



Andrew J. Volstead and Family Papers.

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit

www.mnhs.org/copyright.

Hector Murrot
Gov. 12, 1922

Endorsed by Republican Convention
Congressman
ANDREW J. VOLSTEAD

The Prohibition Amendment was adopted by the people of the United States. It was up to Congressman Volstead as chairman of the Judiciary Committee to make rules for its enforcement. That was his business and its now up to all law abiding citizens to sustain Mr. Volstead for the work he did in making the prohibition law effective.

Just a question. If the Cummins-Esch bill is not favorable to the railroads why do they make such strenuous fight to prevent its amendment in any way whatsoever? Why did the senate committee fail to report the Capper bill, repealing Section 15-a of the transportation act—the rate-making clause? Senator Capper claims that it would have given the state railroad commissions more control over rates; that it would have terminated the excessive charges by removing the so-called guarantee in the Cummins-Esch act and so have made possible the return of good times and a genuine revival of business in the way in which they can come to stay, and that to our thinking is why the railroads are putting up a fight to save the Cummins-Esch law from amendment or repeal.
Ind. Press - Oct. 13, 1922

Oct. 12, 1922
VOLSTEAD IN CITY
Congressman Andrew J. Volstead was seen in Benson Wednesday, in consultation with some of his friends. He did not pay us his respects. As a result the whole News force feels very much aggrieved. He and his daughter passed right by our door but did not even look our way.
Monte News

LINDBERGH SUMS UP PRESENT CONDITIONS

Former Congressman in Political Talk Sunday Urges Co-operation as Key to Real Success.

"It is not within the powers of the farmer alone to correct the existing evils, nor is it within the powers of the wage-worker, nor of the business man," said C. A. Lindbergh in concluding his interesting talk at the Opera House, Sunday night. "Before any real progress can be made, the farmer, the wage-earner and the merchant must co-operate," he added. In his speech, he summed up the errors of the present political and economic conditions as he saw them. His remarks were free from invective against individuals, being confined entirely to the issues involved.

Mr. Lindbergh scored the Federal Reserve Bank as a tool of Wall Street, accusing it of borrowing money from the United States Treasury at one-half of one per cent, and using this money chiefly for the benefit of the large banks and the money interests. The division of this bank into twelve units, each supposedly representing a district, was merely a sham, he said, to hoodwink the public. The principle of the measure, he stated, was good, and could easily be amended to effect the purpose for which it was intended. In speaking of the Esch-Cummins Law he suggested that the measure itself would be all right if the railroad earnings were figured on the basis of the actual values of their holdings, instead of the inflated valuations upon which the government was declared by the speaker to be guaranteeing a profit.

The remedy to these and other alleged evils is a matter of arousing the mass of the people to a greater appreciation of their responsibility in directing the legislation of the country, Mr. Lindbergh believed. A greater spirit of co-operation must be built up within the community, he urged. He warned his hearers against reading only one side of the question. The so-called radical press is not a safe guide to follow, for the reason that the radical press has a tendency to discuss men rather than measures, he argued. C. E. Mills presided at the meeting at which about 350 people were present. Mr. Lindbergh, who was the nonpartisan league candidate for governor in 1918 and who has been connected this year with the state farmer-labor campaign, at one time represented the Sixth Minnesota district in Congress. His meeting here was advertised as being under farmer-labor league auspices.

Monte News
Oct. 13, 1922

THE MORRIS TRIBUNE

J. C. MORRISON, Editor and Publisher.

Advertising Rate—40 cents per column inch

Open Space Contract Rates: Regular Space Contract Rates:
500 inches.....25 cents 1 week.....40 cents
1,000 inches.....20 cents 4 weeks.....30 cents
1 year.....20 cents
Legal notices, 10 cents per line. Want Ads, 1 cent a word.
Lodge resolutions, \$1.00. Card of Thanks, 50 cents.
Legal notices at legal rates.

Northwestern Advertising Representative
MINNESOTA SELECT LIST

709 Exchange Bank,
St. Paul.

215 S. 6th St.
Minneapolis.

SUBSCRIPTIONS.—\$2.00 per year, \$1.00 for six months, \$.60 for three months. All subscriptions are payable strictly in advance, and the paper is stopped promptly at the expiration of the time paid for. Subscriptions expire on the first of the month, never in the middle of the month, and the month and year printed after the subscriber's name means that the subscription is paid to the first day of the month in the year given.

Entered as second class matter, at post office, Morris, Minn. under act of March 3, 1879.



CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN OPENS

The congressional campaign is on.

Either Volstead or Kvale will represent the Seventh district in the House of Representatives after the 4th of next March.

Congressman Andrew J. Volstead bases his claim to re-election on nearly twenty years of true, faithful and conscientious service in the interest of the district, the state and the nation.

Rev. O. J. Kvale bases his claim to election on his ability to criticize and condemn about everything that has been done by Mr. Volstead or the state or national administration during the same period.

Rev. Kvale gave his keynote speech at Benson last week, Monday.

The meeting was presided over by a prominent Democrat. Two Nonpartisan League candidates for the Legislature gave opening addresses. Rev. Kvale said he had been asked why he was successively a Republican, a Nonpartisan, a Democrat and a Farmer-Labor, and replied by saying he was "all of these and then some." If Rev. Kvale gets to congress, he will find he cannot be "all of these and then some" in congress.

He said he stands where Borah, LaFollette, Norris, Roosevelt and Bryan have stood. Borah opposed woman's suffrage, the prohibition amendment and the bonus. LaFollette voted for the 18th amendment, but against all laws to enforce it. Norris is an old scold. Roosevelt, were he alive, would be supporting Congressman Volstead, and Bryan openly endorsed Congressman Volstead two years ago and wrote a letter which was widely published thruout the district.

Rev. Kvale averred that the wet and dry issue should not be injected into this campaign; that it is not an issue but a smoke screen. At the same time he admitted that it is an issue in the congressional campaign thruout the country. Rev. Kvale's logic is faulty. If the wet and dry issue is an issue in the country at large (as it is) then it certainly is an issue in the district whence comes the author of the prohibition law.

In support of his contention that the wets would send no money into this district, Rev. Kvale read a letter from R. H. Gillett of New York, general counsel of the Association against the Prohibition Amendment, in which Mr. Gillett assured Rev. Kvale that he would not receive their support. It is interesting to speculate on what kind of an answer Rev. Kvale expected Mr. Gillett to write. If we recall correctly, the Good Book says something about the absurdity of expected Beelzebub to cast out devils.

Rev. Kvale was bitter against the Anti-Saloon League. The League, he said, knew his record as a fighter for the dry cause for 28 years, and yet spent \$48,000 in this district two years ago to accomplish his defeat. Rev. Kvale wanted to know where all that money came from and dragged in Newberry by asserting that \$5,000 came from him.

This charge of Rev. Kvale's was distinctly Kval-esque. "Mr. Safford gave it as \$48,000, I am told," he said. Evidently Rev. Kvale cannot refrain from toying

with the corrupt practices act. Two years ago, the Anti-Saloon League sent out a letter to some 30,000 voters of the district, and sent a few speakers into the district. Their total expenditure was probably not to exceed five per cent of the figure Rev. Kvale named.

The Anti-Saloon League made no effort to defeat Rev. Kvale but they did throw their strength to Congressman Volstead. The Anti-Saloon League does not want to send a boy to mill.

Congressman Volstead is chairman of the judiciary committee, which fact Rev. Kvale treated with masterly ridicule.

It's like the game of "straw-stack," said Rev. Kvale, that children play, always giving the same answer to any question. "What is your name?" "Strawstack." "Where do you live?" "Strawstack." "What do you eat?" "Strawstack." 'Twas real jolly, and yet the stubborn fact remains that chairmen of important committees do have the power and are supported in that power by the congressional majority. Rev. Kvale could not qualify for even the lowest place on the judiciary committee.

Rev. Kvale criticized the Volstead Act and claimed that it does not apply to U. S. shipping. Attorney-General Daugherty held about a month ago that it does apply.

After spending half his time on the wet and dry issue which is not an issue, Rev. Kvale launched into an attack on the Esch-Cummins law, asserting that the government guaranteed the railroads a six per cent income. This falsehood has been overworked. The railroads have not made six per cent, and yet no railroad has either received or claimed any guarantee since August 31, 1920.

Rev. Kvale claimed that rates were based on stock valuations which contain \$8,000,000,000 of water. In this he is wrong again. Rates are based on actual value, without any regard to the stocks and bonds outstanding.

Rev. Kvale asserted that rates were based on stock railroad stocks and bonds was \$10,800,000,000, and that rates should be based on this amount. If this reasoning were followed, the Interstate Commerce Commission could reduce rates by successive stages, until the stock market value dropped to five billion, then to one billion, then to nothing—except that the courts would of course rule that such action was confiscation. The rates established by the Esch-Cummins law have forced railroad stocks way below their pre-war value and way below their par value. People will not put their money into a business where they cannot get a return.

Rev. Kvale asserted that the Esch-Cummins law added \$1.00 a day to the expenses of every family. This would be about seven and a half billions annually or more than 50 per cent higher than the total gross income of the railroads.

Railroad rates are too high and a clog on business but Rev. Kvale said not one word of the fact that 60 cents out of every \$1.00 goes to pay the railroad wages that are higher than those paid for similar work in any other line.

Rev. Kvale objects to the new tariff which gives a larger protection to farmers than any tariff bill has ever done, and has lower rates or no tariff on what the farmer must buy. It is a tariff that the foreigner will pay. It is roundly condemned in Europe as well as by Rev. Kvale.

Rev. Kvale condemned the administration of the federal reserve banks in contracting credit two years ago. In this Rev. Kvale is partly right. The bubble was sure to burst, and the action of the federal reserve banks saved the country from a much worse smash that was coming. The reserve banks should have begun contracting credit right after the Armistice but Secretary McAdoo wanted to float the Victory loan and so used his influence to have the inflation continued.

Rev. Kvale condemned the money spent for militarism, but said not one word in praise of congress for insisting on the reduction of naval and military expenditures, nor one word in praise of the great saving effected by the Washington conference.

Rev. Kvale criticized, condemned, attacked, ridiculed and roasted, but he gave no hint of what he would do to solve present problems.

The 7th district decided two years ago that it would best be served by sending Congressman Volstead back—they will do so again.

Down in Nicollet county the county board has ordered all advertising sign boards removed from the road right of ways in the county. The board gave four reasons for its action, all of which seem to be logical: (1) Such signs in the roadway interfere with proper upkeep of roads; (2) they are erected in such positions that views on many crossings are obstructed; (3) some are placed on curves and distract the attention of drivers while turning corners; (4) they are unsightly and detract from the scenic beauties of the landscapes.—Hutchinson Leader.

ESOTA, OCTOBER 12, 1922

Olivia Times

bor is suffering, but Kvale easily takes first prize when he attacks the rich church members sitting in the front pews as a reward for stealing. Being a minister of the Gospel that revelation ought to pull some votes for him among the "reds" and other foes of religion who are now spending their Sundays listening to the Gospel of hate while picnicing and progressing almost faster than their comrades in Russia. According to his clear logic, prohibition is not an issue, yet he stands for the enforcement of the prohibition laws, and the retirement of the United States government, for bootlegging, a rather drastic punishment, but after reading all the Socialist literature we could get hold of for several years we find this to be their one great cure for all our national ills. Dispite the misleading statement that prohibition is not an issue. We all know that Mr. Kvale will get every "wet" vote in the Seventh district and dispite his dryness to elect him at this time would be the greatest victory won yet by demon rum, as it also would give aid and comfort to all those within our fair land who are working so hard for the retirement of the United States government.

For many years the American people have prayed, worked, and at last won in this mighty struggle, and in no other way can we so well show our thankfulness for our victory by re-electing Congressman Volstead, regardless of his alleged mistakes on any other question.

J. Engberg, Hector.

PROHIBITION QUESTION

In a recent number of the "Progressive?" propaganda sheet published in this county, we find the "key-note speeches" of Shipstead and Kvale.

Besides the usual dope of the out's against the in's these key-notes are also masterpieces of class-hatred and envy of big biz and they should be read by every voter in the district. Especially by those who try to do their own thinking.

As was expected, Shipstead is still sore because Uncle Sam did not permit his energies and resources to be used as the "tail" to the political and economic kite of the Prussian war lords, and the unspeakable Turk.

Of course the efforts of their opponents in the interest of our country's transportation problems was the greatest crime for which farmer-la-

Friday, Oct. 13, 1922

MONTEVIDEO NEWS

(Incorporated)

MONTEVIDEO - MINNESOTA

LUDWIG I. ROE - - - Editor

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

Entered at the Postoffice at Montevideo, Minnesota, as Second Class Mail Matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

One year cash in advance - \$2.00
To subscribers in the United States
One year cash in advance - \$2.50
To subscribers in Canada and foreign countries

Northwestern Advertising Representative: Minnesota Select List, 215 So. 6th St., Minneapolis; 709 Exchange Bank Bldg., St. Paul.

ANOTHER BUBBLE BUSTED

Here is a chance for some one to get his winter's supply of coal free. The Canby News state that Congressman Volstead in his speech at Canby last week offered to give \$100.00 to anyone who "could find one word in the present law (Esch-Cummins Act) guaranteeing the railroads a six per cent return on their valuation." We have been told the past two years by speakers appearing here on the average of once a month that the "iniquitous and infamous" Esch-Cummins law gave the railroads such a guar-

antee. If repetition proves a statement this favorite must be as true as the fact that two and two makes four.

It looks as if the Congressman will have to issue a lot of checks for \$100.00 each. We fear it will be the financial ruin of the man. Or can it be possible that the man knows what he is talking about? Perhaps he is trying this method of pinning his opponents down to facts, if that be possible. It is a highly discourteous thing to do. At any rate it is an interesting offer—that one of \$100.00—and The News has detailed its staff photographer to get a picture of the fortunate individuals who accept the defi and submit the proof—if it ever happens.

"HOPELESSLY DIVIDED"

The split widens in the ranks of that unnatural, and therefore short-lived, alliance that has called itself the farmer-labor ticket. One publication that has long been the fair-haired child of the nonpartisan league group, the Montevideo American, has come out severely censuring Rev. O. J. Kvale, candidate for Congress.

It charges him with a "dog in the manger" attitude at the time of filing; suggests that he has submitted to domination by Democrats and asks if he has "delivered himself body and soul to Democrats, the party that threw its support to the Republican machine." It points out that at his opening meeting Mr. Kvale "failed to even mention Shipstead or the state ticket." It goes on to say "We believe the election of Shipstead and Johnson—is far more important than the election of Mr. Kvale."

This league editor reveals further: "A horde of democrats are combing the entire district raking in money from the farmer-labor progressives to carry on Kvale's democratic campaign. They have already obtained, according to the best information, double the amount he can legally spend under the corrupt practises act, and they are still at it while the state ticket is being hampered and held up for lack of funds. Added to this they are using the farmer labor organization to put it over."

All of which is given by the league editor to prove his opening statement "That the reform forces in Minnesota, particularly those in the seventh congressional district, seem hopelessly divided is plain to every thinking person."

Naturally this attack made some of the other fellows mad. The Swift County News was called to the defense and in its Oct. 6 issue charged the attack to outside influences, declaring "the tirade smells very much as though the fine hand of Andrew Volstead was back of it." Those who know the Montevideo American and its policies will agree that the editor's tirades often "smell very much," but there the agreement ends. He has had to defend some punk policies and persons in the recent political upheaval, so naturally his tirades are smelly. To charge that Mr. Volstead had any connection with the exposure of friction in the Kvale ranks is laughable. The Benson editor admits to "grave suspicion that the article was not written in the Daily American office." Local observers have had the same suspicion about this article and about many others that have appeared in that publication. Suspicion usually leads, and it does in this instance, to other members of the extreme radical group.

Says the Swift County News: "It has all the earmarks of having come from some other source and that it will now be copied in all the papers of the district who oppose Kvale." Usually little importance is put locally on attacks from this source and The Montevideo News had given no space to the Kvale article until it caused

such a disturbance in the candidate's own headquarters. The anger which it aroused reveals that there is much friction in the Kvale camp, and that it touched a tender spot. At the suggestion of the Benson editor The Montevideo News has decided to call the attention of its readers to this ruction.

Indrehus Opens Drive; Attacks Record of Preus

Democratic Candidate for Governor, in "Front Porch" Address Near Foley, Charges Extravagance—Criticizes "U"

Foley, Sept. 12.—Edward Indrehus, democratic candidate for governor, opened his campaign late today with a "front porch" address from a platform near his farm home eight miles southeast of this city, before an audience gathered by automobile from the twin cities, Duluth, St. Cloud and other points, including many Benton and Mille Lacs county neighbors of the candidate.

Mr. Indrehus launched an attack on the administration of Governor J. A. O. Preus and scored the republican "machine," as he termed it, charging extravagance and subservience to "vested interests." He advocated a system of "state marketing agencies" for large centers, to cut down the spread between the farm and the consumer.

The candidate also criticized the University of Minnesota, promising to reorganize the board of regents if elected, declaring for "academic freedom," and for a fixed income instead of biennial appropriations for the institution.

Governor Preus was held to be "in blind sympathy with capital" because he put state troops in South St. Paul to preserve order in the packing house strike.

Silas W. Bryan, democratic candidate for lieutenant governor, spoke at the meeting. Mrs. Anna D. Oleson, nominee for United States senator, who

INDREHUS LAUNCHES DRIVE FOR GOVERNOR

Continued from Page 1.

opened her own campaign Saturday night, also appeared on the Indrehus "front porch." A delegation from Minneapolis and St. Paul made the trip by automobile after parading downtown streets with a band, driving by way of Elk River and Princeton.

Opposes State Police

Mr. Indrehus outlined his own position in the campaign as standing for the following:

- Retrenchment in state expenses.
- Repeal of the street railway rate regulation law.
- Opposition to a state police.
- Reform of state university administration.
- Establishment of "state marketing agencies" for farmers' products.
- Vetoes by governor of bills passed in legislature through "log rolling" methods.
- Establishment of co-operative banks.
- Lower tax rates on improvements and personal property.
- State owned cement plant.
- Enlargement of the state flour mill at Minneapolis.
- Tax on gasoline when it enters the state, and a lower minimum tax on autos.
- State income tax.
- Reasonable pay for school teachers and social studies in grade and high schools.
- Rural credit amendment.

