



# Mountain Rule Revisited

*The Mountain Rule was initially adopted to assure a rough political balance between the two geographic and economic regions of the state. It persisted for over 150 years while evolving into a device for regulating Republican candidate selection. The Rule's longevity was facilitated by such factors as a single party system, rotation in office principles, demography, and a deferential electorate.*

By SAMUEL B. HAND

**M**ore than thirty years have passed since the late Professor L. Jay Gould and I first stumbled over the Mountain Rule. Researching elections to the Vermont Supreme Court, we first noticed geographic patterns. I cannot recall exactly how we reached our conclusions, but it became clear that whatever the size of the court, neither side of the crest of the Green Mountains claimed more than a one-judge majority. Which side held that slim majority varied, but courts invariably geographically divided either three to two or two to one. It did not require any significant further effort to determine that geographic patterns characterized other offices as well.

We could not attribute this regular pattern to random selection. Fortunately we stumbled upon these patterns before we read anything

.....  
SAMUEL B. HAND is professor emeritus of history at the University of Vermont. Among his many publications in Vermont history are his article with Lyman Jay Gould on the Mountain Rule (1970) and his recent book, *The Star That Set: The Vermont Republican Party, 1854–1974* (2002). In 2003 the Center for Research on Vermont of the University of Vermont awarded Hand a life-time achievement award for his contributions to Vermont historical studies.

*Vermont History* 71 (Summer/Fall 2003): 139–151.

© 2003 by the Vermont Historical Society. ISSN: 0042-4161; on-line ISSN: 1544-3043

about the Mountain Rule because the definitions in the literature had often become obsolete. By 1970, the Mountain Rule had become an artifact frequently reshaped during its existence to adapt to evolving political realities. The crestline of the Green Mountains that runs the length of Vermont and bisects it into eastern and western sections that the Rule addresses satisfies a purely physical definition of the boundary, but political expediency created a geography ultimately fixed by counties that crossed the crestline. Suitably impressed with our insight and erudition, we thereupon performed the academic rite of presenting a paper on the Rule and subsequently publishing it.<sup>1</sup> At the time we believed we knew everything worth knowing about the Mountain Rule. I have continued to learn more about it ever since.

The Mountain Rule was initially adopted to assure a rough political balance between the two geographic and economic regions of the state. It persisted for over 150 years while evolving into a device for regulating Republican candidate selection. The Rule's longevity was facilitated by such factors as a single party system, rotation in office principles, demography, and a deferential electorate.

A practice worthy of designation as a Mountain Rule precedes by a few months the foundation of Vermont itself in 1777. Men from the western side of the Green Mountains dominated the 1777 Committee of Safety, Vermont's ruling body prior to the first elections held under the Vermont constitution in early 1778. The east, though more heavily populated than the west, could claim only three of the twelve committeemen and one of those three, an alleged Tory, was not allowed to serve.

The first general election returned a governor elected from the west and a lieutenant governor from the east, and that pattern, a governor from the west and lieutenant governor from the east, persisted annually until 1826, with all seven of the different men elected governor from the west and all nine of the different men elected lieutenant governor from the east. One of the latter, Elisha Payne, an East Union adherent, resided in Lebanon, New Hampshire, in 1781, during Vermont's abortive imperial phase.<sup>2</sup>

The legislature implemented a policy of rotating sessions among towns located on alternate sides of the Green Mountains until after November 1805, when it named Montpelier as the permanent seat of the state legislature.<sup>3</sup>

The twelve-member Governor's Council exercised both legislative and executive powers, and until the 1790s as the House of Representatives matured, it was the center of Vermont government. Elected at large, the seats on the Governor's Council were usually evenly divided between east and west, although in unbalanced years the west most often enjoyed a seven to five advantage. In the years immediately prior

to 1836, when a state senate succeeded the Council, the east enjoyed that advantage.

