rest their claims to fame on the foregoing list.

In spite of the early adjournment, the work was cleaned up in better shape than at any session in recent history. A total of 738 bills were introduced in the house, and 553 in the senate. Yet so smoothly did the wheels move that night sessions were not necessary until the last night of the session.

The presiding officers, desk forces and leading members displayed business ability and industry. Nothing was allowed to drag. Only six legislative days were wasted by recesses.

The session lasted through seventy-nine legislative days, which does not include Sundays and holidays. The two houses were actually in session seventhy-three days. Compare this with the session of 1899, when the full ninety days were used. The legislature was then in actual session seventy-nine days, having lost eleven by recesses.

This session lasted just ninety-five calendar days, and it is on that basis that the per diem of members and employes is computed.

Junketing was very little indulged in, except by committees in search of information.

The early days of the session did not promise much. The senatorial fight obscured everything else, and delayed attention to matters of legislation. When it was settled, members were tired, and moved listlessly for a while. The early adjournment proposition stirred things up. Those who had bills to get through began to expediate business, and the latter part of the session both houses worked under a full head of steam, clearing the decks in magnificent shape. The measures of most importance were all out of the way before the lat week, which was devoted to the dispatch of business more routine in character.

State campaigns in off years are necessarily fought on state issues. It is for the dominant party to make the issues, and to the legislature of 1901 was entrusted the task of creating campaign arguments for the party to put forward in 1902. Both branches were republican by an overwhelming vote. The democrats had only nineteen out of sixty-three senators, and twenty-three out of 119 members of the lower house. The republican majority succeeded beyond all expectations. The list of measures cited above will be campaign thunder enough and to spare. The gross earnings bill and the primary election bill were passed in response to popular demand, and the people will be inclined to feel gratitude to the party which put their pet measures through. There was also considerable popular demand for the Hurd bill, and the action of the senate in deferring its action was not well liked, but the bill was put through, and the public office of oil inspector will cease to be a private "graft" after 1903. Seven democrats in the senate voted with the unpopular side, and the democracy can say little about this measure.

The bribery embroglio tarnished republicans and fusionists alike. It is not a blemish on either party, but on a certain coterie of individuals, for which neither party is responsible. The only matter for regret is that the men referred to could not have been "smoked out," so the public might know who the public servants were who were betraying their trust.

Taken all in all, the legislature of 1901 did more and better work in less time than any of its predecessors. Some of the things it did will have deep and lasting influence on the people and institutions of the state.

—C. B. C.

THE REAPPORTIONMENT TASK

With Much Labor the State Was Divided Into Nine Districts.

Reapportionment was a party measure. The overwhelming republican majority in both houses was determined to divide the state into nine republican districts. Under the law they must be compact and contiguous, and nearly equal as might be in population, but politics required that the line be so adjusted as to give nine safely republican districts. The various congressional aspirants, however, had another desire—to cut out districts for themselves in which none of the present delegation lived.

The wire pulling began at once. Several solons drafted plans, and discussion and comparison began. Senator Daugherty of Duluth was named chairman of the senate committee, and he soon figured out a plan. In fact, his was announced before the full committee was appointed. There was a long hitch, due to the fact that Lieutenant Governor Smith appointed two democrats out of seven members of the senate committee. This was thought to be a mistake as two congressional districts would thus be represented on the senate end of the joint committee by democrats. The matter was finally adjusted by increasing the senate committee to fourteen and in the house to seventeen. Senators Du Toit and Fitzpatrick were the only democrats among thirty-one, and they soon found that their services were not required in drafting plans.

Attitude of the Delegation.

The seven Minnesota congressmen took an active interest in the game. They had enemies and rivals in the legislature, and it looked at one time as though districts were to be carved out without much regard for their wishes. The seven finally agreed that it would be much better to have no reapportionment at all than divide into nine districts. They feared that at least one district would be democratic, while the present division is quite safe. This proposition found no favor at St. Paul, however. Its opponents used two bugaboos effectively. Both were rather shopworn, having proved their utility on many occasions. First, it was agreed that if two congressmen at large were to be elected, John Lind and Charles A. Towne would be impossible to beat in an off year. The other argument was that St. Paul would get one of the congressmen, and Minneapolis the other, though how the twin cities would get a majority of the state convention was never explained.

The arguments worked, however, and the congressmen-at-large scheme never had any show, unless in the multitude of schemes a tangle should result. This danger was averted by what was known as the "reapportionment trust," a coterie who got together early and drafted a plan, and then made everything bend to its adoption.

The greatest interest was in the central, northern and western sections, where the greatest changes had to be made. A glance at the population of the present seven districts showed this. By the 1900 census, the districts were populated as follows:

First	210,130
Second	281,496
Third	209,768
Fourth	227,899
Fifth	228,340
Sixth	324,729
Seventh	275,442

Winning Plan Agreed On.

