

## SEVENTEENTH DAY.

BISMARCK, *Saturday, July 20, 1889.*

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. KLINE.

The Convention adjourned without transacting any business.

## NINETEENTH DAY.

BISMARCK, *Monday, July 22, 1889.*

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. BOLLINGER.

Mr. PURCELL. In view of the fact that many of the delegates present are anxious to be relieved of duty as fast as possible, and in view of the fact that to-day is the last day for the presentation of articles, I move that all standing committees be required to make their reports by Thursday of this week.

Seconded and carried.

## SOUTH DAKOTA CONSTITUTION.

Mr. PARSONS of Morton moved the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Constitution of South Dakota as appears in Long's Legislative Hand Book, (a copy of which is upon the desk of each member) be considered as introduced for adoption by this Convention, without being printed in the Files or Journal.

Mr. WALLACE. I should like to know if it is intended to print the Constitution either in the Journal or in the Files.

Mr. PARSONS of Morton. I supposed that the resolution was clear enough. The only printing that we have done is in the Journal and the Files, and my resolution specially says that the Constitution of South Dakota shall not be printed. I introduced the resolution simply that we might have the Constitution before us as an assistance in future debate. The Constitution is right here and we can refer to it. There are several matters coming before us which are brought out in this Constitution, and I think it would be wise for us to have the privilege to refer to it if we want to.

#### REBUKING A COMMITTEE.

An article introduced by Mr. RICHARDSON, known as File No. 46, was referred back to the Convention by the Committee on Revenue and Taxation, with the statement that as the matter was covered by other articles, the committee had no further use for it.

Mr. RICHARDSON said: I rise in protest of the way these Files are handled by the committees. It appears that there have been several propositions or proposed articles handed in to the committees covering the same ground. For instance, the preamble or the prohibition question, and in fact there is hardly any matter that is not covered by two or more proposed articles. I don't see why one particular article should be taken out from the numerous articles and flung back at the parties bringing it in, unless it is an established rule that every article which the committee does not see fit to adopt is to be sent back in this way. I supposed that the proposed articles went before their respective committees, and that the committee acted on them and from their own ingenuity they selected or made out a report, and that report, if accepted and adopted by the Convention, became one of the articles of the Constitution. It seems, however, in this case, that one or two articles are brought out separately and thrown out, while there are other cases where several articles are handed to the committees that are all alike, and these are retained in the hands of the committees that are all alike, and these are retained in the hands of the committees. Mr. PRESIDENT, it seems to me that this Convention has no right justly to say that one proposed article shall not remain with the committee until their final report any more than that all shall. I would move that this article be referred back to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems to me that the remarks of the

gentleman are fair. If the committee wishes to adopt a substitute for this article they can report the article back when they report the substitute. It seems to me that it is hardly proper to select one or two articles to return to the Convention in this way. Let the File be recommitted, and if the committee has something better let it report a substitute.

File No. 46 was recommitted to the committee.

Mr. LAUDER. I am a member of the committee, and I desire to say to the gentleman from Pembina that there was no disrespect to the gentleman from Pembina, or his proposed article intended, but when we came to look over the articles we found that we had half a dozen or so covering the same ground, and if the committee returned only this one, it was because we had not got through with the balance.

Mr. PARSONS. Would it not be well to have a resolution passed providing that all Files or articles referred should not be reported back until the final report of the committee, except such articles as are recommended to be referred to another committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON'S motion was carried.

Mr. PARSONS of Morton. I move that all articles submitted to committees be not reported back to the house until the committees send their full report, except such articles as they may send with the recommendation that they be referred to some other committee.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it would be better to leave this to the discretion of the committees. After this informal discussion that we have had I think the committees will understand what is expected of them. I think it would be better not to adopt this resolution, and thus tie up the hands of the committees.

Mr. STEVENS. I move as a substitute motion that all matters reported from any committee shall immediately be referred to the Committee of the Whole, and be taken up at the time the report of the committee is discussed.

Mr. PARSONS of Morton. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. STEVENS. I withdraw my substitute.

Mr. MOER. I move that the vote by which File No. 44 was indefinitely postponed be reconsidered.

Seconded and carried.

Mr. MOER. I move that File No. 44 be referred back to the Committee on Revenue and Taxation.