The Council of Censors, a thirteen-man body upon which the east also sometimes enjoyed a majority, had as its principal responsibility proposing amendments to the constitution for consideration for ratification at a state convention. Elected at large every seven years, it met from 1785 until 1869 when the Council proposed and a convention ratified an amendment for its abolition. Over the course of its existence the east most often claimed a majority, although eight of the thirteen councils had a narrow geographic split, seven to six. From 1841 through to the final council a seven to six majority alternated east-west.

Upon admission to the Union in 1791 the legislature had elected one U.S. Senator from the east and the other from the west. An informal understanding, the rule operated through the force of tradition and, except for two instances involving special circumstances (1853–1855), the practice of an eastern and a western Senate seat remained inviolate until after World War II.<sup>4</sup>

The impetus for seeking geographic balance grew out of the founders' appreciation of the formidable military, political, diplomatic, and economic differences that constituted as serious a threat to divide the state politically as did the Green Mountains physically. Geography lay at the heart of the problem. Not only did few roads connect the east with the west, but also their economies were focused in different directions. The west, in the Hudson River and more significantly the Lake Champlain watersheds, looked to Albany and New York and for the bulky produce of pioneer agriculture to Montreal and Quebec on the St. Lawrence River for its principal markets. The east, with the south-flowing Connecticut River as its principal commercial artery, depended on southern New England and the New Hampshire towns on the east bank of the river and overland routes to Boston. Sectional rivalries manifesting themselves in such maneuverings as the east and west unions and the Haldimand negotiations dictated military and diplomatic strategies. With Lake Champlain serving as a military as well as a commercial highway, dealing directly with British invasions and threats of invasions colored western judgments more deeply than they did the east. And though the potential for a British invasion remained until after the War of 1812, a Canadian focus persisted until 1823 when the Champlain Canal connected the Lake to the Hudson River and subsequently to the Erie Canal and reoriented the western section's trade routes.

By 1826 some conditions that originally gave rise to the Mountain Rule had changed. The east insisted the time had arrived for one of its own to serve as governor, and under the pressures of regional loyalties and new issues traditional political alliances dissolved. As alliances and

established understanding shifted, application of the Mountain Rule to the governor's office became a casualty. [See table of governors and lieutenant governors, 1826–1974, below] The existing political organizations splintered into National Republicans, Democratic Republicans, Jacksonian Democrats, Whigs, and Anti-Masons. Often no party could secure the popular majority to elect the governor and other constitutional officers and as mandated by the state constitution, the choice fell to the legislature. Although both the Anti-Masons and the Whigs enjoyed a period of primacy as the state's single largest party,<sup>5</sup> of the twenty-four elections from 1830 through 1853 in fourteen instances no gubernatorial candidate received a popular majority, throwing the election into a contentious legislature. In 1835 the legislature failed to decide upon a governor, and the job went by default to the lieutenant governor.<sup>6</sup> Annual elections, county boundary realignments, and the creation of a state senate compounded the political turmoil and no party, in Edward Brynn's telling metaphor, could fill the state's "political vacuum."<sup>7</sup>

In the 1853 statewide contests, no party, neither Whig, Democratic, nor Free Soil received a popular majority. Nor did any capture a legislative majority. It took the house thirty-one ballots to elect a speaker, and after twenty-six ballots a Free Soil-Democratic coalition chose a Democratic governor. After thirty-nine ballots it failed to agree on a U.S. Senator. The legislature anticipated that Whig Samuel Phelps, whom Whig Governor Erastus Fairbanks had appointed interim Senator upon the death of William Upham, would retain the seat until a subsequent Vermont legislature would vote a successor. But the U.S. Senate, by a 26 to 12 vote, ruled Phelps no longer entitled to the seat since the Vermont legislature had the opportunity to act. Until the following October when the legislature elected Lawrence Brainerd to complete Upham's unexpired term, Vermont occupied a single seat. A westerner like Phelps, Brainerd continued the break in the Mountain Rule until later that same session when the legislature elected Woodstock's Jacob Collamer to a full term, returning Vermont representation in the U.S. Senate to east and west seats. Until Chittenden County State's Attorney Patrick Leahy took office in January 1975 none but easterners held that seat, whether elected by the legislature or since 1920 by popular vote.<sup>8</sup>

The Brainerd and the Collamer elections marked the onset of the Republican Party and an unparalleled era of political hegemony. Republicans perfected such political mechanisms as the Mountain Rule, and through their ability to modify the Rule changed it from an instrument maintaining regional balance to a device that helped mute Republican Party controversy by limiting the pool of eligible candidates at any particular time.