Dividing the state equally into nine districts would leave 195,311 in each. The great surplus was in the second, sixth and seventh districts, and there naturally was the greatest interest in reapportionment. The cities did not wake up until a very late day. But the sixth district was afire. Senator J. D. Jones of Long Prairie, and A. F. Ferris of Brainerd put their heads together with Senator Daugherty and agreed on a modified form of his plan. He had carved a new district out of the southern end of the sixth and the surplus counties of the fourth, and made the dividing line between this and the Duluth district run east and west. They modified it so that Brainerd and Long Prairie were set off from Duluth, and the line ran north and south, leaving Anoka attached to Duluth. The legislature was then canvassed in a quiet way, and several of the leaders were interested in the Daugherty-Ferris plan. Speaker Dowling gave it his approval, and men from southern Minnesota were brought into consultation, such as Anderson of Winona, Whitford of Hastings, and Jacobson. The plan was worked out in such shape as to leave no two of the present congressional delegation in the same district, and to make nine districts that were safely republican on paper. It gave Jones, Brower, Ferris and Buckman a new district in the center of the state, and turned the Red River valley into a separate district for the aspirants in that section. The drainage boomers were brought into a deal which resulted in mutual advantage. The drainage people stood by the reapportionment plan with a solid front, and as a reward their bill went through with little opposition.

Before the committee met the plan leaked out. It was first printed in The Journal Feb. 2, with a map showing the population and political complexion of the counties. The map then printed differed from the bill finally adopted only in four places, which will be noticed further on.

Hennepin's Complaint.

The publication of this plan started up a swarm of objectors, but they were not able to get together. The most legitimate kick was from Hennepin county, which was left intact. Although it had grown as fast as the average of the state, the fifth was the only one not reduced by the committee plan. It was left with a surplus of more than 33,000. Ramsey objected to being deprived of Chisago county. Politicians of the capital city are notoriously good at handling conventions and caucuses, but they are not strong on election day, and they feared to be left alone with only Washington county to offset a possible democratic slump. They wanted Chisago, with 1,200 republican majority, left attached.

Another complaint came from the counties taken away from the second district. Senator Somerville, an old rival of McCleary's, had figured out a plan which took Blue Earth county, Mankato and all, out of the second district and left it good fighting ground for Somerville and the rest. James A. Larson of Redwood joined hands with Somerville, hoping to get Redwood retained in the second. Larson got an appointment on the committee and the plan became known as the Larson plan. As it threw McCleary and Heatwole in the same district, it was hotly opposed by the friends of both.

The Daugherty-Ferris combination worked like a watch. It lined up a majority of the joint committee in support of the program, and when the committee held its first meeting Feb. 6, W. B. Anderson of Winona was chosen chairman without dissent. At the next meeting he appointed a sub-committee of seven to draft a plan. The committee consisted of Senators Daugherty of Duluth, J. D. Jones of Long Prairie and Jepson of Minneapolis; Representatives Ferris of Brainerd, Benson of Big Stone, Jacobson of Lac qui Parle and Whitford of Hastings. With one exception this committee was all agreed to the Daugherty-Ferris plan or something closely resembling it.

The sub-committee went to work and so did the opposition. The Hennepin delegation caucussed repeatedly, and several schemes were proposed. It was finally agreed to work together for a division along the river, attaching the east side to a new district and leaving the rest of Hennepin to constitute the fifth district. Senator Jepson, Hennepin's representative on the sub-committee, was instructed to work for this, and he did. But every proposition he made met six hostile voices and votes.

Ramsey Was Placated.

Ramsey county worked, as usual, with more success. The delegation from St. Paul gave it out that they would fight against reapportionment of any kind unless Chisago county was left attached to the fourth district. The sub-committee decided to placate Ramsey and modified the plan accordingly. To preserve the balance, Mille Lacs county was taken from the sixth and given to the eighth, and Meeker was taken from the seventh and given to the sixth, greatly to Meeker's disgust. The plan was reported out Feb. 20, at a stormy meeting of the joint committee. After a long debate, it was agreed to give the subcommittee another week to look over other plans and report. Hennepin drafted a plan, which met with scant courtesy, and Feb. 28 the subcommittee reported back as before. All efforts to modify this plan were met by a solid front of 22 votes. The plan was adopted and a subcommittee appointed to draft a bill.

Hennepin had planned to make a fight on the floor, and in default of any other ally, had gone in with the Somerville-Larson scheme. But Somerville and Larson decided to be content with less than they had started out to get. They only asked that Redwood county be retained in the second district, and Waseca put in the first to keep things even. The committee members agreed to accept this amendment if satisfactory to all concerned. Right here McCleary's friends objected, and so did Dowling. Both preferred to see Redwood stay in the new seventh.

When the vote came up for a vote in the house, Hennepin made a gallant fight. James A. Peterson made a strong speech against the bill, and other Hennepin members pointed out its injustice. But the combination was to strong. Even Larson had left them, and there was only scattering support from the country for Hennepin's plan, which was proposed as an amendment. Then the Henenpin members retaliated by voting against Larson's amendment, which lost by a tie vote, Speaker Dowling casting the tying vote. In the senate Hennepin's effort was futile, but Somerville had better luck than Larson. He succeeded in getting their amendment attached, and it went back to the house for conference. The house refused to concur, and a conference committee was appointed. It held several sessions, and refused to agree. Another was appointed, and this one came to an agreement. The difference was compromised by leaving Waseca in the first district, and forcing Redwood to stay in the seventh. This compromise was adopted by both houses, and the fight closed.

Population of Districts.

The new congressional districts, with their population by counties, are as follows:

First—Dodge, 13,340; Fillmore, 28,238; Freeborn, 21,838; Houston, 15,400; Mower, 22,355; Olmsted, 23,119; Steele, 16,524; Wabasha, 18,924; Waseca, 14,760; Winona, 35,686. Total, 210,164.