Republican propaganda, Mr. Indrehus said, has broken down the old democratic structure to some extent, through appeals to democrats when "progressives" threatened to capture republican party organization. "But the disruption," he went on, "now has enabled the people to capture the democratic organization, and henceforth it will be used for the betterment of the social, political and economic condition of the people."

"Handpicked" G. O. P. Candidates

Voters two years ago, Mr. Indrehus said, were swept with propaganda saying that "good citizenship consisted exclusively of voting for a group of hand-picked republican candidates."

"Close observers," he said, "insist that the combined interests two years ago in Minnesota had the Newberry program in Michigan backed off the boards two to one."

"By a vote of the people," he continued, "after this process and injection of poison, hate and prejudice, the political control of this state was turned over to those influences that are so subserviently represented by Mr. Preus—the man who saved our Sunday schools, our homes, the man who has such a wonderful war record, who finally saved us from private ownership of railroads, of coal mines, from co-operative banks, and came very near saving us from the co-operative sales agency of the creameries of the state."

"After nearly two years of his administration, what is the condition?"

Refers to "Groaning Taxpayers"

"The last legislature, under his merciless whip, created more new jobs and is responsible for a budget so heavy that the taxpayers of this state now are groaning under a load so heavy, taxation upon taxation, that they can hardly stand the pressure. The people who were told that Mr. Preus saved the state two years ago now are wondering whom he saved it for.

"The cost of the government of Minnesota, according to government statistics, in 1921 reached the sum of \$17.80 per capita, as against \$7.54 in 1915."

Mr. Indrehus did not explain that this increase is entirely in local taxation, and that the state levy for revenue purposes was wiped out entirely for last year. He cited the increase in the state board of control from three to five members as a sample extravagance, "thus adding to the political machine of Mr. Preus a new unit subject to his dictation and political schemes." He charges further that a number of new "state jobs" have been created for faithful servants of the administration, some of them holding places in violation of the constitution while members of the legislature.

Reviews Fare Increase Orders

Mr. Indrehus said all the power of the state administration was wielded to force through the legislature the bill giving control of street railway rates to the state railroad and warehouse commission. He reviewed the orders allowing increased carfares in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth, admitting, however, that none of them is in effect, being held up by court orders, under the appeal authority granted by the law.

"Recent developments," he said, "brought out by the city attorney of Minneapolis and a valuation expert regarding the expenditures by the street railway company of a \$2,000,000 slush fund, including the paying of large sums to politicians and the political allies of our present governor, together with the refusal of the street railway officials to comply with court orders as to the detailed disbursements of over \$200,000 in connection with politics, have so disgusted the people of Minnesota, furnishing proof for the suspicion and lack of confidence, as to weaken the respect for constituted authority.

"Violation of Traditions."

"If time permitted, I could go down the line and prove to you further that this state is now in the hands of the worst political ring in its history. Our governor now is advocating the establishment of a state constabulary—a system of military police—to stop the present crime wave. In some states they already have such organizations, but statistics prove that crime prevails in spite of them, and to a greater extent than in our own state.

"People are taxed to death as it is, and with the addition of a few more hundred thousand, what would be the

result? The proposed system would centralize the entire police power of the state in the hands of the governor—it would be a violation of our traditions."

Criticizes Parole Board Acts

Scoring the governor for placing state troops in South St. Paul to preserve order in the packing house strike, Mr. Indrehus said "the governor should remember that the 'rights of humanity are superior to those of capital.'" He criticized recent acts of the state parole board.

"The University of Minnesota," Mr. Indrehus continued, "should be the pride of every Minnesotan. It is the one institution that reflects the best that the state should have to offer. It should teach nothing but unadulterated truth, and to that end I favor academic freedom at the university. The present method of compelling the board of regents and departmental officials to lobby before every legislature for appropriations is a disgrace, and I favor a law which will give a fixed and dependable income from year to year predicated upon the assessed valuation of the state. The majority of the board of regents are splendid men personally, but they look upon the world through different eyes than do most men of modern thought who are fully informed concerning present day conditions. I am of the opinion that much of the criticism you hear about the university is not due to an inefficient faculty, but to a reactionary board of regents, and if elected, I pledge myself to a reorganization of the university board of regents."

Mr. Indrehus closed his address with an appeal for universal peace, condemning school text books for "playing up the tinsel glory of war." "Cease the business of creating conditions that make war," he explained.

"Unless the conviction that war is hell burns itself into the consciousness of the people," he said, "then all our praise and song, eloquence and music and talk about patriotism is an empty husk—a meaningless noise.

"The question of peace must be discussed from the pulpits of the churches; it must be forced to the front in our legislatures; its advocates must occupy executive positions; it must be the burning question of the generation; the only way in which the dead can save the world is through the living."

J. R. Landy, publisher of the Olivia Times and a life-long Democrat, is an enthusiastic supporter of Congressman Volstead for re-election. Mr. Landy is anti-liquor and is numbered among those realizing that of the two aspirants for representative in congress Mr. Volstead is the one who can do the most in keeping J. Barleycorn buried.

*Boyd Bulletin
Oct. 20, 1922*

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1922.

What Will Mr. Bryan Say?

It is reported in an Associated Press dispatch from Lincoln, Neb., that William Jennings Bryan is soon to go on an extensive campaign tour in behalf of the national cause of the Democratic party, and that part of his efforts will be directed to Minnesota.

If this plan is carried out it will be interesting to learn what Mr. Bryan may have to say in this state about candidates and issues. For a long time now he has been visualized as one of the outstanding champions of prohibition and prohibition enforcement.

What, if anything, will the Nebraskan counsel as to the candidacy of Representative Andrew J. Volstead for re-election? Will he urge that the man whose name is attached to the national prohibition enforcement act be succeeded in office by the Democratic candidate in the Seventh district, even granting that Mr. Volstead's opponent is himself an avowed prohibitionist?

The anti-prohibition forces of the country have been particularly desirous that Representative Volstead be retired from Congress, not so much because they consider him a great obstacle in the way of the attainment of their program, as because they think a popular rebuke to him in his district would be interpreted as a rebuke to the whole prohibition cause as now established, and that his defeat would, therefore, have widespread moral effect.

The merits of Mr. Volstead's candidacy, pro and con, are not under discussion here, and neither are the terms of the enforcement act. The question is as to what Mr. Bryan will say regarding the political situation in the Seventh Minnesota congressional district, and how he will justify his utterances, whatever they may happen to be. He can scarcely discuss the Democratic cause from a national standpoint without taking due notice of Mr. Volstead's officially recorded wish to be returned to the next Congress and, if the Republicans retain a majority in the House of Representatives, to the chairmanship of the judiciary committee of that body.

It is expected as a matter of course that Mr. Bryan will plead strongly for the election of Anna Dickie Olesen to the United States senatorship. Here again an interesting question comes to the front: Will Mr. Bryan be more outspoken on his favorite theme of prohibition enforcement than the senatorial candidate herself?

VOLSTEAD SPEAKS

AT FRANKLIN

Fairfax Standard

CONGRESSMAN WILL DELIVER
MESSAGE TO VOTERS OF
THE SOUTHSIDE

Oct. 12, 1922

Congressman Andrew J. Volstead will speak in the village hall in Franklin this (Thursday) evening at eight o'clock, upon the issues which he deems important in this campaign.

Mr. Volstead is the most cussed and discussed congressman in this country at present, depending upon whether you are a wet or a dry, and as his opponent claims that prohibition is no longer an issue in this campaign, he being dryer than Mr. Volstead, it will be of interest to the voters to learn what other claim Mr. Volstead has to base his election upon. At any rate he is advertised to discuss the problems that confront congress and tell you why, or why not certain matters are passed or rejected. Incidentally he will likely defend prohibition as an issue in this campaign insofar as the Volstead Enforcement Act is concerned.

SMALL CROWD HEARS

CAPT. EVERETT SPEAKS

Capt. Frank B. Everett of San Francisco, Cal., spoke to a small crowd in the Fairfax village hall Monday afternoon at two o'clock in behalf of the re-election of Congressman Andrew J. Volstead. Chas. Lammers, chairman of the Second Commissioner District Republican Committee, introduced the speaker to the audience in a brief speech. The Captain is associate general counsel of the Anti-Saloon League in the Pacific Coast states, and is a fluent speaker, well versed in matters pertaining to the enforcement of the Volstead Act. He urged the return of Congressman Volstead because of his position as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which should Volstead be defeated, would, by reason of seniority, be held by a wet. As this committee can kill or approve legislation that might be introduced by the wets to modify the present Volstead Enforcement Act, the speaker contended that Mr. Volstead should be retained. This was his main argument, tempered by a discussion of the evils that would result should the Volstead Act be modified and beer and wine allowed to be sold.

GRACEVILLE ENTERPRISE

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
H. L. DAY

ONE YEAR . . . \$2.00

Entered at the Graceville Postoffice,
Graceville, Minn., as second class matter.

Foreign Advertising Representative
THE AMERICAN PRESS ASSOCIATION

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1922

In his speeches throughout the state Mr. Volstead, as he did here, enlarges considerably upon the great power which he exercises as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the quite autocratic manner in which he exercises this power in suppressing legislation with which he is not in sympathy. The conviction must necessarily arise that the possession of such power, if it be exercised in this way, might be a very dangerous thing if it be conceded that its possessor might sometimes be mistaken in his estimate of the legislation under consideration. If the head of any committee is arbitrarily going to suppress any proposed measure with which he is not in sympathy, why, in the name of reason, have any committee? The chairman, in his wisdom, should be all-sufficient. This assumption of autocratic power by any one man, in Congress or its committees, seems the height of absurdity.

EX-SENATOR LENDE FOR A. J. VOLSTEAD

Franklin Tribune
Former Senator from Lyon
County Raps Kvale's Cam-
paign Statements

Oct. 26, 1922
Hon. O. A. Lende of Canby, Yellow Medicine county, spoke at several points in the south part of our county this week making his principal address Tuesday evening in the school house in Dist. No. 10, Camp. Mr. Lende took up some of the campaign statements of Mr. Kvale who is an independent candidate for representative in Congress, backed by certain Democrat elements as well as by the Non-partisan League, and showed the fallacy of Mr. Kvale's claims. Mr. Lende, explained the Esch-Cummins railroad law and proved where Mr. Kvale is making misleading and false statements with reference to the act. He also showed where Representative Volstead has stood squarely for every measure in congress calculated to bring relief to the farmers who perhaps more than any other class of people have suffered under the after-war financial depression.

The futility of throwing away the services that congressman Volstead can render the district and the northwest was thoroughly explained by Mr. Lende who urged that an effort be made to retain Mr. Volstead in congress.

Mr. Lende is a man of great force and his arguments are logical and convincing. Being, as he is, a native of this district his plea strikes home more than that of speakers, who come in from outside of the district.

Park Region Echo
Oct. 18, 1922
William Jennings Bryan is making a speaking tour of Minnesota this week in the interests of the Democratic ticket, and will return next week for another series of meetings, but on neither trip will he come into the Seventh district, it is announced by Democratic state headquarters. Two years ago Bryan campaigned for Volstead, but since then he has seen his error and will not work against Kvale this year. There is no more enthusiastic worker for prohibition in America than Bryan. He was a strong prohibition fighter long before Volstead lined up with the "dries". If he thought the defeat of Volstead would hurt prohibition, as Volstead supporters claim, Bryan would devote all his time in Minnesota toward electing Volstead—everybody knows that. The danger to prohibition in Volstead's defeat is all bunk—and the fellows who peddle it know it is bunk.

The Prohibition Question

"In a recent number of the "progressive?" propaganda sheet published in this county, we find the "keynote speeches" of Shipstead and Kvale. Besides the usual "dope" of the "outs" against the "ins" these "keynotes" are also real masterpieces of class hatred and envy of "big biz" and they certainly "should be read by every voter in the district," especially by those who try to do some of their own thinking.

As could be expected Shipstead is still sore because Uncle Sam did not permit his "energies and resources" to be used as "the tail to the political and economic kite" of the Prussian war lords and the unspeakable Turk.

Of course the efforts of their opponents in the interest of our country's transportation problems was the "greater crime" for which "farmer-labor" is now suffering. But Kvale easily takes the first prize for attacking the "rich church members" who "sit in the front pews" as a reward for "stealing." Being a minister of the gospel, such exposure ought surely to pull some votes for him among the "reds" and other foes of religion who are spending their Sundays listening to the gospel of hate under the guise of "picnicers" thus "progressing almost as fast as their Russian "comrades."

According to his mud-clear logic "prohibition is not an issue," yet he "stands for the prohibition laws" and the "retirement of the United States Government" for "bootlegging," a rather drastic punishment, but after reading all the socialist propaganda literature we could get hold of for several years, we find this to be their one great "cure" for all our national ills and troubles.

In spite of the misleading statement that "prohibition is not an issue," still we all know that Kvale will get every wet vote in the seventh district and despite his "dryness" to elect him at this time would be the greatest victory yet won by the "wets." It also would give aid and comfort to all those within our fair land who are working so hard for the "retirement of the United States Government."

For many years the American people prayed, worked and at last won in this mighty struggle, and in no other way can we so well show our thankfulness for the victory as by electing Congressman Volstead. Every American citizen who believes in this great cause, is expecting it from us regardless of his alleged mistakes on any other question."

John Engberg.

*Walter Murray
Oct. 12, 1922*

Minneapolis Journal Aug 2
Volstead Strike View
Attacked by Kvale

Rev. O. J. Kvale of Benson, who is to be the Nonpartisan league candidate for congress in the seventh district for a third time, passed through Minneapolis today on his way back from a vacation spent in Wisconsin. Petitions to make him an independent candidate for congress are in circulation, and Mr. Kvale said he expects to make a definite announcement of his plans in about two weeks. While in Minneapolis today he took issue with the recent statements of Congressman A. J. Volstead about the railway labor situation.

The statement of Mr. Volstead that the railroad strike is a "strike against the government" was called the "veriest poppycock" by Mr. Kvale. "This strike," he declared, "is really a concerted move on the part of the railroads to crush union labor. Labor should be victorious at least in gaining a decent living wage."

Making the Kansas industrial court law a national tribunal, in his opinion, would be "a remedy worse than the disease."

Wendell Dubuque
Oct. 13, 1922

Congressman Volstead has been powerful in agricultural legislation in Congress as his record proves. He's a good man for a farming community to keep in Congress during these times. He has been and is at present identified with numerous pieces of legislation favorable to farmers and there can be no reason why farmers should turn him out for an inexperienced man whose only claim to distinction is, so far as we can learn, that he is a preacher and actively allied with the Nonpartisan League, a socialistic group who have yet to show that their principles (if they can be called such) are worthy of consideration by progressive, right-thinking people.

Part Region 2 also

Senator Knute Nelson has alluded in two speeches lately to the fact that Alexandria once had 13 saloons and will have 26 saloons if Volstead is defeated. This is supposing that Volstead is the congress of the United States, whereas he has only one vote in that body. A "dry" Congress is not going to vote in saloons if Volstead is left at home—and every thinking person knows it. Douglas county folks can do a lot more to keep 26 saloons or rather blindpiggers out of Alexandria by electing a good, strong sheriff with known "dry" principles like Emil Lundeen than they could by giving two votes apiece to Volstead. *Oct. 18, 1922*



HON. AND. J. VOLSTEAD

Who seeks election from the Seventh District and may arrange a date upon which he will address the people of Balaton. We are receiving considerable recognition from politicians this year. We ought to be wise.

Balaton Press
Tribune
Oct. 19, 1922

ANDREW J'S AID GETS HOT REPLY FROM A FARMER

Farmer Who Gets Safford's Circular
Letter Gets "Het" Up Under The
Collar and Breaks into Print.

HAS FUN AT ANDY'S EXPENSE

Seems to Doubt That Volstead is
Greatest Man in The World
Benson, Minn., Oct. 14, '22

Mr. George B. Safford,
322 Hennepin Ave.,
Minneapolis, Minn.

My Dear Sir:-

Your circular of the 10th at hand and contents noted with care. After trying to digest same I have become so het up under the collar, and although it is a laborious task for an humble farmer like me to write a letter I cannot resist the temptation and so will attempt to scribble a few lines to you in reply.

In the first place I think it is a shame that an organization, such as you represent, should lend its support and spend money in trying to mislead the voters of the 7th district by sending out such a collection of bunk as your circular contains. It is an insult to every voter in this district for you to even think that we are so simple, ignorant and narrowminded as to believe one single statement that you make. You could just as well tell us that unless this man's hide is saved the whole world will go to the dogs, and that on November 8th the sun will fail to rise.

Since when has the nation become dependent upon one man for law enforcement? History tells us that at different times this country has suffered the loss of some really great public men at the height of their usefulness. Nevertheless the affairs of state have gone on and our government has survived. And now you would have us believe that unless this one man is re-elected a reign of terror will spread over this country that will effect the whole world. If our government cannot enforce the laws, including the 18th amendment without the aid of Volstead there must be something wrong and mighty rotten in Washington.

And that gag about the Judiciary committee. Why it is getting so old that it smells. If it has come to pass so that in this land of liberty one man can absolutely control a committee then I say to h--- with committees. No doubt one man can do a lot to help pull somebody's chestnuts out of the fire as well as was shown by Andy J's work in successfully blocking the Daugherty investigation but of course you failed to mention such wonderful work, nor about some of Andrew's culinary accomplishments, such as preserving Newberries and helping slice railroad Melons.

Oh, yes, we all know that he has wonderful influence in securing appropriations and guarantees for a poor down-trodden corporation, while of course he knows that the small business men, farmers and working men are simply rolling in wealth and do not need help. So, over with the tariff bill and make them pay. Now you, Mr. Safford, and every honest man who cares to investigate, knows and will admit that prohibition is not an issue in the 7th district. Rev. Kvale has worked for prohibition and law enforcement all his life and has always been and is dryer than Volstead is or ever has been. And again I say that it is a shame for an organization that Kvale has worked for and helped to build up to use the money that he and we have subscribed (or pray who is footing the bills?), and so lend itself as a tool to try to defeat a man on who's record there is not a single blemish. And I am sure that every honest and fair-minded voter in this district will show their utter disgust for this sort of propoganda and dirty politics by going to the polls on Nov., 7th and voting for a man who has been selected by the people, who is of the people, and who will fight for the people. That man is O. J. Kvale. All honor to him.