Adherence to a rotation in office with succeeding candidates from al-

ternate sides of the mountains legitimized gubernatorial candidates. The Whig Party had earlier pointed in this direction when it instituted the policy of rotation in office. From 1841 the Whigs limited governors to two years in office, an annual election and reelection. Once the Republicans came into power in 1854 they continued this policy and cemented it to sectional rotation [See table of governors and lieutenant governors].<sup>9</sup> Political candidates abided by the Rule and offered themselves only during the appropriate years. This informal but rigidly adhered to term limit principal assured the distribution of the top state offices, and even the most ambitious candidates bided their time knowing their next best opportunity lay only four years off. Rutland maverick Percival Clement, who had bolted the Republican Party to run for governor as the Local Option candidate in 1902, waited until 1906, when a western year had come around again, to run as a Democrat. Presumably accepted practice, even for a lapsed Republican, required observance of the Mountain Rule to legitimize a candidacy.

In 1870 after the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for two-year terms, a state nominating convention fought out whether implementation of the Mountain Rule allowed two terms or a single term of two years. The latter won out and persisted until after the 1927 flood when in 1928 Governor John Weeks won election to a second two-year term. This inaugurated a new tradition permitting four years in office before rotating to the opposite side of the mountain. Perhaps most remarkable, earlier when the direct primary replaced the party caucus in 1916, the Rule had remained in force.

As noted in the table below, the lieutenant governor provided a mirror image of the governor's office.

The Rule had its critics. Proponents of scientific management were particularly vocal. In 1916, recurring charges "that the mountain rule in our state politics is obsolete and out of date and that it should be abolished" provoked former Governor Edward C. Smith to come to its defense. He believed that "to the mountain line, more than to any other factor or multitude of factors is due the glorious record of this state in the affairs of this nation." In his judgment "to abandon the rule would be to tear away at the foundation of our strength and to sow the seed of discord and internal conflict in our political life."<sup>10</sup>

U.S. congressional districts, having once eluded Mountain Rule dictates, developed their own variant of its principles and fixed the Rule's geography after the 1880 census numbers reduced Vermont to two districts. The state legislature established the two districts for 1882 as the western and eastern districts. The first congressional district, the western district, consisted of Addison, Bennington, Chittenden, Franklin, Grand Isle, Lamoille, and Rutland counties. Caledonia, Essex,

Orange, Orleans, Washington, Windham, and Windsor counties constituted the second, the eastern district. This confirmed the political geography of the Mountain Rule and stands as the only instance when Vermont formalized it into law. Until then, while legislators might strain to form congressional districts that roughly conformed to Mountain Rule protocol, they encountered formidable obstacles. Districts were primarily fashioned along county lines, and counties did not remain fixed during the early years while the population density moved north. Vermont did not organize its full complement of counties until the incorporation of Lamoille County in 1835. Between 1791 when Vermont entered the Union until 1835, the legislature added six counties, requiring the frequent readjustment of congressional districts to conform to existing county boundaries. Furthermore, the original counties hardly respected Mountain Rule geography. Chittenden County, as an example, once claimed towns that were later included in Orleans, Lamoille, and Washington counties, and to this day counties claim towns on both sides of the crest of the mountains. To compound matters further the Vermont delegations to the U.S. House of Representatives have ranged from a high of six to a low of one and have included every number in between.