Second District—Blue Earth, 32,263; Brown, 19,787; Cottonwood, 12,069; Faribault, 22,055; Jackson, 14,793; Martin, 16,936; Murray, 11,911; Nobles, 14,932; Pipestone, 9,264; Rock, 9,668; Watonwan, 11,496. Total, 175,174.

Third District—Carver, 17,544; Dakota, 21,733; Goodhue, 31,137; Le Sueur, 20,234; McLeod, 19,595; Nicollet, 14,774; Rice, 26,080; Scott, 15,147; Sibley, 16,862. Total, 183,106.

Fourth District—Chisago, 13,248; Ramsey, 170,554; Washington, 27,808. Total, 211,610.

Fifth District—Hennepin, 228,340.

Sixth District—Benton, 9,912; Cass, 7,777; Crow Wing, 14,250; Douglas, 17,964; Hubbard, 6,578; Meeker, 17,753; Morrison, 22,891; Sherburne, 7,281; Stearns, 44,464; Todd. 22,214; Wadena, 7,921; Wright, 29,157; total, 208,162.

Seventh District—Big Stone, 8,731; Chippewa, 12,499; Grant, 8,935; Kandiyohi, 18,416; Lac qui Parle, 14,289; Lincoln, 8,966; Lyon, 14,591; Pope, 12,577; Redwood, 17,261; Renville, 23,693; Stevens, 8,721; Swift, 13,503; Traverse, 7,573; Yellow Medicine, 14,602; total, 184,357.

Eighth District—Aitkin, 6,743; Anoka, 11,313; Carlton, 10,017; Cook, 810; Isanti, 11,675; Itasca, 4,573; Kanabec, 4,614; Lake, 4,654: Mille Lacs, 8,066; Pine, 11,546; St. Louis, 82,932; total, 156,943.

Ninth District—Becker, 14,375; Beltrami, 11,030; Clay, 17,942; Kittson, 7,889; Marshall, 15,698; Norman, 15,045; Otter Tail, 45,375; Polk, 35,429; Red Lake, 12,195; Roseau, 6,994; Wilkin, 8,080; total, 190,052.

Political Aspect.

The districts are for the most part safely republican, the first, second, third, fifth and seventh are safely republican. Under ordinary conditions the fourth district will be sure. The eighth cannot be sized up on the vote of 1898, when Towne carried St. Louis county by 977. It is now a reasonably safe district, more so than the old sixth. The sixth district will be the choice battle ground of democracy. It contains the democratic counties of Stearns, Benton and Morrison. The counties in the new sixth gave a net republican majority on the vote for congressmen in 1898 of 1,119, but should Stearns roll up an old-time democratic majority of 3,000, such a small margin would go glimmering. A candidate like Judge Theodore Bruner of St. Cloud would be extremely dangerous to any republican who could be named. This is especially true in view of the fact that there is no well-known republican of commanding ability.

The ninth district looks dubious on paper, but is much safer than the sixth, as the trend is strongly toward republicanism in the former populist counties of the Red River valley.

The most unfortunate feature of the reapportionment is the great inequality in population. In the opinion of many attorneys the supreme court would set the act aside if it were contested, but it is not likely that the attempt will be made. There was great feeling among members of the Hennepin delegation, but it has nearly blown over.

For the ready reference of the politician, the congressional majorities of 1898 and 1900 in all the counties and new districts are given below:

Majorities of 1898 and 1900.

	1900.	1898.
FIRST DISTRICT.		
Dodge	570 R	725 R
Fillmore	1,473 R	809 R
Freeborn	1,549 R	1,381 R
Houston	455 R	590 R
Mower	1,318 R	1,243 R
Olmsted	687 R	748 R
Steele	197 R	526 R
Wabasha	4 R	546 R
Waseca	135 R	243 R
Winona	1,406 D	197 R
Net plurality	4,982 R	7,008 R
SECOND DISTRICT.		
Blue Earth	1,122 R	825 R
Brown	60 R	147 R
Cottonwood	692 R	330 R
Faribault	1,843 R	1,384 R
Jackson	740 R	385 R
Martin	366 R	305 R
Murray	381 R	95 D
Nobles	460 R	80 R
Pipestone	258 R	97 R
Rock	590 R	400 R
Watonwan	875 R	614 R
Net plurality	7,387 R	4,472 R
THIRD DISTRICT.		
Carver	402 R	434 R
Dakota	66 R	252 R
Goodhue	3,447 R	2,951 R
Le Sueur	168 D	139 R
McLeod	80 D	32 D
Nicollet	665 R	459 R
Rice	1,108 R	1,283 R
Scott	789 D	913 D
Sibley	567 R	397 R
Net plurality	5,209 R	4,970 R
FOURTH DISTRICT.		
Chisago	1,698 R	1,103 R
Ramsey	2,555 R	1,753 R
Washington	1,187 R	880 R
Net plurality	5,440 R	3,736 R
FIFTH DISTRICT.		
Hennepin	10,455 R	5,840 R
SIXTH DISTRICT.		
Benton	55 D	121 D
Cass	446 R	242 R
Crow Wing	803 R	373 R
Douglas	347 R	525 R
Hubbard	483 R	47 R
Meeker	743 R	608 R
Morrison	142 D	427 D
Sherburne	493 R	267 R
Stearns	1,845 D	1,215 D
Todd	477 R	343 R
Wadena	421 R	237 R
Wright	880 R	320 R
Net plurality	3,051 R	1,199 R
SEVENTH DISTRICT.		
Big Stone	289 R	354 R
Chippewa	529 R	235 R
Grant	424 R	196 R
Kandiyohi	750 R	208 R
Lac qui Parle	1,007 R	535 R
Lincoln	55 R	35 D
Lyon	390 R	31 R
Pope	1,262 R	902 R
Redwood	959 R	365 R
Renville	1,325 R	969 R
Stevens	103 R	369 R
Swift	103 R	318 R
Traverse	39 D	61 D
Yellow Medicine	633 R	450 R
Net plurality	7,790 R	4,836 R
EIGHTH DISTRICT.		
Aitkin	566 R	266 R
Anoka	872 R	469 R
Carlton	478 R	179 R
Cook	20 R	19 R
Isanti	719 R	459 R
Itasca	232 R	31 R
Kanabec	357 R	155 R
Lake	143 R	32 D
Mille Lacs	674 R	360 R
Pine	270 R	27 D
St. Louis	1,883 R	977 D
Net plurality	6,214 R	902 R
NINTH DISTRICT.		
Becker	717 R	793 R
Beltrami	474 R	109 R
Clay	558 R	176 R
Kittson	180 R	5 D
Marshall	343 R	122 R
Norman	356 R	367 R
Otter Tail	610 D	47 D
Polk	45 R	592 D
Red Lake	343 R	92 D
Roseau	147 R	38 R
Wilkin	94 R	123 R
Net plurality	2,647 R	992 R