Now in conclusion I have a few suggestions to make, and one is thta if Andy J. is the great man you claim he is by all means let us relieve him of his congressional duties and appoint him Attorney General and Chief Prohibition Agent of the United States. There have been over 300 dry enforcement officers killed in trying to enforce the 18th amendment. Now with the great Andy as chief no doubt every wiskey runner, bootlegger, moonshiner and high-jacker will start shivering in their boots with fear, and will quickly crawl into a hole and then pull the hole in after them, and so at one stroke rid the country once and for all of the great source of lawlessness. Not only that but he will save the government tremendous sums of money, also the lives of hundreds of brave men who are now being sacrificed in the performance of their duties. Andy, the hero! We will then take up a popular subscription of one cent per person and with these 110,000,000 pennies we will buy every empty beer and whiskey bottle that can be found, will salvage those that are sunk outside the three mile limit, and with them we will build a monument on the Pribilof Island in honor of the greatest, first and only man

that this nation could not get along without. And on the statue with rows of shining glasses inscribe these words, "Of all sad words, by mouth or pen, the saddest are these, it might have been."—W. G. S.

*Smith Co. News
Oct. 19, 1922*

Oct. 19, 1922

ST. PAUL DISPATCH.

FOUR MINNESOTANS
INDORSED BY WETS

Secretary Predicts Gain of 75
Anti-prohibitionists in
Next Congress.

By Edgar Markham.

Washington, Oct. 18.—A gain of seventy to seventy-five wets in the next Congress was predicted Tuesday by G. C. Hinckley, secretary of the association against the prohibition amendment, in announcing that the beer and wine forces are conducting active campaigns in thirty-five states.

The important feature of Mr. Hinckley's statement was a list of 202 candidates for Senate and House who were tabbed with the wet label. The wet movement, described as liberal, is

non-partisan. Whether a candidate is a Democrat or Republican makes no difference.

Four Minnesotans Listed.

Four Minnesotans are listed among wet candidates. Charles R. Davis of the Third district is the only Republican, Paul Doty of St. Paul is not one of the three Democrats. They are J. F. Lynn, First; J. R. Coan, Fifth, and P. J. Seberger, Sixth.

None of the North Dakota candidates is listed. However, John Stredonsky, Democrat, First district, South Dakota, is favored by the wets.

One Iowa Republican, Hull of Dav- enport, is on the wet list as are four Democrats as follows: Hage- man, Third district; Smith, Fifth dis- trict; Paul W. Richards, Ninth dis- trict, and J. M. Gillette, Eleventh dis- trict.

La Follette heads the Wisconsin wet list. Except the First, Third, Eighth and Tenth districts, the wets have candidates in the Congressional dis- tricts. Republicans are indorsed ex- cept in the Second, Fourth and Ninth districts.

Has 350,000 Members.

According to Mr. Hinckley, his or-

ganization has 350,000 active members and there is every intention of push- ing the fight for a wet Congress to the limit. The program calls for im- mediate repeal of the Volstead law so beer and wine can be made and sold, and the ultimate repeal of the pro- hibition amendment.

It was announced that the list of 202 names given out is only prelimi- nary. More names will be added. The Pennsylvania list was incomplete so no names were given from that state.

Prominent among the candidates fa- vored by the wets are Senator Reed of Missouri, Democrat, and Senator Lodge of Massachusetts, the Republi- can leader.

"In general," an announcement by the association says "the association has stolen a leaf from the tactics the anti-Saloon league in its campaign plans and confidentially looks for an even greater degree of success to fol- low, once the liberal candidate is as- sured of vigorous and unremitting support along organized lines from the liberal element in his own con- gressional district, backed up by sim- ilar support throughout the entire country."

In making public the list of candi- dates, Mr. Hinckley said: "It should

be understood that this is a pre- liminary list, subject to revision and expansion as the campaign develops.

"It should be further distinctly un- derstood that the association's in- dorsement of a candidate does not necessarily mean that he has directly advocated our platform; it does mean, however, that, for reasons satisfac- tory to us, we are willing to indorse him.

"In some districts, voters are con- fronted with the necessity of choos- ing between two liberal candidates, one of whom usually has been a mem- ber of the Sixty-seventh Congress. In such cases, where other considerations are equal, the association is inclined to support the present incumbent, feeling that his sincerity has been amply demonstrated by his open lib- eralism in the face of an overwhelm- ing dry majority in the present Con- gress, and feeling also that his cour- age should be rewarded.

**SAYS ONE LEADING DEMOCRAT
AND ANOTHER:**

"Were we a resident of Mr. Volstead's district, he would get our vote, regardless of what course the

*Willmar Rep. Gazette
Oct. 19, 1922*

democratic organization pursued," says Frank A. Day, democratic leader. Mr. Day is right. The defeat of Mr. Volstead at this time would be a blow to the cause of true reform in this country.—Olivia Times.

VOLSTEAD LAW NOT DRASTIC.

The Volstead law is not drastic. The eighteenth amendment to the constitution is drastic. Nevertheless that expresses the will of the people so long as it remains a part of the constitution.

The Volstead law sustains the constitution. Every congressman takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

Intelligently conceived opposition to the Volstead law that is not predicated upon a possible reamendment of the constitution is not honest.

You may assume that to reamend the constitution to make possible the enactment of a modified law is an impossible task. That is no doubt true. Yet is the only honorable manner in which to undertake the accomplishment of such a change.

A "dry" constitution and a "wet" law would constitute an inconceivable situation—a legislative defiance of the fundamental law of the land, a legal invitation to disruption and disregard for law.

Congressman Volstead and Senator Kellogg, astute students of governmental problems that they are, know this to be so, and therefore on the proposition that the Constitution of the United States must be sustained are immovable. For that they earn commendation.

There is no good reason why any citizen, wet or dry, can not support that proposition.

The Volstead law is necessary, absolutely necessary, therefore not drastic. The eighteenth amendment has brought a drastic change.

All over the country a defeat for Volstead would be hailed as a wet victory. It would displace a dry Congressman from the chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee, which has charge of prohibition legislation, and put in his place a wet congressman.—Minneapolis Journal.

It delights our soul to be able to agree with the esteemed Journal on one political proposition. The defeat of Volstead would be a world wide calamity. The Sentinel hopes every decent democrat in the Seventh district will vote for him—Frank Day in Fairmont Sentinel.

**HAS MOONSHINING GIVEN NEW
MEANING TO DIVERSIFIED
FARMING?**

Some Kandiyohi county farmers have recently received pamphlets from the Minnesota Sanity League, so-called. The Sanity League, so-called, is one of the fifty-seven varieties of wet organizations "out to defeat national prohibition," and operating under various appealing aliases. The pamphlet says:

"Under the Volstead law DIVERSIFIED FARMING has taken on a NEW MEANING—the manufacture of moonshine in connection with the ORDINARY AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS OF THE FARMER and in many cases it is proving his most profitable form of industry."

The suggestion that farmers approve of the Volstead law because it makes it possible for them to engage profitably in the moonshine business is "rotten," of course. It shows to what extent an organized effort will be pushed to discredit the law and the constitution.

The wet organizations are determined to "get" Congressman Volstead. They are also determined to defeat Senator Kellogg, if possible, and the purpose of the pamphlet quoted is to that end. The pamphlet quotes a news item from the St. Paul Dispatch of the date of June 8, 1922, as follows:

"Senator Frank B. Kellogg, Minnesota's junior senator, is heartily in favor of the Volstead law. In answer to a telegram sent him by Mrs. H. A. Tomlinson, executive secretary of the Republican Women's clubs here, Senator Kellogg wired as follows:

"Have not only voted for all prohibition legislation, but am heartily in favor of the enforcement of the prohibition law and am opposed to the light wines and beer proposal."

"His telegram further said,

that during his entire time in the senate he has voted consistently for all prohibition legislation, including war time prohibition and the constitutional amendment."

For that Senator Kellogg is condemned. With Congressman Volstead, Senator Kellogg is determined that the Constitution of the United States shall be sustained.

The fact that the wets are "after" Senator Kellogg does not indicate that his opponents are "wet." Dr. Shipstead may be "dry" and Mrs. Olesen surely is. But Senator Kellogg takes an unequivocal position in the matter of sustaining the prohibition amendment. He is a power in the senate and the wets would like to get rid of him.

SCHILLING "SAID A MOUTHFUL."

W. F. Schilling, the prominent Northfield dairyman, and authority on cooperative marketing, says the two most valuable members of Congress to the farmers of the country are Congressman Anderson of the First Minnesota district, chairman of the agricultural committee, and Congressman Volstead of the Seventh Minnesota district, chairman of the judiciary committee and author of the Capper-Volstead cooperative marketing law.

The farmers of these two districts will serve the farmers of the country, he says, by reelecting Congressman Anderson and Congressman Volstead.

VOLSTEAD STAGES ANTI-LEGION EPISODE IN APPLETON

Our Veteran and Able Congressman
True to Form, Appoints Old Line
Republican to Post Office Position
in Preference to Legionaire.

Volstead, who is bound for Salt Creek in the coming election, seems to delight in taking a "crack" at the ex-soldiers whenever the opportunity presents itself. He professes a great love and respect for the men who fought for their country but, upon their return to civil life they find that all Volstead thinks they are entitled to is the privilege to vote and they are certainly going to do that on November 7th. Volstead bases his friendship to the legion boys on the fact that he framed and helped pass the laws which incorporated the American Legion. As citizens they were entitled to this, apparently, but any further privileges Volstead thinks should be accorded to his staunch republican friends.

Some time ago a vacancy occurred in the Appleton post office and at a mass meeting of the ex-service men it was decided to endorse their comrade Henry J. Larson, assistant cashier of the Farmers and Merchants State Bank, for the position. Petitions were circulated by the Legion among the ex-service men, the Women's Auxiliary, and still another among the citizens of Appleton. Mr. Larson is a young man of exceptional ability and sterling character. He has held the position he now has for several years and at the time of the declaration of war he enlisted in the U. S. Army and served two years over seas. Upon his return he again took up his duties at the bank where he is yet today.

The petitions were sent to Washington together with letters of recommendation to our veteran and able congressman but he politely ignored as a servant of the people should do.

By this time there was competition in the field, the opponent to the Legionaire being Edward Lende, a staunch republican and a cousin to Olaf A. Lende of this city. Mr. Lende having spent the best years of his life in the services of the republican party and being a very close friend and supporter of Volstead's was certainly entitled to the post office appointment by way of Andy's best judgement and thinking capacity. Lende had at one time years back been elected to serve the special privileged as State Representative from Swift county.

In the meantime, the PEOPLE of Appleton were not satisfied with the treatment their petitions and letters were receiving at the hands of Volstead. He paid little or no attention to what the citizens desired and the matter dragged on for several months. Around this time Lende was appointed acting post master. Thus it was that the Legionaires received unofficial notice that their candidate would not be appointed though he had successfully passed the examination and deserved recognition under the Soldiers preference act. He finally condescended to send a letter to the many inquiries and he stated that never before in the many years of his public service had he been burdened and bothered by so many foolish requests as he had in the past two years by the ex-service men of his district. Above all, he was under no obligations to these men and if he had any favors to bestow, his friends would be the beneficiaries. Consequently, the people did everything in their power to bring pressure to bear on their congressman in the appointment of an ex-service man but to no avail. The appointment was made but it was kept secret and concealed in the city of Appleton for over a period of three months and during this time Lende denied that he had been appointed, or that any appointment had been made and signed his name as acting post master. Even after Larson had received a letter from the postal department in answer to his inquiry stating that Lende had been made the post master and this statement made public in the Appleton Press Lende had the affontry to deny it.

If Volstead feels justified in keeping the practice in vogue of passing meal tickets for feeding at the public crib to his life long and staunch republican friends, then, it behooves

the ex-service men and all others who believe in true Americanism and representative, constitutional government to act according to their true convictions and go forward, en masse on November 7th and cast their ballot for a man with a clean, intellectual mind and one who will give the American people as a whole the best there is in him.

Conby Press
Oct. 19, 1922

Unicornille Enterprise

VOLSTEAD SPEAKS HERE

Oct 20 1922

Congressman Volstead addressed a meeting here yesterday afternoon at the village hall to an audience which possibly would have been larger if the meeting had been in the evening. Mr. Volstead defended the tariff law in that it protected farm products, while commodities necessary to the farm, such as farm machinery, coal, lumber, etc. were on the free list. Inasmuch as practically all these farm necessities are produced in this country and not imported, it is hard to see just how the price would be affected thereby. As to the Federal Reserve bank, he stated that he was not in favor of it and voted against the law. He stated, however, that he had a part, in passing a number of measures to help the financial condition of the farmers which probably accounts, to some extent, for their very happy condition at present. He defended the Esch-Cummings law and said that instead of imposing a burden upon the people, he thought it would produce an opposite effect, a result, however, which is not perceptible as yet. On the Prohibition question he stated that as he was indispensable to the cause, thru his position as chairman of the judiciary committee where he wielded, as he stated, autocratic power in the shelving of consideration of bills submitted to the committee, it would be a severe blow to the dry cause if he was defeated.

All eyes are upon the 7th Congressional district of Minnesota. Andrew J. Volstead is a marked man. He has made himself obnoxious to the big liquor interests and they are going after him with all the power at their command. They can afford to spend a mint of money if they can only shake him loose from the position he holds in Congress. Some there are who say he has grown away from his people and is not in touch with them through his long residence in Washington, but the fact is your congressman is the same honest and forceful gentleman that he was when he first made his appearance in the capitol city nearly twenty years ago. Always working in the interest of his constituency he has had the rare influence among his fellow members to have his name attached to at least two important measures that are the law of the land namely, the Volstead Act enforcing the law with reference to the 18th Amendment to the constitution and the Capper-Volstead law that has to do with agriculture, a law that is an aid to the farmer. In a word this man occupies such a position in congress that the eyes of the whole country are upon this contest and watching the outcome of the election with the keenest interest. His return is based on both a moral and economic basis, moral because of his ability to keep in force his act in connection with the 18th Amendment, and economic that he may have the opportunity to complete the work he has so well begun in safe-guarding the farmer's interests of the northwest. Reforms come slowly in congress but they come if one goes after them in the manner Mr. Volstead has.

Ballaton
Press
Oct. 19, 1922

Will "Andy Gump" be our next Congressman? Nobody knows but Sid Smith has certainly succeeded in putting him before the public. We'll venture to say that "Andy" is better known in America than any real congressman, unless it be our own congressman, Hon. A. J. Volstead, who became famous because he cured the American men of headaches "on the morning after." Bob Briggs whose picture is shown above is just as famous in his way as is Sid Smith in the "Gumps". Briggs is the man who succeeds in making us laugh reminiscently over his cartoons entitled, "When a

LENROOT HITS RADICAL AGITATORS

CHARGES THEY ARE LOUD ON
PROMISES BUT ACCOMP-
LISH NOTHING

In his address before an audience of more than a thousand at the Armory in Alexandria Friday evening, Senator Irvine L. Lenroot of Wisconsin gave one of the strongest Republican addresses ever heard in Douglas county. He handled the radicals without gloves.

On the platform with the speaker were Senator Knute Nelson and Congressman A. P. Nelson of Grantsburg, Wis. The latter a former Douglas county boy, was presented as chairman of the meeting by Dr. C. L. Cole, chairman of the republican county committee. Mr. A. P. Nelson, in presenting Minnesota's grand old man to a home audience, said he was not only a state and national figure but was one of the world's great men. The whole audience arose and roundly applauded as the speakers entered the hall.

Senator Nelson spoke briefly but in spite of his approaching 80th birthday, is in excellent health and spirits. He made a telling plea for the return of Congressman Volstead whom he said was one of the most effective workers for beneficial farm legislation in Congress, and he did not believe the good people of the district wanted to see his place taken by a man who is supported by a combination of wets and radicals, even if his opponent is a minister of the gospel.

"Senator Kellogg is a great lawyer a great student and a great scholar," he said. "He is one of the most distinguished men in the senate. He is a tireless worker for the people of Minnesota. I was very much struck, just before congress adjourned with the service he did the people of the state. There was great difficulty over getting our coal supply and it looked very serious. During all that time Senator Kellogg was busy early and late and he did much to bring about relief.

Senator Nelson said in presenting Senator Lenroot, "he is a progressive, but he is a sane progressive. We have some men in the senate who call themselves progressives but are really radicals. These radicals never accomplish anything in the legislative halls or outside of them."

Senator Lenroot dwelt at length on republican achievements but it was when he met radical attacks on the record of congress that he struck fire.

"This congress has done more to help agriculture than all the others put together for the last twenty years" he said. He told how radical senators had brought in a bill to relieve depression in farm prices.

"It was a very simple plan," he remarked. "The government was to buy the products of the country at a high price, and sell them at a low price, and everybody would be happy. That's about the extent of the radical's economic program.

The radicals never want to help the farmers out, really. They just want to make political issues to talk about."

Mr. Lenroot then told how this bill, doomed to defeat and with no chance of serious consideration was about to be killed, when Senator Frank B. Kellogg of Minnesota undertook to prepare a workable measure for the relief of the farmers. He framed the substitute bill under which loans were made by the War Finance Corporation and it passed.

Senator Lenroot cited one act after another to the credit of Senator Kellogg, and told how it was the Minnesota senator's initiative that picked up the Capper-Volstead bill when it seemed to be blocked, and fought this measure to promote the co-operative movement.

Telling how the republicans already have cut \$1,000,000,000 from the country's war debt. Senator Lenroot said radicals are fond of doleful predictions that it will take 1,000 years to pay off the debt. "I admit that is possible" he said. "If the radicals get control, or the democratic party gets back in power. But under the republican economy it will be wiped out in less than 25 years."

Herman Review

V. W. BRENNER, Editor.

Entered in the Post Office at Herman, Minnesota as second class matter. Published every Thursday.

Subscription \$1.50 per year in Grant county, Chokio, Donnelly, Morris, Tintah and Wheaton. To all other points in the United States, \$2.00 per year.