The motion carried.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I move that the several standing committees hereafter report back to the Convention no articles unless the same be deemed of use for other committees.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. MOER. I don't wish to offer any discourtesy to the gentleman, but it seems to me that this would give a committee wonderful power. It simply allows a committee to say, out of all that is introduced, what shall go back, and we have no power to pass on anything that is introduced here that the committee does not see fit to report back. It makes the committee absolute judge of what shall go before this Convention. I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. ROLFE. I move that the resolution by which the committees were required to report by Thursday be reconsidered. I voted in the affirmative. I do this for the purpose of moving an amendment which will read: "Except the Committee on Apportionment and Representation." That committee can make no report whatever until the Committee on Legislative Department has reported upon the number of houses, and the number of members of which the Legislature shall be composed, and that report has been adopted by the Convention, or at least by the Committee of the Whole.

Seconded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would seem unnecessary to pass this. We are not going to ask any committee to do that which they cannot do. If one of the standing committees cannot report, all they have got to do is to stand up in this House and say they can't report for lack of action on the part of other committees. It does not seem to me that it is necessary to do more than this.

Mr. STEVENS. I would say that the resolution that was passed relative to the reports of committees does not say that they shall finally report, but that they shall report, and they can easily do that. The resolution is simply that they shall report. They may report progress under the resolution.

Motion to reconsider was lost.

The following resolution, known as File No. 25, was taken up for discussion in Committee of the Whole.

*Resolved*, That the Constitution provide that the Legislative authority of this State shall rest in a single body, to be called the "Legislative Assembly,"

---

which shall consist of not less than one hundred members, to be elected by the people; *Provided*, The Legislative Assembly may from time to time increase the number of members, as necessity may require.

Mr. LAUDER. I move that the speeches be limited to twenty minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope this motion will not prevail. I think the Committee of the Whole should allow the members as much time as they desire to take to discuss these questions. It is fair and just that they should say as much on this question as they want to say.

Mr. LAUDER. I have no desire to deprive any man of time, but it seems to me that we are spending a good deal of valuable time here without doing much. But I withdraw my motion.

#### THE SINGLE HOUSE QUESTION.

Mr. STEVENS. MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: In introducing this proposition to have our Legislature consist of a single house, I assure you I have not been influenced by an ambitious desire to depart from the beaten path trod by constitutional conventions heretofore held, merely as an experiment. Neither have I been influenced by a morbid curiosity to ascertain what support the proposition might receive. I take unto myself no credit for having originated the idea or the resolution under consideration. As far back as 1850 the Hon. D. A. Robertson urged its adoption in the great State of Ohio, and in North Dakota its adoption has been ably urged by the Bismarck Tribune, and endorsed editorially by some of the leading papers of the Northwest. No meeting of its advocates has, so far as I am aware, been held to consider what course is best to pursue in urging its adoption, but it comes before you as a simple proposition for your earnest consideration. And had I the powers and ability that would allow me to make a plain statement of the necessities of its adoption unembellished by oratorical display, I would have attained my highest ambition in its advocacy.

In the formation by this Convention of a constitution we are led to consider not only its permanency, but also its adaptability to the wants and the necessities of the people. What might be appropriate in the great manufacturing states of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, the great mining states of California and Colorado need not of necessity be applicable to the wants of the great agricultural State of North Dakota. The members of the

Constitutional Convention that formed our greatest of National Constitutions took into consideration, not only the necessities of the times and the circumstances of the people, but also attempted in a measure to adopt a plan as near analogous to the form of government under which the people had been governed as the blood-bought liberties of the people would admit, and that among other things was one of the causes that led to the dual complexion of our National Government. In imitation of the British Parliament the two branches of Congress were formed, one to protect the rights of the people and the other to protect landed interests. Different modes of election and qualification were prescribed for Senators and Representatives so that no conflict might ever arise as to their election. The one and only argument to-day in favor of the perpetuation of our National Senate is the protection it affords to independent sovereignties which compose our Federal Union—a branch of the government where the little state of Delaware and the great empire state of New York shall meet on equal terms and have equal representation. Can any such argument be urged in favor of a Senate for North Dakota? Surely not unless you agree that every county is entitled to a member of the Senate. If the Senators are to be elected from the same districts as Representatives, then every argument in its favor is but a drop of sand, and the boasted protection to the rights of the people it is supposed to afford becomes but a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. The House of Lords, in imitation of which our National Senate was originally created, is but a remnant of that old feudal system which the enlightenment of time has relegated to the dead past, and to-day the House of Lords is only perpetuated to mark that aristocratic distinction so absolutely necessary to a monarchical form of government, and sits idly by trembling at the very frown of the House of Commons.