GROSS EARNINGS TAX

Long Battle Between People and Railroads Ends in Passage.

The long fight for a 4 per cent gross earnings tax on railroads is over, so far as the legislature is concerned. The Jacobson bill is passed and will be voted on by the people at the next general election. After its passage, which is certain, the courts will have to determine its validity.

The passage of the Jacobson bill was the dramatic climax of a most sensational contest. It was a splendid triumph for Messrs. Jacobson, Anderson, Peterson and their faithful allies on the floor, but not less for the independent press and the people at large, who by the pressure they exerted at the right moment turned the tide and compelled their representatives to pass the bill.

The defeat of the bill had been cleverly planned. It was not to be voted down, but sidetracked. This favorite railroad maneuver came near being accomplished, with the house committee on taxes at the switch.

It was a plausible proposition and deceived many friends of the bill for some time. It took two weeks thoroughly to unmask the plot. After the tax commission bill passed, and Mr. Jacobson introduced the gross earnings bill, its enemies passed the word around: "Refer the bill to the tax commission. That is what we created them for. There is a doubt as to our right to raise the rate. Let the tax commission rule on that, and then we can vote on it at the extra session."

They ignored the fact that no ruling of the tax commission could settle the case. They hoped for an unfavorable decision, which would probably mean the death of the bill. But had the commission ruled otherwise, the question would still have to go to the highest court in the land for settlement. Moreover, it is no part of the work of the tax commission to fix rates of taxation, but rather to devise means for levying, assessing and collecting taxes.

The fallacy of reference could not win on its merits, though it found some honest converts in the house. It was found necessary to resort to other means of getting votes for the railroad plan. No one doubts, even after reading the mild report given out by the committee of investigation, that a corruption fund was used as a convincing argument in favor of reference. By fair means or foul, sixty-five members were lined up to present a solid front against the progress of the bill to passage.

After a vexatious delay, succeeding the addresses of the railroad attorneys to the tax committee of the house, a vote was secured in the committee and it stood 13 to 4 in favor of reference. Messrs. Jacobson, J. A. Peterson, Washburn and Ward signed a minority report, recommending the bill to pass.

Meanwhile, the bribery charges had come into the hands of Mr. Jacobson, in the shape of an affidavit signed by W. D. Washburn, Jr., certifying to a conversation with Representative Hogan, in which Hogan told of the existence of a "pool" to which would yield $200 apiece to its members. Mr. Jacobson consulted with several senators and representatives and a plan of action was mapped out. The bribery charges were to be reserved until the house had voted down the minority report, and were to be followed by the ingenious point of order, raised by Mr. Anderson, which really saved the day.

The battle raged all day March 20. Jacobson, in his impassioned speech for the minority report, alleged the existence of "a damnable system of corruption" within the legislative halls as well as without. The air was highly charged, and all day an explosion was looked for. The opponents of the bill had the whip hand, and forced the vote. A roll call on the adoption of the minority report showed 50 ayes and 64 noes, and Mr. Washburn changed his vote in order to move reconsideration. Mr. Laybourn, the astute leader of the opposition, pressed for an immediate vote on reconsideration in order to deal the bill its death blow. But the friends of the bill had two more shots in the locker.

First, Mr. Anderson made a dramatic demand for proof of the charges of corruption. Mr. Washburn in reply announced that he had information which he was ready to lay before the proper committee of the house. A motion to appoint an investigating committee was at once made and carried.

Trump Card Played.

Mr. Laybourn now pressed for the adoption of the majority report. A few minutes more and it would have gone through with 64 votes behind it, but here Mr. Anderson played his trump. He made the point of order that the bill could not be referred to the tax commission, or to any other outside body. It was the property of the house, and must be disposed of by the house.