In commenting on the Seventh District Congressional race, the Olivia times expresses itself thusly: "While importance should attach to the consideration of his service, yet it seems to us that the all-important thing in the re-election of Mr. Volstead would be the defeat of his radical opponent. The election of Mr. Kvale would give comfort and encouragement to two factions in this country whose policy is destructive, namely the wet element and the radical element." We don't believe the Times really means what it says. The Herman Review is for Andrew J. Volstead for Congress from the Seventh District, and doesn't care who knows it, but the defeat of Mr. Kvale, or any other opponent, is not the all-important thing with us. We favor Mr. Volstead's return to Congress because we believe he can, and will, better serve the District and State than could a new man at this time, regardless of what his intentions or inclinations might be. Volstead has been in Congress long enough to gain experience and prestige that puts him in a position to demand recognition which no new man could provide under the present organization and rules of the House. Any thinking man knows that things have been manipulated in Congress to the disadvantage of the agricultural districts, and to the advantage of the industrial districts. This was carried so far in the Senate that Senators from the agricultural states had to band themselves together in the so-called "Agricultural Bloc" in the last congress to get any recognition. The situation in the house is but little better, and if we want to be represented in Congress we have got to send men down to Washington who can demand and compel recognition for their districts.

The seniority rule plays such an important part in the organization of the House that a first-term Congressman can be sidetracked to where he has about as much voice in affairs as if he had stayed at home, and unless he belongs to some one of the industrial groups that is just about what he gets right now. They can't do this with Mr. Volstead, and that is one reason, if no other, why we favor his re-election. As to the "wet" and "radical" argument, we take it as all bosh, and a political smoke screen. Neither Mr. Kvale nor Mr. Volstead are making the liquor question an issue, nor can they. The Eighteenth Amendment is in effect, and neither the Seventh District of Minnesota, nor its Representative can repeal it. We might as well argue that Kvale was in favor of slavery and Volstead for abolition. There are, no doubt, people not yet content to let the liquor question rest, but none of them are really foolish enough to imagine that the election of either of our Congressional candidates will give them one single foaming schooner of good old four percent pale. A lot of people are being called "radicals" now days, but, as yet we have seen no attempt to define this much abused term. As near as we have been able to observe it means the fellow who thinks differently on political matters. He may also be a "Socialist" and a "Bolshevist", these two terms are losing out lately. We grant every man the right to differ with us on political opinion. Abraham Lincoln, while President, gave expression to these words: "This country and all that is within it belongs to the people who inhabit it, and when-

ever they shall tire of the existing form of government, they have the constitutional right to amend it, or the revolutionary right to overthrow it." Sounds pretty radical. But nobody thinks of Lincoln as a "Bolshevist". We are not supporting Kvale for Congress, but we do believe that the newspaper or individual that resorts to the sort of statements which we quote from the Olivia Times gives him more support than they realize. The way to make "radical" votes is to shout "radical" at the other fellow.

THE MRS. REPLY

Dear Mr. Safford I should have written before
But I am sure you've already received answers galore.
You must use a lot of cash
To mail all your thrash;
Soon you'll be asking our churches for more.

"The Eyes of the World are turning towards us,"
The Anti-Saloon League has again spoken thus.
Yes, the whole world shall see
That the seventh district sends Kvale
To take Volstead's place in the next Congress.

He has represented us now for twenty years
And on his record nothing appears
But to threaten friend and foe,
With a moonshine overflow,
Unless we make him Prince of Wine and Beers.

We care nothing for a Judiciary Chairman.
All we want is a Judicious Fair Man.
We're tired of Volstead soup,
And we don't give a whoop
For advice from an Anti-Saloon man.

He's called the "Father of Prohibition," they say,
"And the only dry leader in Congress today."
Let's give "Father" rest,
Help him feather his nest.
We'll haul him "DOWN" on election Tuesday.

If all of us mothers had this "Father" in court,
We could easily get rid of him for non-support.
But we know a better way.
Just watch for the day,
And afterwards read the report.

They're preaching that imperishable Volstead Act,
But that measure was not a one-man's pact.
'Twas a universal demand,
Voiced by the whole land
Volstead just worded the fact.

*Swift Co.
News Oct 26/22*

*Renville Star Farmer
Oct. 26, 1922*

The 7th congressional district is being combed, by speakers both for and against A. J. Volstead's return to congress. No one on either side will deny that Mr. Volstead holds a commanding position in congress. He has initiated a number of the measures favorable to the farmer and pushed them through and they have become the law of the land. He belongs to the agricultural bloc in the lower house that have already made their influence felt in legislation desired by the farmers of the northwest. The wet element are leaving no stone unturned to defeat the congressman from this district even going so far as to support a pronounced dry candidate Rev. O. J. Kvale. However able Mr. Kvale may be it would take him at least a term or two before his

influence would be felt in a body of 435 members. Mr. Volstead has the interest of the farmer at heart. He knows what they have to contend with and is always on the spot in their defense. It is only through powerful influence in committee and on the floor of the house that the strength of the east and south can be held in check. If you turn down your congressmen from the west the east and south will dominate. The safe thing to do is to hold fast to what we got. Just think it over and see if we are not right. Remember that in the congress we have government by party. If the Republicans are in the majority congress is organized with their issue dominant and if the Democrats organize their issues will be carried out. That being true an independent candidate though ever so well versed in legislative procedure and able would be absolutely null in such a body. Give this serious thought before you cast your ballot on November 7.

Congressman Clague and Ivan Bowen Address Large Crowd At City Hall Wednesday

Hon. Frank Clague, member of Congress from the Second Minnesota District, and Hon. Ivan Bowen, Railroad and Warehouse Commissioner, spoke at the Canby City hall Wednesday night to a good sized audience in the interest of the Republican ticket.

Mr. Clague has been a member of the legislature, speaker of the House, state senator, and judge of the district court and is now serving as Congressman from the Second district of this state. Those who heard his able and sensible address Wednesday night could not help being impressed with the strong case he made on behalf of the Republican administration. Referring to the socialistic, communistic doctrine that some are trying to inject into this country he illustrated his point by showing a letter received recently by a citizen of New Ulm from Russia, the home of the Soviet-Communist government. It took \$15,000 worth of Russian rubles to buy enough stamps to send that letter from Russia to America while it would take just five good American cents to carry a letter from the U. S. A. to Russia. Where would you rather buy your stamps—or for that matter, anything? In Red Russia where no man can own anything—a cow, a sack of grain or what not—without fear of its being taken away from him any moment, where the children belong to the state, or under a republican form of government such as the U. S. A., where every man's constitutional rights are guaranteed him, where he remains in secured possession of whatever his industry and labor have provided him with and where every man is king of his own domain.

In urging the re-election of Mr. Volstead for Congress, he reminded his hearers that a new man in Congress, particularly a man outside of the two major parties, would be practically as helpless as a babe in accomplishing anything for his constituents. That he himself (Clague) affiliated as he is with the Republican party, serving his first term in Congress, would not even have had a chance to be recognized had it not been for the influence of Congressman Volstead, who is chairman of one of the two most important committees in Congress. What chance then, would a new man, entirely out of the ranks and sympathy with either the Republican or Democratic parties, which of course numerically control Congress, have of ever "getting to first base?"—he would be swallowed up and submerged completely so far as his influence or ability to accomplish anything is concerned. Nobody but a blind man would refuse to see the point. Volstead, he said, is one of the ablest, most influential and valuable members of Congress—keep him there where he can help you.

*Canby News
Oct. 27, 1922*

A SACRED DUTY

As the campaign draws to a close it seems more and more clear that there is not a man in America today so bitterly hated and feared by the wets and reds as our simple and level-headed Congressman Volstead.

His opponent not only shows his independence by opposing the anti-saloon league and the whole American temperance movement, but is also the willing tool of the radical forces who became so "progressive" during the war that 478 common people in this county alone sold their American birthright to a traitor, by throwing away their votes to Debs as their president last election.

These two important facts should arouse every voter in the district who believe in the great cause of prohibition, and the American form of government, to do their sacred duty at the coming election by supporting our well known congressman even if he had committed all the "crimes" and then some, that his opponents are trying so hard to make us believe.

John Engberg, Hector.

*Clague Times
Oct. 26, 1922*

CHURCH ... NCE AT

Established 1871.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Three months, in advance .50
Six months, in advance 1.00
One year, in advance 2.00
One year, to Canadian subscribers, in advance 2.50
Publishes All Official Matter of City and County.

Entered at the Postoffice at Willmar, Minnesota, as Second Class Matter.

Published every Thursday at 537 Pacific Avenue, Willmar, Minnesota, by G. R. C. Baker, editor and manager, H. A. Hengstler, city editor, L. E. Baker, superintendent of printery.

CONGRESSMAN VOLSTEAD ISN'T ANY DRYER THAN ANY OTHER DRY.

It has been claimed that Congressman Volstead is not any dryer than his opponent.

That is true. In the situation the matter of "personal dryness" is of no importance.

Mr. Volstead is one dry congressman. Occupying a position of strategical importance he is charged with a grave responsibility.

Mr. Volstead has been charged with making the country arid. He did not do that. The people of the country did that.

It has been charged that he has joined the ranks of the destructionists; that he is an extremist; that he does not recognize personal rights.

That is not true. He is a constructive statesman with the vision to recognize and the courage to face a grave responsibility when it confronts him.

Two-thirds of the members of congress, Volstead one of them, voted to submit the proposed eighteenth amendment to the people for action by their state legislatures. The amendment was approved by the required number of states, thirty-six, and more, and it became a part of the Constitution of the United States.

It PROHIBITS the manufacture, sale, transportation and importation of intoxicating liquor.

You can not by congressional action control the sale of intoxicating liquor. The constitution prohibits that.

You can not license it. You can not supervise its manufacture and sale. The constitution prohibits that.

The organized wets are trying to bring about a congressional defiance of the constitution by a trick—by "slipping one over on the Constitution of the United States."

They are asking for the uncontrolled, unlicensed, unrestricted, unregulated manufacture, transportation and sale of wine and beer to get it "outside the constitution."

It is the sworn duty of congress to sustain the constitution; to pass laws giving its provisions force and effect.

Congressman Volstead adheres to the fundamental principle that congress must sustain the constitution and that no destructive legislation shall go to the floor of congress from the important committee of which he is chairman.

Is there any reason why the Anti-Saloon League should not be making every effort to make clear to the people the very great importance of the reelection of Mr. Volstead? That is what that organization, and every other dry organization, is doing.

Is there any reason why even the citizen who might favor a less drastic provision in the constitution should oppose Mr. Volstead's position in the situation? Should not any good citizen desire that the law shall sustain the constitution?

VOLSTEAD; PROHIBITION; A HUMAN INTEREST STORY

That which is giving Mr. Volstead his greatest opposition at this time is the fact that he framed and was active in securing the passage of a law that has since born his name.

There are those who will not hesitate to say that however much Mr. Volstead is a constructive statesman he joined the ranks of the destructionists when he fathered the Volstead Act.

But this is not correct. The trouble is that so many con-

the Volstead Act. That which made this country permanently dry was the Eighteenth Amendment. Mr. Volstead had no more to do with that than any other man who voted for it.

In order to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that amendment must first pass both branches of Congress by a two-thirds vote of each branch and then it must be submitted to the legislatures of the different states and it must be ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states.

The prohibition amendment was passed this way—two-thirds of both branches of Congress voted for it and three-fourths of the legislatures of the several states passed it.

It is well to remember this in talking about prohibition for it will help one from falling into the error of blaming one man for the drought that has been visited upon the nation.

But the Eighteenth Amendment was not a complete piece of legislation. Even from the standpoint of those who supported the amendment the strongest, it was not a complete job.

It prohibited the sale, manufacture, transportation and importation of intoxicating liquors—but it did not say what constituted "intoxicating liquors."

Here is where Mr. Volstead entered upon the scene with his constructive statesmanship.

The Constitution had to be supplemented with legislation and Mr. Volstead worked out the law that defined intoxicating liquor.

The theory that Mr. Volstead worked on was that the Congress of the United States and all the different legislatures of the several states that ratified the Eighteenth Amendment had meant just what they said when they said "intoxicating liquors," and that what they meant was liquor that would have the effect of intoxicating.

He worked out the law defining the meaning along just that line.

It was not a matter of making the country dry—that had already been done, the Eighteenth Amendment had done that. The Volstead Act merely clarified the meaning of the Constitution and left no opportunity for haggling about what was meant by the words in the Constitution.

The Volstead Act was a constructive piece of legislation.

It was just the kind of legislation that might be expected from a man like Mr. Volstead.

It went right to the very heart of the situation and furnished a working program for the Constitution to function under.

It matters not what men think of prohibition.

The fact remains that the sovereign people, through their representatives in the Congress of the United States and in the several legislative bodies of the different states, have put prohibition into the federal constitution. It is a part of the supreme law of the land and there is but one thing for the Congress of the United States to do and that is to provide the machinery for the enforcement of the Constitution.

To do that is the sworn duty of every member of Congress.

When Congressman Volstead wrote the Volstead Act he was merely doing a bit of constructive work designed to uphold the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

If the Eighteenth Amendment is as bad as its enemies hold, then the best and the quickest and the surest way to get rid of it is to enforce it.

The machinery for enforcement is provided in the Volstead Act. In some form, Congress had to pass an act embodying the things in the Volstead Act. Congress could not get away from that duty if it tried. And the Volstead Act was passed by a substantial majority in both houses.

—Gunnar Bjornson in Minnesota Mascot.

THE InSANITY LEAGUE.

In their campaign against Senator Kellogg and in their campaign documents issued in the name of the Sanity League, the wets are running true to form. With Congressman Volstead, Senator Kellogg takes the stand that the Constitution of the United States must be sustained.

Because he is unreservedly committed to that position and because he has attained a commanding position in the United States Senate, the In-Sanity League has decided that it

ONE HALF OF ONE PER CENT. Most of the states and the federal government, in the time when the liquor laws regulated but did not prohibit, defined intoxicating liquor as that containing more than one half of one per cent of alcohol; that containing less than that amount as "soft" or "temperance" drinks.

In drafting the enforcement law sustaining the eighteenth amendment Congressman Volstead recognized the established standard.

Is it not perfectly clear that if the law is to sustain the constitution that it had to provide for one half of one per cent OR NOTHING?

Oct. 26, 1922

"I Kept The Middle of The Road"--Volstead

The congressional campaign in the Seventh district in its final stages appears to be centering on the prohibition question. In spite of the fact that O. J. Kvale is admitted to be absolutely and consistently dry and this from a matter of principle and not from political expediency, Mr. Volstead's chief reason for asking reelection for the eleventh time is that he is responsible for all of the dry legislation that has been attached to the constitution and placed upon the statute books of the nation, and his defeat at this time would jeopardize for all time the progress made in the direction of prohibition.

Since this is the case and since Mr. Volstead insists upon making this an issue and since he insists upon making claims in this connection that are not justified by fact, it appears time that this phase of his campaign be discussed.

To know accurately the condition that surrounded the enactment of the dry legislation, it is necessary but to refer to the time when this legislation went into effect and to accept Mr. Volstead's own statements at that time concerning his responsibility for it and his attitude toward it.

In the Literary Digest of December 27, 1919, an article that quotes Mr. Volstead's own words states that he is by no means a fanatical dry and that when the issue of prohibition was put squarely up to him when he was forced to campaign against a prohibitionist he "took the middle of the road." His opposition points out that this clearly indicates that the congressman plays with the prohibition question as a matter of politics and not as a matter of principle. He has no prohibition views other than those forced upon him by expediency. If he considered it expedient he would be in the middle of the road now or even against the dry measure, it would seem from that statement.

In the same article also he is quoted as stating that in his judgment the repeal of the national prohibition act would be a hopeless task, a remark that does not square in any particular with the claims made during the present campaign.

The December 27, 1919, article of the Literary Digest says:

"Fate must have been in one of her most ironical moods when she selected Representative A. J. Volstead of Minnesota to draft the stringent Federal prohibition law. By that act the Minnesota man made himself particularly displeasing to all the wets of this broad land, and yet, we learn, he is by no means a fanatical dry, but rather, to judge by his own statement, **"in the middle of the road."** While wrathful friends of booze may picture Mr. Volstead as a wild-eyed, long-haired zealot who never took a drink and who would move heaven and earth to bar everybody else from joys alcoholic, the fact is, we are told, that the author of the Volstead act is a slender, bushy-haired, heavy-mustached, grey-eyed, mild-mannered Congressman, who never made a prohibition speech in his life, never joined a temperance society, and never signed a temperance pledge. It is even said that in one of his campaigns to secure nomination for congress his only opponent ran on a prohibition platform. **The sole reason Mr. Volstead wrote the law, which bears his name, it is said, was that it came along to be done as a regular part of his day's work while he was chairman of the Committee of Judiciary.**

"While it thus seems that Mr. Volstead can present something of an alibi, it doesn't appear to have helped him much. The fact of the matter, we gather, is that someone had to be blamed for prohibition, and the logic of the situation placed the blame on the shoulders of the Minnesota representative. The fact that prohibition was brought on by the action of a number of men seems to have been overlooked by these letter writers, probably on the principle that administering a "kick" to an individual yields more satisfaction than directing it against a crowd.

"Three years ago, however, Mr. Volstead had to take the stump against a prohibition candidate. "Oh!" Mr. Volstead said, when the writer inquired about the tactics he employed against the Prohibitionist, **"I just kept in the middle of the road."**

"The National Prohibition Act passed by Congress simply puts into effect the will of the people as expressed when they adopted the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution."

"It can be repealed, however?" the interviewer asked.

"Yes, but the country would have to choose a Congress that would be willing to resubmit the question to the states, and then the legislatures of three-fourths of the States would be required to vote the Prohibition Amendment out of the National Constitution. **The task, in my judgment, would be hopeless."**

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROHIBITION?

Credit for the enactment of prohibition legislation is given to the people of the United States as a whole in an article written by James B. Morrow and published in a syndicate of newspapers which article appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Nov. 23, 1919.

An accurate answer to the question of who is responsible for prohibition would bring out names of persons long since dead and the complete list would "bulk like a city directory." This testimony, written at the time when the question was being decided in the latter part of 1919 and resulting from an interview with Mr. Volstead is severely contradictory to the present day statement of Mr. Volstead which is in effect that he made it and that he alone can keep it alive.

The article further tends to prove that whatever notoriety Mr. Volstead has acquired in this connection has been due to and the direct result of the efforts of the thirsty and not because of any particular interest of his in the prohibition cause.