Population disparities also differentiated the sections. Until approximately 1870, the east contained more people than the west, and that, along with variations in county populations, made it impossible to draw congressional districts with contiguous counties that conformed strictly to geographic dictates of the Mountain Rule. The legislature often found it necessary to trade towns among counties to meet population requirements. In the elections of 1814, 1816, and 1818, when Vermont was a single at-large district electing six representatives, it elected three congressmen from the east and three from the west.

The Vermont legislature has passed at least eighteen legislative acts redistricting the state.<sup>11</sup> The first, in January 1791, uncertain whether Congress would allot three or two congressmen, provided for both contingencies and anticipated transmontane districts. The state, actually limited to two seats, divided them geographically by eastern and western counties. The east-west pattern was continued when Vermont held four seats (1802–1810). When the state possessed three or five districts it always had two districts that included counties from both sides of the mountain.<sup>12</sup> In 1882, and for fifty years thereafter, with the sections roughly equal in population, districting corresponded to the Mountain Rule.<sup>13</sup> In 1932 when the state lost one representative, the state law that established Vermont's single at-large district provided that if Vermont ever regained a second congressman, the congressional districts should revert to their pre-1932 borders. Given the population shifts that have

occurred since then, in the unlikely event Vermont would ever regain a second seat such districting would be disallowed as violating constitutional dictates.<sup>14</sup>

The application of the Rule to a wide variety of political offices demonstrates its broad acceptance as a valuable contrivance, but perhaps nothing better illustrates a dedication to its spirit than the 1932 law dictating the restoration of pre-1932 congressional districts should Vermont ever regain a second representative. The law testifies as a commitment to the century and a half tradition, even though it had drawn increasing fire as politically obsolete and an impediment to efficient government.

The charges against the Rule possessed considerable merit. But we must preface further remarks with a brief narrative of the Rule's abandonment. Apportioning the state down to one congressional seat ended its historic application to that office, and rotation in office has never been a feature of federal offices in Vermont. Since it became a single seat district in 1932 only two incumbents have failed in attempts at reelection.

By 1934 the state's population distribution gave the west a two-seat edge in the state senate, and the aggregate totals remained sixteen to fourteen until 1965 when a federal court struck down the Vermont constitutional provision entitling every county to at least one senator. In the years preceding the 1965 reapportionment mandated by the court, the House breakdown was 132 eastern seats and 114 western seats,<sup>15</sup> but by then such geographic determinants had long begun to shed even their symbolic significance. The Rule in regard to the office of lieutenant governor fell in 1940 when Mortimer Proctor, after having served as speaker of the house and president *pro tempore* of the senate, overwhelmed his eastern opponent in the Republican primary for lieutenant governor by a two-to-one margin to win the lieutenant governor nomination. Teamed with fellow westerner William Wills, they broke precedent by becoming governor and lieutenant governor from the same side of the state. At least one close observer thought it "remarkable" that the election occurred "without the Mountain Rule question being seriously raised."<sup>16</sup> In 1944 Proctor succeeded to the governor's office. For the first time since 1860, when the Republicans had accorded Erastus Fairbanks his "entitlement" to a second year in office, successive governors came from the same side of the mountains. Abandoning the Rule in 1940 and 1944 drew little comment; it evoked even less comment in 1946 when easterner Ralph Flanders won election to the U.S. Senate to succeed westerner Warren Austin.

Advocates of a longer executive tenure than allowed under the Mountain Rule voiced its most vigorous criticism. Earlier generations of Vermonters had linked civic virtue to the ideal of an apolitical chief executive, someone who served when called, executed the responsibilities