The argument used to show the necessity of a United States Senate is that it gives each of the different sovereignties equal representation. No such method has ever yet been adopted in the formation of a state. You say each district shall elect three members of the House and one Senator. Why this distinction? Why make one equal to three? Both branches have the same legislative powers; each can originate measures for consideration. The check upon the Senate is as necessary as upon the House, and both are necessary. Would the electors send a representative to one branch of the Legislature under the belief that he would disagree with

the member of the other House because he belonged to a different branch of the same body? Surely not. True it is that measures have passed the House that were improper and have failed in the Senate, but in nearly every case they have only passed the House to be used as trading stock in the Senate, and had there been no co-ordinate branch they would have failed in the first instance. What measure of great injury or inconvenience to the people has ever passed the House and failed because of the conservatism of the Council during our territorial existence? What evils have our Territorial Council prevented; what rights protected; what benefits bestowed upon the people? I call upon the champions of co-ordinate branches to cite them, and failing to do so they must admit that thus far our Territorial Council has been an ulcer upon our body politic that could well have been dispensed with.

Historical observation has taught us that when great emergencies arise and co-ordinate branches of the government disagree, the one branch is swept from power, and as was said by Mr. Snyder of Illinois, in speaking of our Constitutional Congress: "The old, wornout habilaments of mediæval monarchy were cast aside or forgotten, and the grandest and most illustrious of all legislative bodies ever known to a people accomplished its work with unparalleled ability, scouting not only the trammels of an executive vote, but also the dilatory stumbling block of a co-ordinate body." We are not here to form a constitution for the past, but for the future. The history of the past is spread out before us for our instruction, nor should we follow blindly the precedents set by other states in deciding what is best for our success. Look around you and see what has been accomplished by bodies acting without co-ordinate branches in the past. The Athenian democracy to whose wisdom and sagacity we to this day pay the highest tribute of respect; the Phenician republic which swept away more than 2,000 years failures of other forms of government; that grand body of men who presided with so much marked ability over the destinies of Genoa; the Swiss confederation and the Kingdom of Norway and Sweden of the present day; and in our own country, for more than six long and bloody years, a single body carried on with consummate wisdom to a successful termination our own revolution, which established for all time the liberties of a people and the justice of our cause; that promulgated that immortal document, our Declaration of Independence, which has stood, and ever will stand, as a beacon light promulgating the doctrines of

our Republic to the oppressed of every land. It was a single body that framed that Constitution we have just adopted, and which after more than a century of time has required fewer amendments than we have been days in session, and whose work was not even submitted to popular vote for its adoption, and the justice of whose provisions has attracted to our shores the wooden-shoed peasant of staid Germany and sunny France, England's sturdy toilers, the hardy mountaineer and miner of Norway, the brawny and genial son of Erin's isle and Scotland's noble sons, until to-day not a sail whitens either ocean but bears pilgrims coming to worship at the shrine of that document promulgated by a single house.

The constitutions of every state in this Union have been formed without a co-ordinate house. The great City of New York with its two million souls, and the City of Chicago with its millions, and the ramification of whose industries and interests are more varied than that of almost any state in the Union, are governed by single councils elected from year to year. Their growth in wealth, population and importance have had no parallel in modern times. True, I will be confronted by Tweed's reign in New York. So, too, originated in the co-ordinate branch of our own government from the pernicious doctrine of state's rights, the greatest rebellion the world has ever known, and which caused the deep-toned war dogs to bay death from their black and horrid throats for more than four years, and from the effects of which more than half a million of America's noblest sons bit the dust, the evil influences of which will pass away only with the great generations of that day. That great corporation, the Northern Pacific railroad, whose steel threads span our land from lake to ocean and under whose management its patrons are conveyed with speed and safety across our broad prairies, scaling the rockies and bringing the traveler to view with wonder and admiration the snow-capped billows of the Pacific; that has so materially aided in making that country that twenty-five years ago was supposed to be a barren waste, to blossom like the rose—is controlled by and governed by a single board of directors.