The Morrow article as printed on Nov. 23, 1919, follows.

Washington, Nov. 22, 1919.—The goat of the liquor makers, liquor dealers and liquor drinkers is Andrew J. Volstead, a bushy haired, heavy moustached and grey eyed citizen of Granite Falls, Minn., and a representative of congress. Letters that he has received and is receiving, unsigned largely, show, vigorously enough and even profanely that the wrath of the alcoholic hosts of the republic center upon him. There must be somebody to love as well as to hate, collective loving or hating is too scattering either to be satisfying or effective. Always, man or woman demands a target. **Who is responsible for prohibition? An accurate answer to that question printed on paper would look and bulk like a city directory.** Names long since put into marble and granite would be repeated in types and battalioned in columns. Thousands are to blame.

Congress of course, wherein sits about 500 men, is, to get at the roots of the case, praiseworthy or blameworthy in the first instance with respect to prohibition. It sent the question to 48

"I Kept The Middle of The Road"--Volstead

(Continued from page 1)

states and the legislatures of 45 of the states wherein sat several hundred thousand of men, voted prohibition into the underlying laws of the nation. The whole procedure, liquor declared, was dishonest, critical, confiscatory and tyrannical. Ten thousand men and a sprinkling of women were censurable from first to last. To have decried them separately would have been impracticable. Besides, such an effort if applied to them would have been lacking in "kick." (The reader may substitute "punch" if she or he prefers that prevalent and more human word.)

Personalization then seemed to be both logical and practical. An individual was demanded to whom signed anonymous communications could be addressed, an individual upon the back of whom the Aarons of the dis..... and saloons could pile the anger of themselves and the scorn and displeasure of their patrons.

The choice fell on Andrew J. Volstead. Further along in this article the reason for the choice will be put down in proper fashion. Right here, however, it should be said, that Andrew J. Volstead never in his life wrote his name at the bottom of a temperance pledge, that never in his life has he been a member of a teetotaler's society and that never in his life has he made a speech on prohibition.

Three years ago, however, up for the Sixty-Fifth congress, Mr. Volstead had to take the stump against a prohibitionist candidate. Beaten, the prohibitionist turned Republican and last year attempted to defeat Mr. Volstead's nomination and again was whipped out of his boots.

"Oh!" Mr. Volstead said when the writer inquired about the tactics he employed against the prohibitionist, "I just kept in the middle of the road."

At the opening of the present congress, the sixty-sixth, Mr. Volstead thru the rule of seniority, became chairman of the committee of judiciary. The committee is composed of lawyers. When the constitutionality of a bill is in doubt, it is referred to this body of lawyers and they decide whether it will or will not stand the test of the courts. Forty-five of the 48 states, all of the states except Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Jersey, having ratified the prohibition amendment to the constitution, Mr. Volstead knew that a law of congress covering the matter ordered, would have to be enacted. Someone would have to prepare the bill and the committee on judiciary would be required to analyze it and give it form and endorsement.

Machinery was needed.

The legislatures of forty-five states, as provided by the constitution, had declared that "After one year from the ratification of this article the manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all the territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited."

Further it was ordered that "the congress and several states shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." The machinery for enforcement had to be created. Also intoxicating liquor for beverages had to be designated.

"The constitution now outlaws the liquor business or will after Jan. 16, 1920," Mr. Volstead went on to say, "and congress and the 48 states are required to provide laws for carrying prohibition into effect. The country cannot be half "wet" and half "dry." If it were trouble would multiply and neither the wets nor the dries would be satisfied with the situation. I have seen sheriffs and prosecuting attorneys drinking at clubs in dry territory and I have seen solid and prosperous business men who were made sots and bankrupts while members of such clubs.

"The national prohibition act passed by congress simply puts into effect the will of the people as expressed when they adopted the 18th amendment to the constitution. Congress has attempted to stop all use of liquor and of course such performances as I have mentioned—the secret drinking of liquor by sheriffs and prosecuting attorneys in violation of their oath of office.

"It is said by some persons that the law is drastic. I reply that it will be made even more severe after the country has learned what prohibition means. It will be tightened in several places and **in my opinion will never be repealed.**"

"It can repealed, however," the interviewer remarked.

"Yes, but the country would have to choose a congress that would be willing to resubmit the question to the states and then the legislatures of three-fourths of the states would be required to vote the prohibition amendment out of the national constitution. The task in my judgment would be hopeless."

The following articles taken from the news columns of the New York Times of the dates shown give some evidence of the means by which the Federal Prohibition act progressed:

May 28, 1919.—Rep. Volstead of Minnesota, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, today introduced a bill in the house to enforce wartime and national prohibition. **Mr. Volstead's bill was prepared with the assistance of counsel of the Anti-Saloon league.**

June 26, 1919.—After weeks of consideration and controversy between the "wet" and "dry" factions, the Judiciary committee today completed its draft of a bill for the enforcement of both wartime and constitutional prohibition. **By a vote of 12 to 5** the committee decided to combine legislation for enforcement of both brands of prohibition in one bill.

June 28, 1919.—Acting on suggestions made to him last night Chairman Volstead introduced a separate bill for enforcement of wartime prohibition but the Judiciary committee **decided by an overwhelming vote of 17 to 2, against separating the wartime enforcement from constitutional enforcement.**

George B. Safford, superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Minnesota, in a circular letter to the women of the district, makes the claim that Mr. Volstead "fathered the prohibition act." The preceding articles would appear to give evidence that he did not father it, but that he did step-father it, and this only after the child had reached a healthy maturity, and garnered to itself an immense popularity and good fortune and it became apparent to him that in his congressional old age it might be to him his sole support.—Editor. — (over) —

VOLSTEAD SPEAKS TO LARGE CROWD HERE

Knock Props From Under Kvale
Campaign Lies in Speech at El-
bow Lake Tuesday Night.

A crowd that filled the Opera House to capacity, was present Tuesday evening to hear the address by Congressman Andrew J. Volstead. The speech at Elbow Lake was Mr. Volstead's first campaign speech in Grant county.

The speaker was introduced by Mr. E. O. Lokensgard who stated that for the first time in the history of Minnesota, a Minnesota district was represented in congress by a man who was not only a national figure but a world figure.

In opening his address, Mr. Volstead stated that the Republicans did not assume charge of the government in its various branches until March 4, 1921, although for two years prior to that time it had controlled the legislative branch. For this reason much that occurred during the democratic administration has been unjustly charged to the republican administration. He cited the reserve bank ruling of May, 1920 as one of the acts which had been charged against the Republicans. He stated that when the Republicans took over the running of the government, government expenses were six billion dollars a year. The first consideration before the Republican administration was to reduce this great expense in order to relieve taxation. A cut was made in the army, in the navy, 70,000 civilian employees of the government were discharged, and expenditures were curtailed in all departments. The result was that the expenses of running the government was cut in half to three billion dollars. Other employees must go and other expenses must be still further reduced.

Mr. Volstead discussed the boom which followed the war. This boom was even greater than that during the war. With the prospect of an army of 5,000,000 being discharged without employment, the administration was fearful that a panic might result. Then too McAdoo wished to float the last Liberty Bond issue. To prevent a business slump, the manufacture of war materials was continued. When the reserve bank called a halt in May, 1920, it was largely at the incidence of Mr. McAdoo and the administration and not the republicans. Mr. Volstead added that he had been charged with responsibility for the ruling of the reserve bank which brought about the crash in the price of farm products. He pointed out that he had opposed the federal reserve legislation because it had failed to provide what he considered adequate safe guards. Neither Mr. Volstead nor his party were responsible for the ruling of the board and in spite of his opposition to the reserve system, Kvale had charged him with responsibility.

When the republicans assumed control in congress, Canadian wheat was coming in at the rate of ten or twelve million bushels a month. Mutton and beef were being imported from Australia and Argentine. The emergency tariff bill to provide protection for the American farmer was passed, but it was vetoed by Wilson. Free food and free raw material have been democratic doctrines since Cleveland, and under the democratic Underwood tariff, all raw materials were on the free list.

In May, 1921 the republicans were in control of all branches of government and the Emergency Tariff was passed. What good did it do is the question Mr. Volstead answered by quoting Winnipeg and Minneapolis wheat prices before and after passing of the tariff. In May, 1921, wheat was \$1.67 in Winnipeg and \$1.64 in Minneapolis. In June, following the passing of the tariff, Minneapolis wheat was \$1.69 and Winnipeg \$1.68. The spread continued to increase until April, 1922 when Minneapolis market was 25 cents a bushel higher than the Winnipeg market or practically all of the tariff imposed by the Emergency tariff act. He cited the figures for the meat and butter markets to show that the tariff was doing what it was intended to do.

Another measure intended to relieve the condition of agriculture was the revival of the War Finance Corporation to extend credit so that the foreign demand for American agricultural products might assist in establishing the toppling market. One billion dollars was voted by congress for this purpose.

Congress voted a half million to aid in agricultural finance. The federal farm loan act was amended so that bonds drawing 5½ per cent interest might be sold. The amount that might be charged the farmer was still limited to six per cent. So many loans were applied for that all those of \$10,000 or less could not be taken care of. He added however that he hoped that it would not be long before all loans could be cared for and the federal farm loan limit extended to \$20,000 instead of \$10,000.

He spoke of the saving made to the people of the United States through repeal of the transportation tax which was a tax paid by the shippers and not by the railroads. He spoke of his legislation to regulate

Drawn Co. Herald, Oct. 17, 1922

grain exchanges and stock exchanges and the penalties imposed upon speculation. These laws made it possible for farm organizations to become members of exchanges and to transact business on an equal footing with the private owned concern. He mentioned his fight for a bill to permit the farmers to organize. This bill in its original form was introduced by Senator Capper. He showed the importance of his position as chairman of the judiciary committee in securing the passage of this bill.

Speaking of co-operation Mr. Volstead said that he did not refer to the organizing of stores, mills or similar undertakings. What he referred to was the banding together of farmers to secure a fair price for their products. He said that this sort of co-operation had succeeded wherever it had been tried in Europe and that he did not believe the farmer would get a square deal until it was tried here.

He discussed the Esch Cummins bill and the charges that had been made regarding it by his opponent. He offered \$100 to any person who could show one place in which this bill guaranteed the railroads one cent of revenue subsequent to August 31, 1920. He said that he was thoroughly tired of having his opponent misrepresent the facts and challenged Kvale and his supporters to "Put up or shut up."

He called attention to Kvale's statement that the Esch-Cummins bill was costing every person a dollar a day. (As we remember the statement it was that the bill cost each family a dollar a day. Either statement is foolish and far from the truth.) Mr. Volstead pointed out that this would amount to 36 billion dollars or six or seven times more than the total receipts of the railroads. The railroads take in between five and six billions a year. Before the war, their total receipts amounted to four billions. Even a dollar a day a family would amount to fifty per cent more than the total railroad receipts. Kvale's statement any child could figure out its lack of truth with a pencil and paper in a few minutes time.

Volstead read the old law governing the fixing of interstate rates. He then read the Esch Cummins provision. The two were almost counterparts. In other words, the Esch Cummins bill merely incorporated into its provisions the law when in force. He discussed the act in detail and completely knocked the props from under the assertions made by Kvale in his recent speech here.

Relative to railroad valuations Mr. Volstead states that in 1913 La Follette had asked for physical valuation of the railroads. Millions of dollars have been spent in counting ties, rails, and valuing depots and terminal facilities. The work is nearing completion, but this commission does not yet know the valuation of the railroads in spite of months and years of work and the expenditure of millions of dollars. And still men of the type of Shipstead and Kvale can give you the real valuation without batting an eye lash.

Watered stocks and bonds merely impair the credit of a road. There is a law now which makes it impossible to issue watered stocks and bonds on railroad property. And the stockholders of the railroad whose stocks or bonds are watered suffer.

The Esch Cummins bill provides that if a railroad earns more than six per cent, one half of the excess earnings shall go to the government. Rates that are high enough to enable the Chicago Great Western to pay expenses and continue in business, would yield the Chicago Northwestern road a profit of seven or eight per cent. It is impossible to give each railroad an equally good territory and efficient management. So it is necessary to base rates on averages rather than to fit the individual case. Rates must be uniform and rates that are ample for some systems will lose money for others. One thousand miles of railroad is being abandoned yearly because of the fact that it is not profitable to continue it in operation. If the Esch Cummins law made such generous guarantees as Kvale states it does, this would not occur. There is no Esch Cummins bill in Canada and still the railroad rates there are as high as they are here.

The railroads use one-third of the soft coal mined. Coal miners receive \$7.50 to \$20.00 a day. Railroad labor receives higher wages than labor in other vocations. Labor and coal are two of the largest items in the railroad expense. The question of costs is the determining question in determining railroad rates rather than the Esch Cummins law or any other law.

He discussed the new tariff bill. He said that it was the best tariff law we have ever had. Everything marketed from the farm is protected and everything used on the farm is on the free list: farm machinery, lumber, fence, wire, harness, shoes, and similar articles. If experts tell the truth, it is the lowest tariff bill passed at any time by the Republicans.

Kvale states that he favors government ownership of railroads. Practically no one in congress favors government ownership. Kvale would be like a ship without a port. He couldn't repeal the tariff even though he desired to, Volstead said.

Prohibition may not be an issue, but all the wets are active and interested. There is no wet enthusiasm.

(Continued on page four.)

VOLSTEAD SPEAKS TO LARGE CROWD HERE

(Continued from page one.)

ism for Volstead, it is all on the other side. That's why the Anti-Saloon league, the W. C. T. U. and other organizations interested in temperance are giving Volstead their support. There is a wet and a dry issue in Illinois, California, Ohio, and other states all over the country, but Kvale claims there is no such issue in the district where Volstead, the man whose name is synonymous with prohibition enforcement, is a candidate for re-election. When he was here he cited a letter from a wet organization to prove that he was not receiving the wet support.

Volstead stated that he could cuss Wall street just as hard as his opponent. But he stated that he should like to know what his opponent proposed to do about it. Volstead voted against watered stocks, in favor of graduated income tax, for soldiers' compensation, in fact for every bill that has been opposed by Wall street. He read an article from the Canby Press, a Nonpartisan newspaper edited by a former socialist and now supporting Rev. Kvale. He showed how far from the truth the article was and stated that this was the method of campaigning which had been adopted by the opposition.

Speaking of campaign expenditures, Mr. Volstead said that the Nonpartisan league claimed 60,000 members at \$18 each two years ago. A campaign was made to secure 100 members at \$100 in each county. Many of these \$100 memberships were secured. In addition the league established a dozen newspapers in this district alone. Speaking of Newberry, Mr. Volstead added, the league spent more in this district in the last campaign than Newberry spent in the entire state of Michigan. "This fall you'll see the same thing," he said. Smiling he added, "But you won't spend so much money."

In closing he said that if his experience or his position in congress can be of advantage to the people of this district he shall be glad to serve them. The government is run by parties and always will be run by parties. You can't do anything without party affiliation in congress. If you send a man there who has no party affiliation and who represents no one, he is tied hand and foot.

VOLSTEAD CLUB FORMED

Olivia Times
Oct. 26, 1922
On Saturday afternoon, Oct. 21st, at a gathering of women at the home of Mrs. C. A. Heins, a Volstead Club was formed.

The following officers were elected: Chairman, Mrs. W. H. Heins; Secretary, Mrs. A. A. Passer.

A public meeting at the commercial club was held last evening to further the organization.

An intensive membership campaign is being conducted and anyone desirous of joining is urged to send their name to the secretary.

The cooperation and support of every citizen of Olivia and vicinity is earnestly desired by the club.



A. J. VOLSTEAD

Republican Candidate for Congress
from the Seventh District.

VOLSTEAD MADE ABLE ADDRESS SATURDAY NIGHT

Spoke Before Fine Audience at The Court House—His Talk Highly Commended.

Hon. A. J. Volstead representative of this district in the national House of Representatives, defended his record ably and made clear the manner in which some of the measures which he had stood for had been misrepresented by his opponent in his speech delivered at the court house Saturday night.

The author of the prohibition enforcement act defended the Esch-Cummins law, against misrepresentations made against it, the tariff bill passed by the last Congress, and pointed out the responsible position that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee occupies with reference to legislation affecting the prohibition amendment.

There was a very fine crowd at the meeting. Saturday night being a shopping occasion in Willmar, business people and their employees were unable to attend the meeting. Many



farmers were present. The court room was filled to standing room only. The congressman's address was a splendid talk which held the closest attention of the audience. Following the meeting and since people have spoken of the address in terms of highest commendation. The address was a masterly presentation of indisputable facts.

The congressman stated that the Republican party could not be blamed for events that had transpired prior to March 3, 1921, in giving an account of what Congress had done to offset the effects of the war. Under the Underwood tariff, all farm products were admitted free to this country. In May, 1921, after the emergency tariff had been passed the importation of wheat ceased. Since that time or up until the time that the figures were available, the market in Minneapolis had been ten to twenty cents higher than it had been in Winnipeg. Mr. Volstead showed by giving figures for every month. This same advantage was true with respect to all the other agricultural products.

Following the war, Mr. Volstead explained, the European countries could not buy our products owing to lack of money and credit, so the War Finance Corporation was revived for the purpose of loaning one billion dollars to the countries in need of it. In this manner the market was restored. Mr. Volstead then described the conditions leading to the deflation and stringency of money, and showed that with bankruptcy staring the farmer in the face, means had to be found to provide him with credit. The same law was amended so that money could be loaned on farm paper, and for this purpose \$500,000,000 more was given to the War Finance Corporation. Of this amount, \$300,000,000 was used for the relief of the farmer, ninety millions of it going to farmers organizations. Senator Kellogg was instrumental in framing that act.

The congressman paid a high compliment to Senator Kellogg for his masterly handling of the Capper-Volstead farm marketing bill on the floor of the senate. He said that the senator had cooperated earnestly in every effort made to improve marketing conditions by constructive legislation.