The opposition looked blank. All the wind was out of their sails. Mr. Laybourn made a hard fight, but Mr. Anderson was splendidly backed up by Messrs. Jackson and J. A. Peterson. The speaker looked up the house rules, and found that a bill must not leave the hands of the chief clerk, except in the regular course of business. He ruled the point well taken, saying that the subject matter of the bill might properly be referred, but not the bill itself. In order to collect its scattered thoughts, the opposition secured a postponement until the next morning, and over night prepared a modified report, recommending that a copy of the bill be referred to the tax commission, and the bill itself lie on the table. The latter recommendation was ruled out of order in a committee report. Sentiment had so changed over night that the harmless majority report was lost on the first roll call by one vote. But speaker Dowling, voting last, explained that as a friend of the bill, he could not see any harm in referring the subject to the tax commission. After he had spoken, six votes were changed, and the majority report was adopted, 61 to 50, referring the subject to the tax commission. The motion to lay the bill on the table was then carried, with only a show of opposition, as that was exactly where Mr. Jacobson wanted the bill. He wanted time for the members to hear from home, before bringing the question to a final issue.

That morning an investigation committee was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Mallory, Whitford, Wells, Lee and Johnson. Under the resolution, no power was given the committee to summon witnesses, and it remained inactive for several days.

March 27, just a week after the first battle, Mr. Jacobson took everybody by surprise by moving to take the bill from the table. The debate did not last long. It was merely a test of strength and by a margin so narrow as to be almost an accident the bill was taken from the table. The vote was 57 to 56. G. W. Armstrong, an opponent of the bill, chanced to be absent, or it would have been a tie. His colleague, Mr. Lane, for some unexplained reason voted "aye," or the motion would have been lost. Mr. Lane had voted against the bill before, and did so again on its final passage. But several members had experienced a change of heart, among them Mr. Torson, who had signed the majority report of the committee. That narrow margin of one was enough. From that moment the opponents of the bill were on the run. A motion to make the bill a special order passed, 92 to 12, and when the bill came up for final passage there was a great rush to get under cover. It was passed by a vote of 78 to 36.

The senate lost no time in "squaring itself" for the action of two years before, when the bill was beaten by a vote of 31 to 30. The tax committee reported the bill to pass by a vote of 10 to 2, and recommended that it be made a special order. J. D. Jones, who fought the bill at the previous session, climbed right to the top of the band wagon, and moved to suspend the rules and put the bill on its final passage immediately. In this he was seconded by Senator Young, who had formerly led the opposition. The bill passed by a vote of 53 to 8.

Where Credit Belongs.

There were a number of honest men in bad company, who believed it was right to refer the bill to the tax commission. Some of them hung out to the last, and voted against the passage of the bill. On the other hand, many votes were changed in order to make explanations easier at home. The final vote in the house is no criterion to show who were friends of the bill. The credit properly belongs to the fifty who stood by the minority report on the first day, and it belongs no less to the silent voters than to the men who worked and talked for the bill. The measure was dubbed "Jacobson's pet," but the popular uprising for the bill indicated that Jacobson had plenty of support. James A. Peterson added laurels to his record by his vigorous speech for the bill. W. B. Anderson of Winona saved the day with his point of order. Both worked hard individually for votes, and the buttonhole argument was employed effectively by several others. Riley, Roberts, Jackson and Sweet all did yeoman service. Jackson was the only republican on the Ramsey delegation to vote for the bill, and Alford was alone from Duluth.

While it is not fair to judge a man solely by his vote on one measure, the people will largely judge their representatives by their stand on this important question, and in order to show how the house was divided on the original proposition, the vote on the minority report is here given:

AYES.

Aanenson, Alford, Alley, Anderson, Bean, Bosworth, Brubaker, Bush, Butler, Cumming, Deming, Dorsey, Feeney, Galt, Grandrud, Harden, Haugen, Haugland, Hilmond, Jackson, Jacobson, Johnson, Johnsrud, Lee, Lommen, Mahood, Martin, Nichols, Oppegaard, Pennington, Peterson, J. A., Peterson, G., Plowman, Potter, Rider, Riley, Roberts, Sageng, Schutz, Stark, Stites, Swanson, Sweet, Torry, Von Wald, Ward, Washburn, Whitford, Mr. Speaker.

NOES.

Allen, Armstrong, G. W., Armstrong, J. A., Babcock, Barteau, Benolken, Benson, Berg, Burns, Bury, Cooke, Daggett, Dealy, Dobbin, Dunn, Ferris, Fust, Gainey, Grass, Hemstead, Herbert, Hickey, Hillary, Hinton, Hogan, Holm, Hunt, Hurd, Hymes, Kelly, Lane, Larson, Laybourn, Lemke, Mallory, Mark, Miller, Morley, Nelson, H. K., Nelson, W., Neubauer, Nolan, Norman, Noyes, O'Neil, Ocobock, Ofsthun, Peterson, S. D., Phillips, Pope, Pugh, Rich, Ryan, Sander, Schert, Schurman, Schwarg, Sikorski, Smith, Stevenson, Torson, Umland, Wells, Wilder.

The absentees were Messrs. Morris, Nyquist, Rapp, Wallace and Wilder. Morris was absent attending the funeral of his uncle, Benjamin Harrison, and the rest were ill. Messrs. Morris and Nyquist afterward were present and voted to take the bill from the table.