With these illustrations before us of what has been accomplished by single bodies, why may we not say we will leave the old rut of precedent, set in the formation of our states, and guided by the splendid examples before us provide for a single Legislative body. Congress has provided that this Constitutional Convention consist



of a single house. Surely the permanency and importance of our work is greater than can be the work of any Legislative Assembly. I am here met with the objection that before it becomes operative it must be ratified by the people. Yes, as a whole it must, but without power in the people to rectify or amend, and I have sometimes thought it would be better if the work of the Legislature as a whole, before its laws become operative, were ratified by the people. Unjust discrimination, jobs, schemes, and corrupt practices would disappear from our Legislative halls. The governing power ought to have no right to inflict penalties until the governed have had ample opportunity to know what laws they are expected to obey. Some will say I would like to see this resolution in force, but am afraid of experiments.

First, It is not an experiment. It has been demonstrated to be a success in every instance in which it has been tried. Second, had Newton when the apple fell, or Galileo when with measured beat the pendulum marked the present, past, or Franklin when he gathered the lightning from the clouds, stopped before following their observations to their legitimate conclusions—had they not by experiment and demonstration shown the wisdom of their observations, the world might still be groping in ignorance of the great discoveries they made. Had Columbus, when he sailed upon his voyage of discovery followed in the path mariners had followed for centuries before him, our own fair America might to-day be uninhabited save by the untutored savage, who sees God in the clouds, and hears Him in the winds, and Columbia, our fair goddess, never have presided over the world's greatest republic. When our Constitution shall have been adopted and our Legislature shall have prescribed a code of laws for our government, we shall need very little legislation until changes in our condition shall require it. One of the evils of the times is the tendency to make too many laws—to legislate on too many subjects. We have no great subsidies to protect—no great industries save that of agriculture to foster. The greatest problem we will have to solve will be economic problems, and which can as readily and safely be solved by a single House. Let us, then, study well the problem before us, and see how well it suits our circumstances and conditions. It has been urged that, should this resolution be adopted, we would stand alone in the galaxy of stars with such a provision. The firmament of heaven is thickly studded with brilliant stars, but the man lost on the open prairie or in the tangled wood; the weary

mariner when lost upon the trackless ocean intuitively looks to the north star alone, and from it takes his bearings to guide him to a place of rest or a harbor of safety. Let North Dakota set an example by the adoption of this resolution and he who shall at the end of a quarter of a century turn his eyes to the northern boundary of our Union will see not only a united, happy and prosperous people whose flocks and herds graze on a thousand hills, and whose millions of acres of golden grain wave in the breezes of heaven, but he will also see on the pages of this day's history a reform that will stand out in bold relief as if the Angel Gabriel had dipped his fingers in the sunbeams and painted it in letters of living light across the vaulted arch of heaven.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there are no others who wish to speak I move that the committee rise.

Mr. TURNER. I would like to second the adoption of the resolution if it has not been seconded. In seconding this resolution that North Dakota have one legislative house instead of two, I do so because I think it is a matter of very great importance to this country that we should establish a legislature with one house instead of following the usual routine which has been followed in all other states of having two houses. As has already been stated by the speaker who has addressed you on this resolution, the objection is raised against one house that the one house plan has not been tried and found to be a success. This objection I claim is not well grounded. We have the experience of the British House of Commons for nearly two hundred years—the House of Commons, that with all its varied interests, extends not only over the united lands of England, Ireland and Scotland, but over more than fifty-one dependencies which are connected with the British crown. All the legislation for about two hundred years which has been enacted for that great empire has been passed by the House of Commons, and has been the act of one legislature and one legislature alone. The House of Commons was called into existence in 1264 by the noted Simon B. Montfort, to aid the barons in the rebellion against Henry III. Since that date the march of progress has been marked with respect to the powers of that one house, always encroaching on, and doing away with, the powers of the upper house. No sovereign in England for nearly two hundred years has ever vetoed an act of that House. All acts that have been of a progressive character have emanated from the House of Commons. We have the