The congressman traced the history of the management of the railroads since a short time previous to the war, calling attention to the fact that the government took over the railroads on account of the lack of co-ordination that existed between the roads, that during the period of government ownership the wages and coal and the cost of maintenance went soaring upwards. During the period of government operation the government lost \$1,200,000,000. He then explained very carefully the terms under which the roads were returned to private ownership, pointing out plainly that there was a guarantee period for six months in which the railroads were to get the difference between the income that they received and the amount of rental that they were getting from the government while the roads were under government ownership. This guarantee period extended no longer than six months, and Mr. Volstead offered to give any opponent \$100 at any time who could show that this period extended over six months. A total increase was granted to the railroads of \$700,000,000, and of this amount labor wages took \$650,000,000. The balance was used to wipe out a deficit.

There is no guarantee today. There is in fact quite the opposite condition. One half of all earnings above a certain amount must be turned over to the government. That is more like a tax than a guarantee. Railroads have in fact been earning less than the amount, less than six per cent. If there were a guarantee, would not the railroads be trying to recover the difference?

Railroad valuations are appraised by the government, not by the com-

panies, as is contended for political purposes. The appraisal has been made not under the Esch-Cummins law but under a law previously enacted authorizing such valuations and of which law Senator LaFollette was the "sponsor."

Any intelligent person must admit that getting the railroads back to the companies following two years of war time use presented difficult problems.

The Esch-Cummins law is the most drastic railroad law ever enacted. Expressions of disapproval have been fostered by those bent upon forcing government ownership or the adoption of some such scheme as the "Prum Plan," long since discarded as visionary.

Mr. Volstead also discussed in a modest manner the relationship of the important Judiciary Committee chairmanship to national prohibition. Hundreds of bills are presented to the committee. Not more than fifty or seventy-five can be considered. The chairman largely determines what bills shall come up for committee consideration. On the floor of the house the chairman largely controls the action taken and may be able to prevent amendments or shut off debate.

In the case of a House bill being amended in the Senate a conference committee composed of three members of the Senate committee and three members of the House committee is appointed. The chairman appoints the three House members on the conference committee. Mr. Volstead asked his hearers how they would like to have Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania or Mr. Dyer of Missouri as his successor as chairman of the committee on the Judiciary. They are next in line for promotion should Volstead be defeated and both are very "wet."

Willmar Republican Gazette
Oct 19, 1922

**The
APPLETON PRESS**
by the
McGowan's
APPLETON
MINN.

Oct. 20, 1922

M. J. McGowan, Editor
F. R. McGowan, Sales Manager
Gertrude McGowan, City Editor

[Published every Friday morning at Appleton, Minn. Entered at the Postoffice at Appleton, Minn., as Second Class Mail Matter.]



MEMBER ORGANIZED 1867

Northwestern Advertising Representatives
Minnesota Select List
709 Exchange Bank 215 S. 6th St.
St. Paul Minneapolis

Foreign Advertising Representative
THE AMERICAN PRESS ASSOCIATION

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES PAYABLE
IN ADVANCE**

\$2.00 per year for subscribers in first two zones; to those living in further zones in the United States, \$2.50 per year; foreign subscriptions \$3.00 per year.

All subscriptions discontinued at expiration

A report is in circulation that Congressman Volstead in his campaign speech at Canby recently stated that "a bunch of old soaks at Appleton had maneuvered an endorsement of O. J. Kvale for congress in what was called a democratic district convention and Mr. Kvale is claiming an endorsement thru this of the Democratic party."

Did He Say It?

It is difficult to believe that the congressman even in his present desperate attempt to retain his congressional position would stoop to such grossly insulting and libelous remarks.

If he did make such a remark as this in any of his campaign speeches the fact will undoubtedly be verified and the individual ladies and gentlemen who composed the convention may find it necessary to call upon Mr. Volstead to define his term "old soaks" and insist that he prove his contention.

If he did not make such a remark anywhere then in justice to these people and to himself the congressman should if he feels so inclined take opportunity to deny that he did and substantiate his denial with some reliable proof.

Should Mr. Volstead or his managers desire to take any official notice of this report The Press would be pleased to receive and to print anything they may have to say on the matter.

The 1922 Democratic Seventh District Congressional convention held at Appleton in March was called, organized and conducted its business under the existing laws of the state of Minnesota. Should Mr. Volstead or his managers desire to delve into the proceedings of that convention or into the record and character of the ladies and gentlemen who composed it, it is stated here that M. J. McGowan of Appleton is the permanent chairman and Mrs. A. L. Hanson of Dawson is the permanent secretary of the Seventh district democratic organization and the records of the meeting, together with the names of the delegates seated in the convention are available to them.

The National Association against the Prohibition amendment has announced the names of 202 candidates to congress thruout the United States that it hopes

Not An Issue

to elect. In the list are four from Minnesota, three democrats and one republican. Lynn in the first district, Davis in the third, Coan in the fifth and Sabberger in the sixth. In the remaining districts no endorsement is made.

After all that has been said by Mr. Volstead concerning what would happen to the prohibition cause in the event of his defeat and the election of Mr. Kvale and if the "eyes of the world" are on the Seventh district in its congressional fight, it is strange that the one association in the country that has as its sole purpose the repeal of the prohibition amendment, should keep out of this district.

This condition substantiates the claim of Mr. Kvale that he is "just as dry as Volstead, with a little to spare" and no one knows this better than the "wets."

It proves also another claim of Mr. Kvale that prohibition is not an issue in this campaign in the Seventh district and if it is conducted as it should be will be fought on the real issues and not over the undeserved reputation of Mr. Volstead, of whom it is said "He never signed a teetotaler's pledge or made a prohibition speech in his life."

Troy Headlight Herald
Oct 20/22

WATCH FOR SMOKESCREEN

We have sought in our news columns to give a fair review of the Kvale speech given here Tuesday. We would have preferred to have given the speech in its entirety and then left it to our readers to draw their own conclusions.

In the first place the speaker must be given credit for his cleverness and ability on the platform. He is well versed in all the arts and tricks of the orator. Of the substance of some of his matter little fault could be found, but it is an easy matter to tell what should have been done after the storm is past and one has had ample time to view the wreckage. The greatest fault with his speech was the faulty conclusions which he drew or left for his hearers to draw from the partial information which he gave. As one prominent man said after the meeting that using the same method he could prove from the Bible that Satan and Christ were friends, altho one is the direct opposite of the other.

An example of this method of presenting his case and overcoming his opponent was his mention of the Minnesota legislature in over-riding the will of a wet committee in enacting state prohibition. He cited the instance but did not refreshen the memory of his audience of the unusual situation under which this legislation was put thru. First it was partly regarded as a war measure, and in the second place some 60 counties of the state had become dry thru the popular county option vote, and the legislature was elected pledged to not only support prohibition but to work for it until it was secured. It was a case where an overwhelming majority was aroused and determined to secure a definite end. The one criticism made against that legislature by the large Twin City papers was that it accomplished nothing for the state during the entire session except enact the prohibition measure. The situation was unusual, one which would hardly occur again in a life ime. It is only fair to the voter interested in maintaining effective prohibition in this country to seek to delude him by throwing a "smokescreen" of this nature when he is not given the full facts in the case? Anyone who knows anything of the methods of congress knows that the work of the various committees is the biggest factor in our national congress.

His complaint of the Federal reserve board was well taken, but he should have gone further and accused the board of not looking to the best interests of the country when it did not immediately after the war prevent inflation. Had inflation been shut off early in 1919 the American farmer might today be \$11,000,000,000 ahead and the laboring man have little to complain of. The fact of the matter is that climbing prices and values had to stop somewhere unless we desired to become a second Russia, and it had gone so far that nothing was left to do but take drastic measures. Deflation came at the insistent demand for lower prices and the result of a buyers' strike. The board was at fault in not letting us down more easily.

The condition of which he complains is the more reason that we should send to congress our ablest and most experienced men. It is no time to call in the quack when the signs indicate that the patient needs the constant care of the trained practitioner.

KVALE GIVES ROUSING SPEECH

Candidate for Congress From Seventh District Greeted
by Crowd of Several Hundred

Canby Press - Oct 19, 1922

The largest crowd ever congregated in Canby for years assembled Thursday evening to greet the Farmer-Labor candidate for Congress namely O. J. Kvale. The city hall was filled to capacity and S. R. O. was at a price, so to speak. Many who came late found that they could not gain admittance and returned home with keen disappointment for not being able to hear Mr. Kvale.

The meeting was in charge of R. A. Trovatten of Clarkfield who is in the race for representative. The various county candidates were given an introduction and K. K. Solberg, candidate for the senate, gave a very fluent and interesting talk for 30 minutes. The main speaker was then introduced and a very hearty applause assured him of genial hospitality of the progressives of Canby and community.

Kvale opened his speech with an explanation as to the wet and dry issue. This was discussed pro and con and when he had finished this, there was no doubt in the minds of who heard him but that he was a tried and true servant of prohibition. His arguments were convincing that prohibition was not an issue in this campaign and he presented a letter from Bryan stating that he would not enter this district during this campaign as he did not deem it necessary when both candidates were dry. Two years ago Volstead bore the endorsement of Bryan but he is lacking in this respect this campaign. In so far as the judiciary committee is concerned, no objection whatsoever could be raised in this respect as certainly, the chairman of that committee could have any power with the majority against him. Oliver Steward of the flying squadron in an editorial of his paper in Indianapolis scored a California Congressman because he voted the same way as did Volstead on the Woodruff Johnson Bill and yet Steward is out in the seventh district campaigning for Volstead. It seems to make a difference whether we live in California or Minnesota.

omical situation of today. He was thoroughly familiar with all of his topics and above all, certainly did justice to the viciousness of the Esch-Cummins Act for which his opponent voted and said was no guarantee. It was a speech, free of mud and slurs, and a precedent of what is to follow when he reaches Washington. It is years since Canby was accorded the privilege of hearing such a wonderful speech and no doubt it will be at least another two years before Kvale will return for re-election and give us the opportunity of hearing another one just as good.

There is no doubt in our minds but what the seventh district will be earnestly and truly represented by Kvale should he be elected and the voters will receive the best there is in him which is no small matter in itself. There can be no mistake about it. Kvale appeals to the voters and they in turn will respond on Tuesday November 7th.

The Esch-Cummins Act was explained without the usual dust and smoke and without any bluffing and with plenty of proof, Kvale exposed the guarantee to the railroads under this act which his opponent stated was a lie in his speech here and offered \$100 to anyone who could show him where there was a guarantee. Kvale stated that no one but squibbling lawyers would draft such a vicious bill for the benefit of a privileged few when it came from the pockets of the nation.

Kvale related an incident which happened Wednesday at Tracy when the president of the W. C. T. U. was given the floor of the high school of that little city and she deliberately gave vent to a volume of Volstead propaganda with the hope that the pupils would carry home this white wash to their parents. But Kvale received an invitation from one of the instructors of that school to appear there and address the pupils which, of course he accepted. Arriving there Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock, he was refused the floor of the high school. Being a member of the state board of education, it seemed hardly probable that he would be refused admission when the president of the W. C. T. U. had been given the privilege and in place of confining herself to her own topics she administered a dose of Volstead poison and Kvale was refused the privilege of giving an antidote. It also seems to make a difference whether you are Kvale or Volstead.

Kvale then confined himself for the remainder of the two hours that he spoke to the main issues which were confronting the voters of the seventh district in their choice for congressman on November 7. He covered the ground so completely that when he had finished there was little or no chance for the opposition to find a loop hole for a lookin. Volstead and the arguments he presented to the people two weeks ago seemed like a speck on the horizon in the hazy distance when Kvale had finished in his profound manner.

Kvale held the undivided attention of his 600 listeners for the entire period he spoke. He displayed a wonderful character, keen of intellect, a masterful mind and the prognostication of a wizard on the econ-

The Renville County Journal

Renville County's Leading Newspaper
With the Largest Circulation

Published every Thursday at Olivia, Minn., by the
RENVILLE COUNTY PUBLISHING CO.

Subscription \$1.50 per year, strictly in advance

Entered at the Olivia P. O. as second class mail matter.

The Seventh Congressional District is overrun with Volstead campaign speakers recruited from New York to San Francisco who are frantically howling the awful calamity which the country faces if Volstead is not re-elected. So far as we have been able to learn these speakers dwell entirely on the worn out wet and dry argument. In some towns there have been as high as three and four meetings planned in a week. The attendance has been such that at times there was no meeting held because of a lack of hearers which may be taken as a pretty good indication that the people are fed up on the stuff and prefer hearing the real issues discussed. Friday evening at Granite Falls, Volstead's home town, the large pavilion was packed to overflowing by Granite Falls people and many outsiders who listened attentively to one of the most forceful and logical campaign speeches ever delivered in the district. Rev. O. J. Kvale was the speaker and is said by many to have made a most favorable impression and will gain many votes as a result. People are tired of the bunk being peddled by Volstead and his "flying squadrons" and are interested in hearing the program of a real progressive discussed. Volstead, as shown by his actions, has gotten out of touch with his constituency during the past twenty years which he has spent in Washington and on the surface it looks mighty much as though the voters were about to select another who is in closer touch with the needs of the common people than A. J. who is one of the most re-actionary and narrow party-line men in the lower house of Congress. Volstead will undoubtedly be well taken care of by interests at Washington after his defeat the same as McCumber will be.

Oct. 26, 1922

Boyd Bulletin
Oct. 27, 1922

Talking against amending the prohibition enforcement act to permit the sale of wine and beer will help, but what will help most is to vote for Andrew J. Volstead at the coming election, Nov. 7th. We urge all friends of prohibition to give this serious consideration and be sure to get out and vote.

Oct. 18, 1922
CANDIDATE KVALE TO SPEAK
Rev. O. J. Kvale, the progressive candidate for Congressman in the seventh district, indorsed by the democratic and the Farmer-Labor party will spend three days campaigning in Meeker county. Mr. Kvale will speak at Eden Valley, Wednesday afternoon, Oct. 5 at 2:30, and in Watkins in the evening the same day. At Dassel Thursday evening Oct. 26, at the auditorium at eight o'clock and Friday evening, Oct. 27th, at the Litchfield Opera House. Mr. Kvale is a fine orator and well posted on the big issues of today. He has a message that every Meeker county voter should hear.
Litchfield Independent

Morton Enterprise
Oct. 17, 1922

Rev. O. J. Kvale of Benson spoke to a hall of thirty people yesterday afternoon. Work prevented us from listening to much of his speech but we heard him state that the 18th amendment absolutely was not an issue in the campaign. He was accompanied by a Mr. O'Connor of Iowa who spoke in behalf of organized labor and for Kvale's election.

Part Region Echo **WOULD VOTE AGAINST ON ANGEL** Oct. 26, 1922

A street speaker in Alexandria Saturday night said that if an angel from Heaven were running against Volstead in the Seventh district he would still urge the voters to vote for Volstead. That is going some. But it really is not any more radical than the statement of other Volstead advocates that his defeat will mean reopening the saloons. One statement is just about as hair-brained as the other. Both Volstead and Kvale are "dry" and whichever is elected there will be a dry vote from the Seventh district. Kvale's vote counts just as much as Volstead's when an attempt is made to change the prohibition law. There must be a loss at this election of the prohibition majority in Congress before the law can be changed—and how does substituting one dry vote for another change the total vote?

As a matter of fact, before there can be saloons again in Alexandria the prohibition amendment must be repealed. Congress cannot repeal the law; a majority of the state legislatures alone can do that. So when old Knute Nelson or anybody else talks about 26 saloons in Alexandria if Kvale is elected, he is talking stuff that he and every thinking man or woman knows is BUNK.

Mankato Daily Free Press - Oct 20/22
EYES ON SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Granite Falls, Minn., October 19—
 The father of America's prohibition law opposed for re-election by a minister and lifelong foe of liquor who has the backing of the National Association Against the Prohibition Amendment and other "wets"—

Such is today's strange paradox in the political campaign in the Seventh Minnesota congressional district.

Congressman Andrew J. Volstead, author of the Volstead prohibition act, is back home here, making the hardest political campaign of his career.

He seeks re-election on his prohibition record, against the Rev. O. J. Kvale, who declares himself "drier than Volstead."

The fight has assumed national interest. The nation's "dry" and "wet" organizations have both entered the campaign, for it is bound to have a tremendous effect upon the big effort to amend the dry law and legalize light wines and beer.

Volstead's opponent is pastor of the Lutheran church at Benson, Minn. Rev. Kvale has not raised the prohibition question did not seek "wet" support—but regardless of his "dry" views, it has been thrust upon him.

Volstead Power Great

Volstead is chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, to which all bills for modification of the prohibition act would be referred. Volstead's ability to hold down consideration of wet measures is a big factor for prohibition strength.

Defeat of Volstead, besides eliminating him, would improve chances for favoring action toward amendment. If the republicans retain

 Representative A. J. Volstead prohibition law author (above), and Rev. O. J. Kvale, prohibitionist, who opposes him.

control, George S. Graham, Philadelphia, would become chairman of the judiciary committee. Wets say he would be "more amenable to reason" than a prohibitionist.

Should the democrats remain control of the house, Robert V. Thomas of Kentucky would be the committee chairman. Consideration of modification amendments by the judiciary committee would be assured in either case, with Volstead removed, says the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.

Thus, the Rev. Kvale, ever a foe of the saloon, involuntarily has the support of the national "wet" organization, while the national organization of the Anti-Saloon

LIFE WILL REALLY BEGIN AT 50.—HE SAYS.



THE 1922 BABY WILL LIVE LONGER THAN YOU.



League, which he has always supported is fighting him.

It's Third Race

This is the third time the two "dry" men have opposed each other. Two years ago, Kvale defeated Volstead for the republican nomination. The republican state organization backed a contest, however, and Volstead was declared nominated.

In the fall Kvale, running as the farmer-labor candidate, lost to Volstead by 1500 votes.

This year, Kvale is running as an independent, with the endorsement of the democrats and Non-Partisan League.

All is not "wet" support that is behind the Rev. Kvale. Since he came to Benson from Wisconsin,

five years ago, he has won widespread popularity through his charitable work, his activity during the war and the prominent part he has taken in public affairs at Benson.

High in Church

In the Lutheran church, he has been prominent since school days. He is a member of the board of education and the board of finance of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America.

For twenty-three years, Kvale was pastor at Oxfordville, Wis., near Madison. During this time he was a close friend of Senator LaFollette, and gives the latter credit for much of his political inspiration.

Rev. Kvale and his wife have seven children.