The victory of the bill was the fruit of three sessions of hard work on the part of Mr. Jacobson and his friends, with the whole power of the railroad companies of the state exerted to block the passage of the measure. No piece of legislation has attracted such universal interest, and save in the railroad centers, public sentiment has been strong for the passage of the bill. It was never so rampant as this year, and the passage of the bill was in obedience to the popular demand.

The measure provides that with the sanction of the people at the next general election, the railroads of the state shall be compelled, after Jan. 1, 1903, to pay a gross earnings tax of 4 per cent in lieu of all other taxes. The earnings are to be computed by adding to the amount of earnings within the state such proportion of the interstate traffic as is represented by the relation the mileage in Minnesota bears to the total mileage of the road. In case the railroads fail to pay, the state may bring suit in any county to compel payment.

PRIMARY ELECTIONS

State at Large Adopts Minneapolis Plan With Slight Changes.

The primary election reform has swept the entire state. The Minneapolis plan, amended up to date, was adopted by the legislature as the method of nominating congressmen, district judges, county, city and school officers. If it proves a success the state over, and is retained, it will mean an end of all conventions but state conventions, and even these may be abolished two years hence. It means an end of trading and of the rule of the boss. The system may have its disadvantages, but its good features are such as the people have been crying for, and the popular demand for the bill was universal. St. Paul was determined to have it, and from the small cities and even the rural districts there came an appeal for a primary law.

Early in the session Hillmond, a populist, introduced a bill which extended the Minneapolis law, without any variation, to the entire state. A trial of the system had convinced Minneapolis people that some minor changes would be beneficial, and outsiders wanted to improve somewhat on the system before accepting it. Dunn of Ramsey introduced a bill later on, enacting the Minneapolis law with a number of amendments. The two bills were made a special order and when they came up Hillmond joined hands with Dunn, permitting his own bill to be laid on the table. The usual treacherous plan of amending a bill to death was adopted by the opposition, most of whom feared popular disapproval too much to come out in the open. An amendment was tacked on to extend the bill to state officers, but later on a showing that it would defeat the bill, was reconsidered. The bill passed by a narrow margin on the first roll call, but no less than sixteen belated ones caught the bandwagon by changing their votes.

The senate wrestled with the bill four days and amended it with vicious intent, but the friends of the bill stood to their guns, cleaned off the objectionable amendments, and finally got the bill through with only minor changes, and those for the better. The house refused to concur, however, and in conference the senate receded from two. One was the Ives amendment, striking out the clause compelling the voter to declare his previous party affiliation, and the other was an immaterial clause relating to voting machines. The bill as amended went through both houses sailing.

Synopsis of the Law.

The Dunn law is in reality only a bill extending the provisions of the Minneapolis law with some minor amendments.

The essential amendments are two. In the first place, petitions are done away with. It is only necessary for a candidate to file an affidavit and pay his fee in order to get on the ticket. In the second place, voters are required to declare their party affiliations. Instead of being handed ballots, by each party, and taking their choice, they are handed the ballot they ask for, and have no chance to mark more than one each. The amendments made are for the purpose of carrying these two changes into effect and of making the bill apply to the entire state. The state canvassing board is to count the votes cast for positions voted for by more than one county.

At the primary elections congressmen, judges, members of the legislature, county and city officers, elective members of school boards, park boards and library boards are to be nominated. The primaries are to be held on Tuesday, seven weeks before the general election, and it is also the first day for registration. Any political party which has cast 10 per cent of the vote at the last preceding election, or which shall present to the county auditor a petition signed by 10 per cent of the qualified voters, is entitled, under the bill, to have a primary election ticket printed. Any persons wishing to go on the ticket as candidate must file an affidavit with the county auditor twenty days before the primary election. Those to be voted for by more than one county must file with the state auditor, and must pay $20, for offices voted for within a county the fee is $10, but if running for a position which pays no salary no fee is required.

County auditors are to prepare the ballots, and the names of candidates for each position are alternated so that each one shall be at the top on an equal number of ballots.

Primary elections in each voting district are to be held at the same place as the general election next ensuing. Judges and clerks are to be appointed in the same manner as for the general election, and will also act as a board of registration. The provisions of the general election law as to saloons and the sale of liquor are extended to the primary elections, also provisions as to arrangements at polling places, ballot boxes, booths, constables, sheriffs, police officers, gatekeepers and arrests, supplies, etc. Polls are to be kept open from 6 a. m. to 9 p. m.

All persons entitled to register are entitled to vote at primary elections. The voter is given the ballot of the party with which he affiliates, and with which party he voted at the last election. He marks it in the same way as the ballot of a general election, returning it folded to the judges, who make their report to the canvassing board as in a general election.

The count must first be made for offices voted for by more than one county, and must be forwarded to the secretary of state within three days. The state canvassing board canvasses the vote and reports the result to the county auditors.

County canvassing boards consist of the county auditor, county clerk, chairman of the board of county commissioners and two justices of the peace, selected by the clerk, and, if possible, of opposite political faith. If any member of the board is a candidate, the rest of the board selects a member to serve in his place.

Ties are to be determined by lot. The persons chosen are to be placed on the official ballot. But no candidate defeated at a primary election is permitted to go on the ticket by petition. Judges and courts are compensated in the same way as at the general election.