of office, and then, after a brief tenure, stepped aside to pass the office on to others.<sup>17</sup> Proponents of greater government efficiency and scientific management subsequently advocated a stronger executive and longer terms. In the fall of 1927 the Burlington *Free Press*, a persistent advocate of the latter position, editorialized how twenty-two states had adopted four-year gubernatorial terms and were “thus spared the persistent biennial growing pains of embryo executives.” Prior efforts to extend term lengths had failed to generate public enthusiasm, but the *Free Press* thought the state “could do worse” than reelect the current governor.<sup>18</sup> The Great Flood of 1927, shortly following the editorial, washed the Rule as it was then applied from its moorings. In 1928 Governor John Weeks confirmed a persistent rumor when he announced he would seek reelection to complete the flood recovery program he had initiated. Weeks easily won reelection, but his radical departure from past precedent called for negotiations and a new understanding. Stanley Wilson, an easterner and former speaker of the house, abandoned his plans to seek the governor’s office and campaigned for lieutenant governor instead. Managing 51 percent of the vote in a three-man primary, he assumed the mantle of heir apparent.

Two two-year terms became central to this emerging instant “tradition.” The two-year gubernatorial limit first imposed by the Whigs in 1841 was rejected and four years became the norm. The new Rule also differed from its predecessor by imposing a succession ladder to determine eligibility [See table of governors and lieutenant governors]. Prior service in the legislature and as lieutenant governor, though not an unusual career pattern for governors, had hardly achieved the status of an informal mandate. In 1836 Silas Jenison became the first lieutenant governor to win election as governor. Since then, until 1930, only thirteen of Vermont’s thirty-eight governors have shared that distinction. In 1930 it became institutionalized. From Wilson through Mortimer Proctor, all five governors served as lieutenant governor and in the legislature, and only Charles Smith failed to serve as speaker of the house or president *pro tempore* of the senate. In 1946, when for the only time in state history an incumbent, Mortimer Proctor, lost renomination in the party primary, his defeat exposed frustration over this succession ladder that helped quench possible future efforts to reimpose the Rule.

The 1946 elections had served as a political homecoming for legions of World War II veterans, and they and their adherents used the occasion to fulminate against a succession ladder that restricted their entry into the corridors of power. A Republican gubernatorial aspirant, former Colonel Ernest W. Gibson Jr., a combat veteran who had seen military service since before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, focused the opposition. He had previously served as Windham County state’s attor-



ney and as interim U.S. Senator after the death of his father, but these did not constitute succession-ladder credentials. Gibson, choosing to ignore whatever claims he might have as an easterner, attacked the “outmoded” gubernatorial “succession rule” as an “unwholesome practice” that kept “able men at the height of their ability” from seeking high political office.<sup>19</sup> The message resonated among Vermont voters, and Gibson displaced Proctor as his party’s nominee. The concurrent U.S. Senate race pitted two easterners, Ralph Flanders and Sterry Waterman, in the Republican primary to fill Warren Austin’s seat, making the repudiation of the Mountain Rule in regard to that seat inevitable. The subsequent rise of two competitive parties in the 1960s and the 1970s rendered a system of sectional rotation to statewide office, especially one tied to a succession ladder, neither achievable nor practical. The Rule no longer served the purposes for which it was cultivated, and it withered.

Nonetheless, some remnants of the Rule persisted in state senate and house districts, particularly those situated along the ridge of the Green Mountains. But the frequency decreased as representatives began serving consecutive terms. Even where representatives did not serve consecutive terms, the records do not always clarify whether a geographic shift occurred because of Mountain Rule dictates, a variation of the rotation in office principle, or to some other cause. Peru, a town in northwestern Bennington County, provides an interesting illustration. From 1808 until 1831, except for 1828, only Peter Dudley represented Peru in the house. In 1811, ’13, ’15, and ’17, however, the town had no representation, perhaps because the unrepresented years occurred when Dudley stepped aside to allow election of someone from the other side of the mountain, though the fact that he and a predecessor also served consecutive terms casts doubt on that explanation. By the 1840s towns began following a more regular turnover in their representatives that corresponds closely to the Whig-Republican “serve and out” principle. The pattern, common in many towns and while frequently referred to as a little Mountain Rule, may often denote rotation in office without regard to geographic distribution.