Oct. 25, 1922
 Dassel Dispatch

The Dispatch differs radically with Congressman Volstead on his prohibition views and measures but we contend that it is only a small part of that gentleman's record during his service in congress. He has a long and creditable record of practical service to this district and state that entitles him to credit and a hearing. No new and untried man will be able to go to congress and step into his shoes without years of apprenticeship, as it might be termed. This is a fact

that should be apparent to every voter who has made any study whatever of the lives of our public men. It is the part of good sense and good judgment to keep a good man on the job when you have one.

Renville Star Farmer

Oct. 19, 1922

Congressman A. J. Volstead who is making a speaking tour of the 7th district spoke at Olivia Monday evening to a good house. When his opponent Rev. O. J. Kvale classes him as an agent of "big business" they are doing this every day friend of the people an injustice. Mr. Volstead is just like you and me and working in our interest at the seat of government to the best of his ability. He holds a position there where his influence is felt in behalf of the common people. It takes years to grow into a position that Mr. Volstead so ably fills at Washington. He is essentially a western man and guards the interests of the west, especially the farmer when legislation comes up affecting him is under consideration. It should be kept in mind your representative is not a substitute on the side lines but is in the midst of the scrimmage all the time whether it is in the interest of the farmer or defending the Volstead act, enforcing the 18th

amendment to the constitution. Your congressman is right on the issues of the hour affecting us of the northwest.

A. J. VOLSTEAD ANSWERS OPPONENT

Congressman A. J. Volstead addressed a good sized crowd at the Armory here Monday evening and took good occasion to give a good account of his stewardship as a representative of the people in Washington. He discussed the issues of the campaign and in a very convincing manner defended his position on many of the important measures considered by Congress in the past two years. He took his opponent to account for ridiculous statements made with reference to Mr. Volstead's record and he showed up the falacy of Mr. Qvale's position on many other public questions. He showed the importance of keeping a man in office from this district that holds the important position of chairman of the Judiciary committee, and made his audience see the loss which this district and state would suffer by forfeiting that position, which means so much to moral forces of the country at this time.

Mr. Volstead's address was the best he has given here at any time and those present were made to feel that there was more to his speech than mere assertions and assumptions. He produced facts and arguments that could not be controverted.

Olivia Times
Oct. 19, 1922

DEPENDING ON THE WOMEN

Swift Co. News, Oct. 19, 1922
Representative Volstead is depending on the women to put him over next month. He is making a special appeal to the women. He is causing to be sent to them numerous letters. These letters are addressed to the women personally, not to their husbands.

One such letter has come into our possession (or rather, we should say, dozens of them). These letters are signed (signature in type), by "Geo. B. Safford," State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League.

No one questions the right of these gentlemen to appeal to the women to vote for Volstead. They have as much right to appeal to them as they do to the men. The thing that is unprincipled, misleading and unsportsman-like about the letter in question is the manner in which it dangles before the gaze of the women the dry skeleton of that old mummyfied argument anent the Judiciary committee. The letter states:

"No bill effecting the liquor traffic can be considered by the House until it has first been examined and reported by this committee. The chairman of the committee largely determines what bills the committee shall consider."

This statement is misleading because of the fact that a minority on the committee, even one man, can bring in a "minority report", and if the House accepts the minority report and rejects the majority report, then the czaristic tactics of the chairman of the said committee is defeated. Even if the chairman was, by virtue of his position, able to thwart the consideration of legislation, by refusing to report out such a bill, then our boasted democracy becomes a hallow farce and our cherished doctrine of majority rule goes a-glimmering. No matter how desirable a piece of legislation may be it is not in keeping with our democratic principles to get it by autocratic methods. Mr. Volstead and Mr. Safford both know this, and yet they seek to mislead people into believing that the former has it in his power to strangle every effort to introduce a bill that does not meet with his approval.

Certain voters may be led to believe that he has such power but Mr. Volstead knows that he has not. He knows that the only thing that can prevent legislation adverse to the enforcement act from passing the Congress is a majority that is opposed to it in that body. Volstead has only one vote and it is worth no more than any other man's vote, and will count for no more than any other man's vote.

It is not with the idea of weakening the prohibition laws that the voters of the Seventh district are determined on the defeat of Mr. Volstead. This determination exists because of the fact that Mr. Volstead has held that one office for a fifth of a century already, and that is as long as any man can hope to be of any great value to his constituents. The tenacity with which Mr. Volstead holds onto his job, even to the extent of dragging his case into court, and depending upon it to help him hold his job, is sufficient reason within itself to make an honest and fairminded voter think twice before he votes for him again.

These are the cold, unvarnished facts, and voters are urged to think them over before November 7.

WETS NAME 202 THEY HOPE TO ELECT ON BEER PLATFORM

Prohibition Opponents Begin Organized Campaign to Pick Supporters for Congress

FOUR MINNESOTANS GIVEN INDORSEMENT

One Republican and Three Democrats Running in State Approved by Association

By GRAFTON WILCOX

Washington, Oct. 18.—An organized effort to promote the election of candidates for congress who are in favor of modifying the Volstead enforcement act so as to permit the manufacture and sale of wine and beer is now being conducted throughout the country by the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment, a nationwide organization with headquarters in Washington and branches in every state of the Union.

There will be the most aggressive activities conducted by the agents of this organization from now until election day, it was announced here today with the publication of a preliminary list of candidates for the United States senate and house of representatives which the association has indorsed.

202 "Wet" Candidates Picked

Activities already are under way in 35 states and 202 aspirants have been selected by the association, candidates chosen from both the big political parties. The preliminary "wet" congressional list was made public by G. C. Hinckley, national secretary of the association. He declared in an official statement that the list would be added to from time to time and that the candidates picked by his organization would be "actively supported" throughout the campaign.

The wet list of candidates announced, includes:

One republican and four democrats in Iowa are indorsed as follows: H. E. Hull, republican, second district; G. P. Hageman, democrat, third district; G. A. Smith, democrat, fifth district; Paul W. Richards, democrat, ninth district; J. M. Gillett, democrat, 11th district.

Four Indorsed in Minnesota

One republican and three democrats are indorsed in Minnesota, as follows:

J. F. Lynn, democrat, first district.

Representative C. R. Davis, republican, third district.

J. R. Coan, democrat, fifth district.

P. J. Saberger, democrat, sixth district.

Senator Robert M. La Follette, republican, seven republicans and three democratic candidates for the house in Wisconsin are indorsed as follows:

W. F. Schanen, democrat, second district.

Representative E. Ward Voigt, republican, second district.

J. C. Schaefer, republican, fourth district.

J. F. Dresdon, democrat, fourth district.

Representative W. H. Stafford, republican, fifth district.

Representative Florian T. Lampert, republican, sixth district.

Representative J. D. Beck, republican, seventh district.

George J. Schneider, republican, ninth district.

Charles J. Hanzel, democrat, ninth district.

Hubert H. Peavey, republican, 11th district.

In the senatorial campaign as well as the house fight, the association is to take an active part in many states. Some of the present senators who are candidates for re-election, who have the association's indorsement, in addition to Senator La Follette, are:

Senator G. P. McLean, republican, Connecticut, the association also indorsing his democratic opponent, Thomas J. Spellacy.

Senator James A. Reed, democrat, Missouri, indorsed in preference to R. R. Brewster, republican candidate.

Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock, democrat, Nebraska, preferred by the wets over R. B. Howell, republican.

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, republican, Massachusetts, the association indorsing also his democratic opponent, W. A. Gaston.

Senator Atlee Pomerene, democrat, Ohio, indorsed as against his republican opponent, Representative Simeon D. Fess.

Senator Peter G. Gerry, democrat, Rhode Island.

See Wets' Increase in Congress

In New Jersey the association indorses Governor Edward I. Edwards, democratic candidate, against Senator Joseph Frelinghuysen, republican, and the campaign waging there now is chiefly over the wet and dry issue.

In Delaware, Thomas F. Bayard, democrat, is indorsed for senator.

"If success attends the vigorous campaign that is being prosecuted," said Mr. Hinckley, "the ranks of the wets in congress will be increased by 70 to 75 over the present number."

"It should be understood that this is a preliminary list, subject to revision and expansion as the campaign develops."

"It should be further distinctly understood that the association's indorsement of a candidate does not necessarily mean that he has directly advocated our platform; it does mean, however, that for reasons satisfactory to us, we are willing to indorse him."

Oct. 18, 1922

M. J. Gillett

**WETS BOUND TO DEFEAT
CONGRESSMAN VOLSTEAD.**

Washington, D. C., August 29.— Each week reveals new evidence at the capitol that the liquor interests of the nation are making it their main fight to defeat Congressman Volstead, of the Seventh district of Minnesota. The managers of the national wet organizations openly declare that they will wage this fight bitterly whether they defeat Mr. Volstead or not. Members of the house who are in close touch with the various wet and dry campaigns in the congressional districts say that it is well understood that the liquor interests are more anxious to defeat Mr. Volstead than any other man in congress. It would give them the chairmanship of the judiciary committee, a larger representation in conference committees on measures which relate to prohibition, and it would be heralded from Maine to California as the greatest wet victory achieved during the year.

Congressman Tinkham of Massachusetts, one of the wet leaders in congress, staged the last attack upon Congressman Volstead, and it turned out to be a boomerang. He attempted to introduce a resolution reiterating his charges against Mr. Volstead, saying that he had accepted the support of the dry forces in his district and that he was unjustly influenced by them as chairman of the judiciary committee. The attack was so vicious and unlooked for that it met with a prompt rebuke from the house. Even members who are opposed to prohibition realized that Mr. Tinkham had overshot the mark, and the motion to table the resolution was immediately adopted by a large majority. On motion of Mr. Dyer, of Missouri, who is opposed to prohibition, the resolution was expunged from the record, as being unworthy of the consideration of the house, by a vote of 141 to 3. Mr. Tinkham and two wet members from New York were the only congressmen to support the resolution. Many members of congress consider it a very effective rebuke to the liquor interests, and the finest vote of confidence ever given to a member of the house of representatives.

inneota Masco

SPEECH BY VOLSTEAD

Continued from Page 1.

passenger rates; that he had opposed the Federal Reserve Act; that he has favored and is fighting for the so called Great Lakes waterway to the sea. These things have all been of vital interest to the Wall Street people and they have been on the opposite side from Mr. Volstead every time.

He touched briefly upon the prohibition amendment and the Volstead Act and said that he had no apology to make for what he had done in drafting the law that would carry out the provisions of the Constitution. He said that the amendment was a dry amendment and if those who now were loudest in their demand for beer and light wine could have their way they would bring back 95 per cent of the saloon business, for the statistics of the brewers themselves showed that this class of liquor constituted just that per cent of the total business of the saloons. If you bring back 95 per cent of the business of the saloon how much is there of the saloon that you do not bring back?

Letters to the Editor

Editor Canby News:

I have lived through a good many political campaigns, but for the amount of filth, lies, misrepresentations, and rank abuse, I never saw anything to equal what we have now. I am glad though, to note that this vulgar method is very much one-sided. Most newspapers show a certain degree of dignity and the American spirit of fairness to opponents, political and otherwise, but the Canby Non-Partisan paper seems to lack all ethics and is throwing filth and dirt like a manure spreader. They are of course killing their own goose and digging their own grave, which is perfectly all right as far as that goes, but the way they are misrepresenting the ex-service men while trying to hide behind their backs is making of themselves a public nuisance and should be so treated by all respectable citizens. I happen to know a lot of ex-service men and I never hear them demand special privileges for what they have done. They simply go about their business, knowing they have done their duty and will do it again when circumstances demand it. A real hero never makes much noise about his own brave acts. It appears to me as remarkable that the service men tolerate being pushed to public notice and allow themselves to be tricked into a false situation.

As to the Press' noise about the Canby Post Office matter, the people of Canby don't want any change there. Efficiency is the middle name of our Postmaster. It takes years of training to be efficient or even barely qualified for a position like that. They are public servants and

unless aspirants can prove absolutely as well or better trained and to be equally or more efficient than our present Postmaster, we want to hold onto a good thing until a better one shows up.

If Congressman Volstead is to blame (the Press says he is) for letting us keep the good thing we already have, he should be thanked and admired for refusing to sacrifice efficiency in favor of an inexperienced and untrained novice.

I respect anybody's political belief and ambitions as long as they are not detrimental to the State and Nation, our laws and institutions. I am not a Republican, so don't speak partisan. I sympathize with the so called farmer's movement, although I don't believe they will gain a nickel's worth of benefit from their present political leadership. I had intended to vote a part of their ticket—governor and state legislature—but I have enough sense to appreciate the value of our own present Congressman Volstead, undoubtedly the best friend the farmers ever had in Congress, who has now attained a position where he is as well known in every nook and corner of our vast land as is the president, if not more so. The eyes of the whole United States—yes, of the whole world—are on the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota. If Mr. Volstead is so unimportant and such a friend of the moneyed interest as the Press and cohorts try to make out, then why are these same moneyed interests so anxious to get rid of him? Enough so that they have promised fortunes to get rid of him. If they are too blind to see; too rank radical stubborn to admit if they do see, words are wasted on all such. I assure you I am proud of being in the Seventh District of Minnesota. It means something to know that I have written a bigger piece in world history than Napoleon, that I have helped do more for mankind and civilization, abolished more poverty, more

crime, and created more happiness than any other living or dead man in history. I say I have done this and I mean it that way. Mr. Volstead is my servant and representative and is handling these matters for me down here in Washington. If you can not feel like that, then where is your patriotism?

Don't fool yourselves, my friends. Prohibition is the issue all right, although they are now trying to sidestep it. They thought it a good piece of strategy to use a minister's cloak to hide the wolf back of it, and use the church as a cover and a means to cut the ties and unlock the prison doors for John "Booze" Barleycorn. How many will fall for it? I hope there is enough serious, thinking element in the Seventh Congressional District to forever bury this hydra-headed monster. Let us be thinking, patriotic men and women and not dupes.

THE REAL ISSUE IS BOOZE, AND DON'T YOU FORGET IT!

—G. A. O.

Canby News
Fish Lake Facts
From Our Own Correspondent

family, ac

Oct 27 1922
DID HE SAY IT?

Hassville Intelligencer
Appleton Press—A report is in circulation that Congressman Volstead in his campaign speech at Canby recently stated that "a bunch of old soaks at Appleton had maneuvered an endorsement of O. J. Kvale for congress in what was called a democratic district convention and Mr. Kvale is claiming an endorsement thru this of the Democratic party."

It is difficult to believe that the congressman even in his present desperate attempt to retain his congressional position would stoop to such grossly insulting and libelous remarks.

If he did make such a remark as this in any of his campaign speeches the fact will undoubtedly be verified and the individual ladies and gentlemen who composed the convention may find it necessary to call upon Mr. Volstead to define his term "old soaks" and insist that he prove his contention.

If he did not make such a remark anywhere then in justice to these people and to himself the congressman should if he feels so inclined take opportunity to deny that he did and substantiate his denial with some reliable proof.

Should Mr. Volstead or his managers desire to take any official notice of this report The Press would be pleased to receive and to print anything they may have to say on the matter.

The 1922 Democratic Seventh District Congressional convention held at Appleton in March was called, organized and conducted its business under the existing laws of the state of Minnesota. Should Mr. Volstead or his managers desire to delve into the proceedings of that convention or into the record and character

of the ladies and gentlemen who composed it, it is stated here that M. J. McGowan of Appleton is the permanent chairman and Mrs. A. L. Hanson of Dawson is the permanent secretary of the Seventh district democratic organization and the records of the meeting, together with the names of the delegates seated in the convention are available to them.

Boyd Bulletin

Oct. 20, 1922

Volstead's Speech Well Received.

Andrew J. Volstead, representative in congress from this district, addressed a good sized audience from the village and community at the Boyd Opera House Wednesday afternoon. In his hour and a half's talk he was given close attention, and the generous applause at its conclusion indicated approval. E.P. Johnson presided and had the audience sing the first stanza of "America" before introducing the speaker.

In his opening remarks Mr. Volstead called attention to his opposition to Canadian reciprocity in farm products; that he introduced the first bill in congress to prevent railroads from issuing watered bonds and stocks and also the first bill to have the government lease instead of sell its coal lands, enumerating his support of various other measures—all in opposition to so-called "Big Business".

During his speech Mr. Volstead spoke at some length on the bill he drafted, fought for for many years and secured its passage, the one known as the "Volstead Co-operative Market-Act", which gives to farmers the right to form co-operative marketing associations. The farmers have and are right now benefiting greatly because of this measure.

Speaking on the Esch-Cummins law Mr. Volstead explained fully its provisions, calling attention to the fact that this very law is now being made use of in compelling railroad companies to furnish cars for the hauling of coal, and in this state to get cars to move the potato crop. The charge that it guaranteed a certain per cent of earnings to the railroad was met by Mr. Volstead by an offer of \$100.00 to anyone proving that this law contained any such provision.

On the subject of the protective tariff law Mr. Volstead showed by its schedules that it is decidedly in favor of the farmers, placing an import duty on all farm products and admitting free farm machinery and other farm necessities. The speaker gave a list of wheat prices both before and after this law went into effect, showing that under this law wheat prices were from 18 to 25c higher in Chicago than Winnipeg.

In conclusion Mr. Volstead touched briefly on prohibition and the enforcement act bearing his name. He imparted the information that fourteen bills for the modification of the enforcement act were "sleeping" in the Judiciary Committee, of which he is the chairman, and that if he was returned would continue to slumber on.

The same forces are opposing the Republican state ticket all down the line and particularly the election of Volstead to Congress, though here the fight is more emphatically a fight of the liquor interests, a fight to bring booze back to our country. The wets knew they could not win with a man who was a "wet" open and above board so they are backing a preacher who is known to be a dry but whose influence in Congress would be nothing more than the wind that blows. It is not the man so much the wets want to get as it is to make vacant the place he holds as chairman of the most powerful committee in Congress and his place to be taken by a Congressman who is on the wet side, a man from the factory districts of the east who cares but little for the farmer of the west. Right here it might be well to add that the senators and congressmen from the east, which is manufacturing and mining district, have never seemed able to comprehend the tremendous part the agriculture of the west plays in the life of the nation, is in fact the basis of the national life, and have never been anxious at all to give the farm its just dues.