The courts may review election results on a showing made by affidavit, and candidates desiring to contest the count may do so by filing affidavit within five days, and must then abide by the order of the court.

BOARD OF CONTROL

State Boards Consolidated Into One Body of Three Men.

The entire management of the charitable, penal and correctional institutions of the state will be in the hands of three men after Aug. 1 as a result of the passage of H. F. 36.

The board of control bill was one of the most far-reaching and hard-fought measures of the session. Without the support of the administration, it could hardly have been carried, so vehement was the opposition roused by the members of the displaced boards and the friends of the various institutions.

This bill was the administration measure, par excellence, and will be one of the strongest pieces of campaign material next summer if all goes well with the new board.

The idea is borrowed from Iowa, where a board of control has proved a great success, and the Minnesota bill as first introduced was closely modeled on the Iowa law. State Auditor Dunn was the original board of control man. It has been his hobby for two years and more, and in his last biennial report he went into the subject at length. Governor Van Sant took up with the idea, and made it the principal recommendation of his message. The bill was framed by George E. Edgerton, former assistant attorney general, under the supervision of Auditor Dunn. It was introduced early in the session by Mr. Torson in the house and by Senator Snyder in the senate. It was considered jointly by the general legislation committee of the house and a special committee of the senate. Hearings were given the friends and foes of the bill on two or three occasions. Auditor Dunn made a strong plea for it, and the theory was fully and cogently stated by C. E. Faulkner, superintendent of the Washburn home in Minneapolis. Representatives of the various boards appeared against the bill, conspicuous among them being C. H. Pettit of Minneapolis, president of the board of trustees of the state training school at Red Wing. Finally, Governor Van Sant played a trump card by sending a commission of three men all experienced in public affairs, to investigate the workings of the system in Wisconsin and Iowa. These three men, it afterward turned out, were the men selected to constitute the first board. They were C. A. Morey of Winona, long a member of the normal school board; W. E. Lee of Long Prairie, ex-speaker of the house and at one time superintendent of the St. Cloud reformatory, and S. W. Leavitt of Litchfield, once a member of the state senate. These three made a tour, taking in Iowa, Michigan and Illinois, and returned with a report strongly recommending the bill, with some minor modifications, all of which were incorporated. The bill was then recommended to pass by the joint committee. It was debated in the house a day and a half. Messrs. Torson, Jacobson, Ward and Anderson were the principal supporters of the measure. J. A. Peterson, Mallory and Sweet opposed it, Peterson in a strong arraignment. It passed practically without amendment, by the following vote:

Yeas—

Aaneson, Allen, Alley, Anderson, Armstrong, G. W., Armstrong, J. A., Bean, Benson, Berg, Bosworth, Brubaker, Burns, Bush, Butler, Cumming, Dobbin, Dorsey, Dunn, Ferris, Gainey, Galt, Gandrud, Grass, Haugland, Hemstead, Hendricks, Herbert, Hickey, Hogan, Holm, Hunt, Hurd, Jackson, Jacobson, Johnsrud, Lane, Larson, Lommen, Mahood, Nelson, H. K., Nelson, W., Nichols, Noyes, Nyquist, O'Neill, Ocobock, Ofsthun, Oppegaard, Peterson, G., Peterson, S. D., Phillips, Pope, Rich, Riley, Roberts, Sander, Schurman, Schutz, Schwarg, Smith, Start, Stevenson, Stites, Swanson, Torson, Torry, Umland, Von Wald, Ward, Washburn, Whitford, Mr. Speaker—72.

Nays—

Alford, Babcock, Barteau, Benolken, Bury, Daggett, Dealy, Deming, Feeney, Harden, Haugan, Hillary, Hillmond, Hinton, Hymes, Johnson, Kelly, Laybourn, Lemke, Mallory, Martin, Miller, Morley, Neubauer, Nolan, Norman, Pennington, Peterson, J. A., Plowman, Potter, Pugh, Rider, Ryan, Sageng, Scherf, Sikorski, Sweet, Wells, Wilder—39.

In the senate the bill nearly went on the rocks. Its enemies were strong enough to work through an amendment putting the state university and normal schools under the financial supervision of the board, and as a concession the schools for the deaf and the blind at Faribault, and the state school at Owatonna were put on the same basis, the local boards remaining in existence to look after the general welfare of the institutions. It was thought that this amendment would kill the bill, but Senator Snyder took his medicine without a grimace, and the bill passed by the following vote:

Yeas—

Barker, Batz, Brower, Buckman, Fitzpatrick, Grindeland, Grue, Halvorson, Hawkins, Jepson, Johnson, Jones, E. J., Jones, J. D., Knatvold, Larson, Lord, McCarthy, McGill, McGowan, McNamee, Miller, Myran, Nixon, Roverud, Rider, Schaller, Shellbach, Sheehan, Shell, Sivright, Smith, E. E., Smith, J. H., Snyder, Somerville, Sweningsen, Thompson, Underleak, Viesselman, Wilson, Young—40.

Nays—

Baldwin, Benedict, Chilton, Coller, Daly, Dart, Daugherty, Dickey, Du Toit, Gausewitz, Greer, Hospes, McArthur, Meilicke, Potter, Stockton—16.

The bill then went back to the house, which finally concurred.