Senate seats, though distributed among various county towns, generally went to people from the largest towns. After the implementation of the direct primary the largest city or towns dominated senate delegations to an even greater extent. Nonetheless, Mountain Rule principles still occasionally obtained. In 1958 Gertrude Mallary did not run for reelection to the Vermont Senate, “bowing to the so-called Mountain Rule in Orange County when a candidate from the west side of the county announced.”<sup>20</sup> By 1975, however, when Patrick Leahy succeeded George Aiken to the U.S. Senate, most Vermonters hardly remembered there had ever been any such thing as a Mountain Rule.<sup>21</sup>

## Governors/Lt. Governors, 1826–1974

<i>Governor</i>	<i>Mt. Side</i>	<i>Year Elected</i>	<i>Lt. Governor</i>	<i>Mt. Side</i>
<i>1 Year Term</i>				
Butler, Ezra	East	1826	Leland, Aaron	East
Butler, Ezra	East	1827	Olin, Henry	West
Crafts, Samuel	East	1828	Olin, Henry	West
Crafts, Samuel	East	1829	Olin, Henry	West
Crafts, Samuel	East	1830	Olin, Henry	West
Palmer, William	East	1831	Egerton, Lebbeus	East
Palmer, William	East	1832	Egerton, Lebbeus	East
Palmer, William	East	1833	Egerton, Lebbeus	East
Palmer, William	East	1834	Egerton, Lebbeus	East
		1835	Jenison, Silas*	West
Jenison, Silas	West	1836	Camp, Davis	East
Jenison, Silas	West	1837	Camp, Davis	East
Jenison, Silas	West	1838	Camp, Davis	East
Jenison, Silas	West	1839	Camp, Davis	East
Jenison, Silas	West	1840	Camp, Davis	East
Paine, Charles	East	1841	Ranney, Waitstill	East
Paine, Charles	East	1842	Ranney, Waitstill	East
Mattocks, John	East	1843	Eaton, Horace	East
Slade, William	West	1844	Eaton, Horace	East
Slade, William	West	1845	Eaton, Horace	East
Eaton, Horace	East	1846	Sargent, Leonard	West
Eaton, Horace	East	1847	Sargent, Leonard	West
Coolidge, Carlos	East	1848	Pierpoint, Robert	West
Coolidge, Carlos	East	1849	Pierpoint, Robert	West
Williams, Charles	West	1850	Converse, Julius	East
Williams, Charles	West	1851	Converse, Julius	East
Fairbanks, Erastus	East	1852	Kitteridge, William	West
Robinson, John	West	1853	Kidder, Jefferson	West
Royce, Stephen	West	1854	Fletcher, Ryland	East
Royce, Stephen	West	1855	Fletcher, Ryland	East
Fletcher, Ryland	East	1856	Slade, James W.	West
Fletcher, Ryland	East	1857	Slade, James W.	West
Hall, Hiland	West	1858	Burnam, Martin	East
Hall, Hiland	West	1859	Burnam, Martin	East
Fairbanks, Erastus	East	1860	Underwood, Levi	West
Holbrook, Frederick	East	1861	Underwood, Levi	West
Holbrook, Frederick	East	1862	Dillingham, Paul	East
Smith, J. Gregory	West	1863	Dillingham, Paul	East
Smith, J. Gregory	West	1864	Dillingham, Paul	East
Dillingham, Paul	East	1865	Gardner, Abraham B.	West
Dillingham, Paul	East	1866	Gardner, Abraham B.	West
Page, John B.	West	1867	Thomas, Stephen	East
Page, John B.	West	1868	Thomas, Stephen	East
Washburn, Peter T.**	East	1869	Hendee, George W.	West