Catholic Emancipation act, the Reform Bill of 1832, the Dis-establishment of the Irish church which the House of Lords tried to prevent, but which the Commons assured them that if they did prevent it it would be the death of the House of Lords. We say that the wisdom manifested in the legislation of one house is sufficiently manifested in one of the greatest nations that wields the scepter in Europe. If we come to the colonies of Great Britain in North America, we find that while the Dominion of Canada has two houses, the upper house is rather an incubus than a help in the great work of legislation, and the most of the advanced thinkers in Canada, and the most acute politicians, all hold that it would be better for Canada to do away with it to-day if it had only one legislature—the House of Commons simply. If we take the various provinces we find that there is only one of these provinces that has to-day or ever has had, more than one house of representatives. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba each has only one house of representatives. Quebec is the only province that has two houses. It is confessed on all hands that the legislation in Quebec, in importance and value, is behind that of the other provinces which have but one house. I might refer you to the legislation which we have had here, in Dakota, and say that two houses of the Legislature in the past has not proved that two houses are especially conducive to wise legislation. It is a fact that on the statute books of Dakota there are acts which have been passed, which have received the sanction of both houses, and yet they are contradictory the one to the other, so that even the Attorney-General, who occupies the highest legal position in this Territory, has been unable to say just what the law means on these subjects. I say with respect to the legislation of Ontario, with which I am most familiar, that their acts have been very much more clear, very much more distinct, very much more easily understood than the acts of the two houses of the Territory of Dakota, and so correct has their legislation been that while the Dominion Houses of Parliament have sought to veto the action of the Legislature of Ontario, and have done so in some thirteen cases, there has not been one single act that has been vetoed by the Dominion Parliament but which, when carried to the highest court, has been sustained, and when carried to the Privy Council of England has been invariably sustained by the highest judicial authority in the whole Empire of Great Britain. These facts

should impress on our minds the great fact that the one-house plan is not wanting in success, and that it bears favorable comparison with any double houses of legislation that have existed anywhere. Bearing these facts in mind, would it not be well and wise for us to pass out of the old-traveled ruts and try among the states of this Union to establish a single legislature to prove to other states that one house can do the work of this people as well and more economically than two houses have hitherto done?

Mr. PARSONS of Morton. I would like to say, Mr. CHAIRMAN and gentlemen of the Committee, that my understanding of the matter was that this matter should come up to-morrow, and therefore I made no preparation whatever on the subject; but there is one matter which seems not to have been touched upon here, and which seems proper to be considered at this time. The remarks made to us a few days ago by one of the ablest jurists of the day contained the statement to the effect that if Thomas Jefferson was here to-day as one of the delegates to frame a Constitution for North Dakota he would not be as well qualified to act and determine on the questions of to-day as any delegate on the floor. There are questions for us to consider to-day which have not come before the people, and which it has been impossible to bring before the people in their true light. I would guarantee that the great mass of the people who compose the inhabitants of North Dakota are far more intelligent than the inhabitants as a mass of any State in the Union. Go back if you please to any state in the most enlightened, the most populous, the most powerful, and out of the line of traffic, away from the business and commercial centres, and you will find that the people are not one-tenth as well posted as they are in Dakota. Now, then, Mr. CHAIRMAN, there is one fact that we have to consider here—it is a fact that precedent is very strong in one direction, but although the one house plan has been tried by two Territorial governments in these United States and finally discarded, and although all State governments to-day have two houses, yet we have the problem before us which must be solved in some way. If the one house system offers the solution to the problem, it seems to me that we should accept that. I am not prepared to state that the one house plan will solve the great problem that is before us. That problem is briefly this—in the days of yore we were accustomed to see men engage in business, and two or three would combine together in enterprises. But to-day we have to meet with the combined capital of thousands of