It developed after the bill left the house and went into the hands of the governor that the senate had been in too much of a hurry with its amendments, and had neglected to include educational institutions in the title of the bill. Under all court decisions, this invalidates all that part of the bill relating to the university and normal schools. The governor was at first inclined to send the bill back for correction, but that was too risky. There was the alternative of requesting a new bill amending the title, but friends of the university and normal schools, who preferred to see the system tried a while before bringing these institutions within its scope, prevailed on the governor to leave it alone, and he signed the bill. He then named S. W. Leavitt a member for two years, W. E. Lee for four years, and C. A. Morey for six years.

The compensation of the members is fixed at $3,500 per year. They are required to furnish bonds in the sum of $25,000 each. They are given the appointment of the wardens or superintendents of the institutions in their charge, but the subordinates employed are appointed only by the executive head of the institution, who is responsible for its conduct. The board fixes the salaries of employes, and has entire control over the purchasing of supplies.

The board is empowered to employ a secretary at not more than $2,000 a year, and such other employes as are deemed necessary, and must maintain, so far as practicable, a uniform system of accounting for the several institutions.

It is made the duty of the board to visit each of the hospitals and asylums for the insane once in each month and the other institutions under its control at least four times in each year. Traveling expenses are to be met from the general fund. The board is given entire control of the purchase of supplies and contracting for new buildings and repairs, for which all plans are to be made by the state architect. Reports to the governor and legislature are to be made biennially and are to include estimates of the total expense of the maintenance of the several institutions for the ensuing biennial period.

The local boards deposed are the state board of corrections and charities, the board of prison managers, board of trustees for the state training school for boys and girls.

THE SENATORIAL CONTEST

Moses E. Clapp Chosen to Succeed the Late Cushman K. Davis.

After the way of the living, the late Senator Cushman K. Davis was not yet dead before the succession was talked of. The first conjectures were as to whom Governor Lind would appoint to succeed him. But the story of the tender to Judge Loren W. Collins and the subsequent choice of Charles A. Towne belongs more properly to a review of Governor Lind's administration than to an account of the work of the legislature. The election of a successor, however, is matter that pertains to this review. The re-election of Senator Knute Nelson being a foregone conclusion, the interest was entirely confined to the contest resulting upon the unexpected death of Senator Davis.

Before the legislature met, a host of potential candidates were mentioned. Among them were Dr. Cyrus Northrop, ex-Governor J. S. Pillsbury, Thomas Lowry, Robert G. Evans, Thomas Shevlin, C. A. Smith and Congressman Fletcher of Minneapolis. Moses E. Clapp, Hiram F. Stevens, W. B. Dean, A. R. McGill and even J. J. Hill of St. Paul; Congressmen McCleary and Tawney.

Evans the Hennepin Candidate.

Thomas Shevlin of Minneapolis was the first to enter the race and R. G. Evans was a close second. Moses E. Clapp soon followed with a formal announcement of his candidacy. The first stage of the contest was that of family rows in both St. Paul and Minneapolis. It was felt that the senatorship should go to one of the two cities and that it was essential that each should be united. Mr. Lowry was slow to get into the race in Minneapolis, failing to return from the east until the day fixed for the Hennepin republican legislative delegation to caucus. Mr. Shevlin had made little headway and Mr. Evans had so many friends on the delegation that Mr. Lowry and Congressman Fletcher decided not to permit their names to be used. Mr. Shevlin, through Representative Sherman Smith, who had managed his campaign, withdrew before a ballot was taken. Mr. Ecans was nominated early in December as the Hennepin candidate, receiving all but three votes—those of Senator Snyder and Representatives Lane and Phillips.

Clapp Backed by the Fourth.

After some friction and uncertainty, especially on the part of Washington county, General Clapp finally received the unanimous indorsement of the fourth congressional district. Then the battle began in the St. Paul hotel lobbies. Its appearance changed with each day and no man could tell what would be the issue. Mr. Evans started his campaign with vigor much earlier than General Clapp, and for a while it looked as if he would surely win the coveted prize. Much of the Davis following thoughout the state was favorable to Evans, and it was generally understood that Senator Knute Nelson's lieutenants were for Evans and would do what they could to elect him—that is in a quiet, unobtrusive way. Besides, Minneapolis was logically entitled to a senator. The Evans boom bowled along merrily until Congressman Tawney appeared in the field.

While the first district congressman had been accredited with a desire to try for the big prize, it was by no means a certainty that he would be a candidate until the first district delegation caucusing in St. Paul on Dec. 28, agreed unanimously to support him. Mr. Evans had always been confident that a majority of the first district legislators were for him, and in the hope that the Tawney movement would be headed off, a hasty meeting of all the second district men in St. Paul that day, with the exception of S. D. Peterson of New Ulm, was called at noon. The first district delegation was to meet at 2 p. m. The eleven declared for Mr. Evans and his followers were at once certain of victory. They counted the second district as good as gained and the news was rushed to the first district caucus.

First Blow to Exans.

It had no effect unless it was to intensify Tawney's determination to get into the race. The announcement of the congressman's candidacy checked Mr. Evans' progress. The Minneapolitan's warm supporters were confident, however, that Tawney would not remain in the race long. But the restiveness of some of the second district eleven who had declared for Mr. Evans and their talk about not being bound had a depressing effect on the Evans forces. The latter held together remarkably well, however, notwithstanding the eleventh hour entrance of Thomas Lowry of Minneapolis with a