*(continued)*

## Governors/Lt. Governors, 1826–1974

<i>Governor</i>	<i>Mt. Side</i>	<i>Year Elected</i>	<i>Lt. Governor</i>	<i>Mt. Side</i>
<i>Rule Modified</i>				
<i>2 Year Term</i>				
Stewart, John W.	West	1870	Dale, George	East
Converse, Julius	East	1872	Taft, Russell S.	West
Peck, Asabel	West	1874	Hinckley, Lyman	East
Fairbanks, Horace	East	1876	Proctor, Redfield	West
Proctor, Redfield	West	1878	Colton, Eban R.	East
Farnham, Roswell	East	1880	Barstow, John J.	West
Barstow, John J.	West	1882	Pingree, Samuel E.	East
Pingree, Samuel E.	East	1884	Ormsbee, Ebenezer	West
Ormsbee, Ebenezer	West	1886	Fuller, Levi K.	East
Dillingham, William	East	1888	Woodbury, Urban A.	West
Page, Carroll	West	1890	Fletcher, Henry A.	East
Fuller, Levi	East	1892	Stranahan, F. Stewart	West
Woodbury, Urban	West	1894	Mansur, Zephar	East
Grout, Josiah	East	1896	Fisk, Nelson W.	West
Smith, Edward	West	1898	Bates, Henry C.	East
Stickney, William	East	1900	Allen, Martin F.	West
McCullough, John	West	1902	Stanton, Zed S.	East
Bell, Charles	East	1904	Stearns, Charles H.	West
Proctor, Fletcher	West	1906	Prouty, George H.	East
Prouty, George H.	East	1908	Mead, John A.	West
Mead, John A.	West	1910	Slack, Leighton P.	East
Fletcher, Allen	East	1912	Howe, Frank E.	West
Gates, Charles	West	1914	Darling, Hale K.	East
Graham, Horace	East	1916	Hulburd, Roger	West
Clement, Percival	West	1918	Stone, Mason	East
Hartness, James	East	1920	Foote, Abram W.	West
Proctor, Redfield	West	1922	Billings, Franklin	East
Billings, Franklin	East	1924	Farmsworth, Walter	West
Weeks, John	West	1926	Jackson, Hollister	East
Weeks, John	West	1928	Wilson, Stanley	East
Wilson, Stanley	East	1930	Williams, Benjamin	West
Wilson, Stanley	East	1932	Smith, Charles M.	West
Smith, Charles M.	West	1934	Aiken, George D.	East
Aiken, George D.	East	1936	Wills, William H.	West
Aiken, George D.	East	1938	Wills, William H.	West
<i>Rule Broken</i>				
Wills, William H.	West	1940	Proctor, Mortimer	West
Wills, William H.	West	1942	Proctor, Mortimer	West
Proctor, Mortimer	West	1944	Emerson, Lee	East
Gibson, Ernest W.	East	1946	Emerson, Lee	East
Gibson, Ernest W.	East	1948	Arthur, Harold	West
Emerson, Lee	East	1950	Johnson, Joseph	East

*(continued)*

## Governors/Lt. Governors, 1826–1974

<i>Governor</i>	<i>Mt. Side</i>	<i>Year Elected</i>	<i>Lt. Governor</i>	<i>Mt. Side</i>
Emerson, Lee	East	1952	Johnson, Joseph	East
Johnson, Joseph	East	1954	Bailey, Consuelo	West
Johnson, Joseph	East	1956	Stafford, Robert	West
Stafford, Robert	West	1958	Babcock, Robert	West
Keyser, F. Ray, Jr.	East	1960	Foote, Ralph	West
Hoff, Philip	West	1962	Foote, Ralph	West
Hoff, Philip	West	1964	Daley, John A.	West
Hoff, Philip	West	1966	Daley, John A.	West
Davis, Deane	East	1968	Hayes, Thomas	West
Davis, Deane	East	1970	Burgess, John S.	East
Salmon, Thomas	East	1972	Burgess, John S.	East
Salmon, Thomas	East	1974	Burns, Brian D.	West

\* Served as Acting Governor

\*\* Died in office

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Lyman Jay Gould and Samuel B. Hand, "A View from the Mountain: Perspectives of Vermont's Political History," in *Growth and Development in Vermont*, Reginald L. Cook, ed., The Vermont Academy of Arts and Sciences, Occasional Paper 5 (1970) pp. 19–24. Reprinted in H. Nicholas Muller III and Samuel B. Hand, *In a State of Nature* (Montpelier, Vt.: Vermont Historical Society, 1982): 186–190.