---

our citizens in one enterprise. A man will say—I don't feel like embarking all I have in this enterprise, but I will contribute a few hundred dollars and take so much stock. By that means we have developed this great Northwest, and the principal portion of the United States, and it has placed us in the foremost rank of the countries of the world. But with characteristic American style we have gone in a free handed manner—whole hog or none—and placed no restraints on this tendency. To-day the toiling masses of the people of this country who earn their living by the sweat of their brow—and that description takes in the farmer as well as the laborer—have come to the conclusion that there must be a line drawn—something done to stop the rapid centralization of capital, or this country will soon be in the condition of those across the water, where he who toils for his living is riveted in chains stronger than those forged by any blacksmith. It has been suggested that these matters are legislation—can all be determined by the Legislature, and that they can be dealt with by the same system as prevails in the other states of the Union. It is lamentably true that we have tested the matter here in the territories, and we are confronted with this humiliating spectacle, that after being granted an organic act and as territories conducting our business here, our legislators have conducted themselves in such a way that it is brought to the ears of the national government, and they have been obliged to pass laws restraining them. However humiliating it may be to the citizens of Dakota or the other territories, it is nevertheless true, and what guarantee have we in the future that simply because we have met here in Constitutional Convention and adopted a Constitution—have taken the reins in our own hands, that the course in the future will be different from that of the past? Now, Mr. CHAIRMAN, the one point comes before us—where two houses have the power of determining in regard to our legislation, the argument urged for the upper house has been that it acts as a wholesome check on legislation. That seems to have been the argument in our national government, and accepted as such in state governments without, perhaps, fully considering the matter. If it has been fully considered, we must admit that we have met with great evils here in our own territory. Men have arisen on this floor, and I will guarantee there are many more who will rise to testify to the wrecks of property and just claims that have followed in the tracks of legislation in this territory. The question becomes one

like this—shall we have that system of legislation which will permit one-eighth or one-sixth of the legislators to obstruct and prevent legislation? It is a notable fact that all the capital united in the corporations or trust companies pay no attention whatever to the lower house of our national government, or to the lower houses of our state governments, except when they need some positive legislation. As a rule all corporate influence simply asks the absence of legislation. They wish to restrain legislation, and the influence here, if it is exercised, will be felt in the restraining of members of this Convention to incorporate more in that constitution than they wish to see there. In the past, as I have said, the rule has been for the corporations to direct their influence towards the upper house. It is much easier to control a small majority in that house than to control a majority in the lower house, and having a majority there they can check any legislation that they regard as being injurious to them. Now Mr. CHAIRMAN, it seems to me that as a safeguard to the people it would be harder for any influence to control a majority where the legislature met in a general assembly of one house, and it seems almost impossible that a corporation should be able to control a majority there, where they are elected directly from the people, and where it would be necessary to have fifty or over in the State of North Dakota. What object can be attained, what safeguard can we have, what benefit can be derived, from two houses so long as they are both apportioned on the number of voters and they come from each district? I have not considered this matter fully, and I hope that a final vote will not be taken on it to-day. It seems to me that some measure—some plan must be formulated for reform in these things, if we wish to see prosperity and peace and happiness fill the homes of our people. It is perhaps one of the most important subjects that will come before us, and while we have precedent of every other state in the Union before us of two houses, we must consider the influences that work here differ in a great degree from those there. We are largely dependent on corporations. Corporations in North Dakota will always have a stronger influence than they have elsewhere. With all due justice to them—we wish to encourage them—we wish to help them—but we must beware of the day when they will shackle us and control our people. In the interest of this measure I would ask that it be further discussed at some future day. I would like to hear from other members—have a full talk, for it is evident at

present that if we have two houses of legislation based on the apportionment as heretofore existing, the same evils will exist in the future that have existed in the past, and it has not been argued here that we should have two houses of the Legislature with a Senator from every county. I should like to have this matter discussed and if the parties who defend the one house theory can show that it will be a panacea for the ills under which we now labor, let us have it. If not, then let us have some change that will bring about a different state of things from that which we have had in the past.

Mr. CARLAND. I move that the committee do now rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. McHUGH. I move to adjourn.

The motion prevailed, and the Convention adjourned.

---

## TWENTIETH DAY.

BISMARCK, *Tuesday, July 23, 1889.*

The Convention met pursuant to adjournment, the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. KLINE.

File No. 63—report of the Committee on County and Township Organization—was considered.

Mr. STEVENS. If I recollect rightly the question of a single or duplicate house was made a special order for yesterday, and being continued to to-day I think it would retain its order.

Mr. MOER. I move that the consideration of the one house bill be taken up.

The motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. MILLER. In regard to the consideration of the report of the Committee on County and Township Organization, I move that it be postponed till Thursday. There are several gentlemen absent who are interested in it, and I should prefer to have them here. All of them do not agree with me on the points to be dis-