<sup>2</sup> In 1778 sixteen New Hampshire towns were temporarily annexed to Vermont and in 1781 thirty-four towns. Also during that latter year fifteen New York towns were annexed.

<sup>3</sup> Since some annual sessions convened on as many as three separate occasions often in different towns on the same side of the mountain, it is important to note the inclusive dates of the annual sessions to best follow the pattern.

<sup>4</sup> In 1946 Ralph Flanders (Springfield) replaced Warren Austin (Burlington) in what up to then had been the western seat.

<sup>5</sup> See Kenneth A. Degree, "Anticipating Antimasonry: The Vermont Gubernatorial Election of 1826," forthcoming in *Vermont History*, 72 (Winter/Spring 2004).

<sup>6</sup> Silas Jenison assumed office as acting governor and was subsequently elected in his own right. He was the first governor who could claim birth in Vermont.

<sup>7</sup> Edward Brynne, "Vermont's Political Vacuum of 1844–1856 and the Emergence of the Republican Party," *Vermont History*, 38, no. 3 (Spring 1970): 113–123.

<sup>8</sup> The first primary election for a western senator was in 1916. The first primary for the eastern senate seat was in 1920.

<sup>9</sup> The deviation, the single term for Erastus Fairbanks, was to grant him his "entitlement" to a second term that he had been "denied" in 1853 after he had won a plurality as a Whig.

<sup>10</sup> E. C. Smith "State Expenditures," *The Vermonter*, 21, no. 8 (Autumn 1916): 203–204.

<sup>11</sup> For a convenient listing of legislative acts see Robert Hagerman ed., *Election Records, State of Vermont: Representatives to Congress 1804–1958 & U.S. Senators, 1914–1858* (Montpelier, Vt.: Secretary of State, 1979). See also John H. Long ed., *New Hampshire Vermont Atlas of Historical County Boundaries* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1933).

<sup>12</sup> For a convenient historic breakdown of congressional districts see *Vermont Legislative Directory and State Manual, 1971–1972* (Montpelier, Vt.: Secretary of State) pp. 288, 289.

<sup>13</sup> It should be noted that with two Representatives the congressional district defined the area from which eligible Senate candidates were drawn. Given name recognition and other related factors this gave Representatives an advantage to campaign for the Senate upon the death or retirement of the Senator from their side of the mountain and marked that office as an entry office to the

.....

U.S. Senate. Unlike governors and lieutenant governors, national officers did not practice rotation in office.

<sup>14</sup> In 1930 the western and eastern counties were roughly equal in population. Since then the western counties have grown more rapidly than their eastern counterparts, and their population exceeds that of the east by over 100,000.

<sup>15</sup> For a time there were 248 House seats. When the House was downsized to 246 one town was dropped from each side of the mountain.

<sup>16</sup> Milo C. Reynolds to Mortimer R. Proctor, September 12, 1940, as quoted in Mortimer R. Proctor, *Pleasant Memories from Public Life* (Rutland, Vt.: Privately Printed, 1964), pp. 102, 103.

<sup>17</sup> The Vermont house leadership maintained this concept until well past the second half of the twentieth century.

<sup>18</sup> Burlington *Free Press*, October 15, 1927. For a more detailed discussion of the politics that follow see Samuel B. Hand, *The Star That Set: The Vermont Republican Party, 1954–1974* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2002).

<sup>19</sup> Rutland *Herald*, March 4, 1946.

<sup>20</sup> Richard Mallary, “Cows and Politics: Recollections of Gertrude Mallary,” *Liber: A Newsletter for the Friends of Special Collections of the University of Vermont* (Summer 2001): 2.

<sup>21</sup> Senator Leahy did remember and suggested that since he was born in Montpelier in Washington County he was actually an easterner.