The big question in this election, or rather the real issue in this state is do we want strikes paralyzing the industries and welfare of the the state or dont we—do we want booze back or dont we? We are paying for two strikes right now and before winter is over we are going to pay a lot more. Kellogg and Volstead say strikes must stop. What do you say Mr. Voter? You, Mr. Farmer, who cannot get coal to heat your home nor cars to ship your produce because the labor unions would not be satisfied with six times the wages you are getting for the same hours a day?

Manley Falls
 Oct 1921
 Press
 Oct 20/22
MANLEY

NUMBER 4

Says Women Will Vote For Volstead

Miss Grace Kaercher and her sister, and Mrs. Manley Fosseen, the first two from Ortonville and the last named from Minneapolis, drove thru Minneota Wednesday, stopping for dinner at the Hotel Pacific. Miss Grace Kaercher is candidate for Clerk of the Supreme Court of this state, being a nominee of the Republican Convention. Mrs. Fosseen is traveling thru the district in the interest of the Republican state ticket. We asked her what she found to be the sentiment among the women voters as to Congressman in the Seventh district and she said that wherever she went she found the women had not changed their minds as to Volstead, from their stand of two years ago, and that he would get the bulk of the women vote. "The women," said Mrs. Fosseen, "have no desire to punish Mr. Volstead for his stand on the liquor question."—Minneota Mascot.

Oct 20/22

THE MONTEVIDEO NEWS

Volstead Speaks Here Next Friday, Oct. 27th

Congressman A. J. Volstead is coming to Montevideo Friday, Oct. 27, to deliver a campaign address at the Opera house, his local committee announced Wednesday. The Congressman has spent the past two weeks campaigning, chiefly in the northern part of the district, and has had large audiences, newspaper reports state. Published summaries of his speeches indicate that he is going down the line of charges made against him by his opponents and is giving a factful review of his record. Republican women of the county are taking special interest in next Friday's meeting.

Curtis Johnson of Rush City, a nationally known speaker on community co-operation, has been secured to give a speech at Clara City Wednesday night, October 25, for the Republican state and district ticket.

James H. Woertendyke of Chicago, one of the men sent out by the Flying Squadron, a national prohibition organization, is to speak in Montevideo Thursday, Oct. 26, at 2:30 p. m., holding an open air meeting on main street.

VOLSTEAD DENOUNCES U. S. RAIL OPERATION

Proves itself
"Let Roads and Strikers Fight It Out" Without Federal Interference, Is Advice.

Proposals that the government take over and operate the railroads were denounced by Representative Andrew J. Volstead of Minnesota, father of the prohibition enforcement act, in St. Paul Monday on his return to Washington.

"What good can the government accomplish by taking over the roads when the strike is now against the government," Mr. Volstead asked. "Let the strikers and the roads fight it out; they might as well fight it out now as later. I believe if we can get back there and get together we can break the strike.

"The trouble will be that many of the representatives will not vote straight. They will play politics. Why, I have seen the House scared to death because Samuel Gompers happened to be seated in the gallery. Whatever the emergency, I am against the government taking over the roads. I believe that the business of the country is willing that it should be a fight to a finish.

"What we ought to do is nationalize the Kansas Industrial court. Then we could deal with the situation.

"What the Democrats in Congress will do is hard to tell. They will do anything they can to cause trouble. It looks to me that they will doubtless side with the strikers.

"Taking over the roads would be a big mistake. It would cost the government an enormous sum and would give the strikers everything they want, because Congress would not have the backbone to refuse their demands. They gave them everything before and they would do it again."

Representative Volstead left St. Paul for Washington Monday night.

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

If Volstead is defeated the next chairman of the committee will be wet, and therefore there is danger of wet legislation being passed by Congress.

This is the claim by Mr. Volstead's supporters. But the claim is not supported by facts.

At the trial at Benson, in July, 1920, Mr. Volstead testified, that he as chairman could not "run the committee." Mr. Volstead was under oath at the time, and told the truth. No chairman can control a committee. No measure can be reported out by a committee unless a majority of the members vote in favor of it.

The present committee is overwhelmingly dry. And even if the next House should have both a wet chairman and a majority of wet members of the Judiciary Committee, that could not result in any wet legislation being passed by the House, unless a majority of Congressmen were wet, and would vote wet.

In the Minnesota House of Representatives, in 1915, the chairman and a majority of members of the Temperance Committee were "as wet as drowned rats." And still the House passed the County Option bill and other temperance legislation. Why? Because a majority of the members were dry. The same rule of procedure obtains in the national House of Representatives. No one acquainted with facts will deny this.

So far as legislation is concerned it all depends on having a majority of dries in the Senate and in the House.

The enforcement of the Prohibition law is not in the hands of Congress, but rests with the enforcement officers and the people.

Rev. O. J. Kvale is opposed to the liquor traffic and is endorsed by all the dries who are progressives, both men and women.

William Jennings Bryan who two years ago endorsed Mr. Volstead, has refused to do so in this campaign, after learning that Mr. Kvale is a pronounced dry and stands on the Eighteenth Amendment and the Prohibition Enforcement Act. Here is Mr. Bryan's statement:

"Where both candidates are equally pledged to Prohibition and to enforcement of prohibition laws, and can be equally trusted to keep their pledges, Prohibition ceases to be an issue."

Vote for a man who is dry from principle, and not as a matter of politics.

(Prepared and circulated by W. E. Boie, Appleton, secretary, Mr. Gust Langved, Benson, and Mr. O. T. Ramsland, Sacred Heart.)

THE MAYNARD NEWS

Published Every Friday at
Maynard, Minn.

F. E. CHILD, Editor and Publisher

Entered at the Post Office at Maynard, Minnesota as Second Class Mail Matter Under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

The 7th district decided two years ago that it would best be served by sending Congressman Volstead back—they will do so again.—Milan Standard:

Another Endorsement

The clipping given below, from the Fairmont Sentinel (Democratic), expresses our opinion, as well as that of many others:

All over the country a defeat for Volstead would be hailed as a wet victory. It would displace a

dry congressman from the chairmanship of the judiciary committee, which has charge of prohibition legislation, and put in his place a wet congressman.—Minneapolis Journal.

It delights our soul to be able to agree with the esteemed Journal on one political proposition. The defeat of Volstead would be a worldwide calamity. The Sentinel hopes that every decent democrat in the Seventh District will vote for him.

Why there is any necessity to make a change we cannot understand. Most of us agree that Mr. Volstead is a good man and that he has done excellent service for his state and district. So why put an un-tried man in his place? Will a new man have the influence or command the attention that Mr. Volstead receives? Will a new and untried man get any recognition from the house at all? These are things that should receive attention by

the voters.

Rev. Kvale is a good prescher, for that has been his profession. But does he know anything about law, especially constitutional law, or is he well versed on political economy, or has the makeup of a statesman? We think not, and think that he had better stick to the pulpit instead of adventuring upon unknown waters. Rev. Kvale is trying to serve God and mammon—"it can't be did." And he knows that his election would be a set-back to the cause of temperance, tho he may preach temperance, sometimes.

Oct. 20, 1922

**VOLSTEAD MARKED FOR DEFEAT
BECAUSE OF HIS SKULLDUGGERY**

Blocking of Daugherty Impeachment Proceedings One of the Most Shameless Acts of Present Congress—Was Sequel to Protection of War Grafters and Profiteers.

REMEMBER

These are the Congressmen who blocked the impeachment proceedings against Attorney General Daugherty by precipitately adjourning the hearing until next December—**AFTER THE ELECTION.**

Every one is a candidate for reelection. **EVERY ONE SHOULD BE DEFEATED.**

Don't forget the names:

VOLSTEAD of Minnesota, **DYER** of Missouri, **FOSTER** of Ohio, **YATES** of Illinois, **HICKEY** of Indiana, **CHRISTOPHERSON** of South Dakota, and **CHANDLER** of New York.

By **Basil M. Manly,**
Director People's Legislative Service.

In the inglorious record of the session of Congress which has just adjourned, two cases of shameless political skullduggery stand out glaringly. Both were committed with the same object—the protection of Attorney General Daugherty from investigation.

The first of these acts of congressional sabotage was the "pocket veto" by Representative Campbell of Kansas of the Woodruff resolution to investigate the refusal of the Attorney General to prosecute war frauds and war grafters. The second was the adjournment, by Representative Volstead of Minnesota of the hearing of the impeachment charges against Attorney General Daugherty, so as to suppress for the present the overwhelming evidence against him. Congressman Campbell' action at least required some courage for he had to face the protests in the House of Representatives.

Congressman Volstead's action had not even this small merit—he merely adjourned the hearings and ran away.

The Woodruff resolution for the investigation of the Attorney General's failure to prosecute the war grafters was introduced simultaneously by two Republican war veterans—Woodruff of Michigan and Johnson of South Dakota. This resolution was ordered favorably reported by the committee on rules, but Campbell, the chairman, contemptuously refused to carry out the directions of the committee and lay it before the House. He pocketed the resolution and relied on the huge machine majority to protect him. They did. But he forgot the American people.

Voters Make Quick Reprisal on Campbell.

When the Kansas primaries came a few weeks later, Campbell, who had been in the House for 20 years and considered himself unbeatable, was snowed under by an avalanche of indignant American voters. He is now retired to political oblivion, and has been punished for his act.

The impeachment of Attorney General Daugherty by Representative Keller was the inevitable sequel to the pocketing of the Woodruff resolution. Although it was made immediately following the application by the Attorney General for an injunction which violated the Bill of Rights of the Constitution, this was simply "the last straw that broke the camel's back."

For months the administration of the Department of Justice by Attorney General Daugherty has been a national scandal. His protection of the war grafters from prosecution in the face of evidence of the grossest frauds, involving more than a billion dollars; his refusal to prosecute cases under the Sherman anti-trust law against profiteering combinations, after evidence had been placed in his hands by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Lockwood committee of the New York legislature; his blocking of the prosecution of corporations criminally indicted under the Sherman anti-trust law; his recommendation of pardons for the head of The Trust and for a rich criminal who had been convicted under the Mann white slave act; his attempt to modify the meat packers' decree, so as to give them a monopoly of the wholesale grocery business—had been arousing ever-increasing indignation throughout the country.

This had been brought to a fever heat by the revelations of his activities in securing the pardon of the banker Morse on fraudulent grounds of ill health. Congressional investigation of the activities of the Attorney General had, however, been prevented by the pocketing of the Woodruff resolution, by the cutting off of general debate in the Senate during the consideration of the tariff bill, and by the adjournment of the House.

Steam Roller Prevents Keller Making Speech

Representative Keller, in bringing his impeachment, made seven specific charges against the Attorney General, only one of which related to the injunction proceeding in Chicago. The others set forth, in unmistakable language, the improper activities of the Attorney General which have been cited above. The only reason that Representative Keller in presenting his impeachment did not make a speech, citing in detail each of the activities of the Attorney General of which he complained, was that the Republican steam roller was used to prevent his speech and to force a reference of his resolution to the judiciary committee without debate.

Representative Volstead, chairman of the judiciary committee, set Saturday, September 17, as the day for the first meeting of his committee on the impeachment charges. These preliminary meetings are always informal and are intended only to establish the procedure and set a date at which witnesses will be heard.

Instead of following this time-honored procedure, Chairman Volstead attempted to force Representative Keller to proceed immediately with the hearings, without being given an opportunity to summon his witnesses.

Keller very properly demanded his right to be represented by counsel and sufficient time to summon his witnesses, most of whom had to be called from a distance. He asked for an adjournment until the following Thursday, but Chairman Volstead insisted that the hearings must proceed immediately, as it would be unfair to the Attorney General to leave such grave charges in suspense for even a few days. He insisted that Keller must produce his witnesses on the following Tuesday.

On Sunday Representative Keller went to New York and spent the entire day going over his evidence with Samuel Untermyer, counsel for the Lockwood committee, and former counsel for the Public congressional committee, which, in 1913, exposed the control of Wall Street over the wealth and industry of the country. The Monday morning papers carried the news that Untermyer would probably act as counsel for Keller, and that Frank P. Walsh, former chairman of the Industrial Relations Commission, would be his associate counsel.

When this news was published, the Republican leaders were panic-stricken. They knew that Daugherty could not stand up against the cross-examination of two lawyers like Untermyer and Walsh. Representative Volstead called his judiciary committee together, and without any notice to Keller, and by a strict partisan vote, adjourned the hearings until December.

On Saturday Volstead would not consent to postpone the hearings even until the following Thursday, on the ground that it would be unfair to the Attorney General, but before 12 o'clock on Monday, he adjourned them until December.

Thus Attorney General Daugherty was given three months of grace before the shameful record of his administration of the Department of Justice can be investigated. Volstead pulled the Attorney General's chestnuts out of the fire, but the best observers in Washington express the opinion that, like Campbell of Kansas, Volstead burned his fingers.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12,

CONGRESSMAN VOL- STEAD HERE MONDAY

ADDRESSES AFTERNOON MEETING
AT EMPRESS THEATRE—
EVENING AT ALEXAN-

Osakis Review

Congressman A. J. Volstead addressed a gathering at Osakis Monday afternoon that about half filled the Empress theatre, and gave an account of his stewardship that favorably impressed all who heard him. He started off with summing up of the things the Republican party has been trying to do to relieve the situation caused by the World War, in the matter of cutting down expenses in government, introduction of a budget system, passage of the emergency tariff bill and later the Fordney law. He quoted statistics to prove that regardless of the claim of the opposition, the emergency tariff had proven of real benefit in stabilizing the prices for wheat, cattle and dairy products for the past year, in face of a falling market.

America was, he said, unable to export their surplus farm products because Europe was unable to buy, and through the War Finance Association and Farm Loan Association a good deal was accomplished to alleviate the situation. He said that people in the East are fast beginning to realize that the country cannot have permanent prosperity until prosperity returns to the farm, as the rural population consumes 42 percent of the output of the factory and mill. The late session of Congress had passed a law that would now stand the legal test, he hoped, to give the secretary of agriculture power to control livestock and grain exchanges, and granting co-operative marketing associations the right of membership in the exchanges.

He touched briefly on the opposition he had encountered in securing the passage of the Farmers' Co-operative Marketing Act of which he was the author, and praised the prominent and useful co-operation he had from Senator Kellogg in securing the passage of this measure so much demanded by the agricultural interests of the country. If the farmers are to enjoy the highest measure of prosperity, they have got to combine in a business way to meet the changing conditions, said Mr. Volstead, and sell their own products by a system similar to that adopted by the farmers of European countries.

Mr. Volstead said his opponent has had much to say about the Esch-Cummins railroad law and in an illuminating defense of the bill made it clear just what the bill is and what it has done.

"It has been claimed," he said, "that the government is guaranteeing 6 per cent interest on watered stocks and bonds, including every penny that the railways claim they have invested in the roads. These statements are utterly false. There is no provision in the law that permits anything of the kind.

"When the government took over the roads during the war it promised to pay for their use a rental equal to their average earnings during the three preceding years. The government had no power to take the roads without paying for their use any more than it could take any other property without paying for it. When the government came to turn the roads back to their owners it was evident that it would take some time for the owners to reorganize them, and to save them from this loss for which the government acknowledged responsibility, it agreed that during that period, which was limited to six months, it would see that the roads earned as much during that time as they would have if the government continued to pay rent for those six months. This is the only guaranty the government ever gave the railways. The claim that they are guaranteed 6 per cent income or any other rate, for two years thereafter is absolutely false. During those two years the roads earned, according to the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, less than 3 per cent, and the railroads have never claimed any such guaranty. The claim is nothing but reckless propaganda.

"The claim that the Esch Cummins law permits freight and passenger rates to be based on watered stocks and bonds is a part of the same propaganda, and so is the claim that the amount invested in the roads determines their value. The law does not authorize anything of the kind, but directs that rates must be based upon the actual value of the roads. The

Interstate Commerce Commission valued the roads for rate-making purposes at about \$1,000,000,000 less than the railroads claimed to have paid in to them, and added not a penny to that valuation because of any outstanding stocks or bonds.

"The Esch-Cummins law is the most drastic railroad law that has ever been passed. Under it the government practically runs the roads. They can not issue a dollar of stock or of bonds without getting permission from the Interstate Commerce Commission to do so. They must keep books showing every dollar that they receive and pay out, and the officers are under heavy penalties for any false entries in such books. They must report annually and are under close governmental supervision. The rates they charge for freight and passengers are fixed by this government commission, and practically everything that the roads can do is subject to its control. If any road earns more than 6 per cent upon the actual value of its property, one-half of all sums earned in excess of 6 per cent must be paid to the government and a part of the other half must be held by the road to care for its needs in lean years. To adjust disputes between the roads and their employes, it creates a board to determine what are proper wages and conditions of employment. It is this provision that has arrayed against it the hostility of labor, and the reason for it is that for the first time in the history of this kind of legislation the public is given representation upon such a board."

The Tariff Law

"The Republicans have written the emergency tariff law into a permanent tariff law," said the speaker, "and the law just passed is the lowest tariff law the Republican party ever passed. We have placed farm machinery, twine, lumber, shoes, harness, coal, gasoline, oil, etc. on the free list and have placed duties on manufactured articles that are so freely imported by the large department stores. If we are to get down to normal, we must get to work and make our goods at home. We are confronted by an unfortunate practice of profiteering that Congress cannot control, because the bulk of the profiteering is interstate business over which the federal government has no power, but if the people will give us time things will be gradually brought back to pre-war conditions.

The Dry Issue

My opponent is attempting to make the people of the district believe that Prohibition is not an issue in this campaign. If it is not why were two issues of that notorious publication known as "Moonshine" circulated over this district, why are scores of congressmen seeking re-election on a wet platform, and why is every county in this district being organized by the radical wet element to encourage my defeat, asked the speaker.

THIRD PARTY DE- NOUNCE OLDHEADS

Rev. O. J. Kvale, Candidate for Congress in This District Presents
His Case in Colonial
Tuesday

CALL FOR NEW ALLIANCE

Present Administration and Past Is
Branded as Reactionary and Un-
progressive. D. H. Evans Urges
More Intelligent Exercise
of Elective Franchise

Rev. O. J. Kvale of Benson, candidate for representative from the 7th district, opened his campaign in Tracy Tuesday afternoon in the Colonial Theatre before a fair sized crowd.

Mr. Kvale who is opposing Rep. A. J. Volstead for re-election to congress spent most of his time in criticism of his opponent's record. He announced a progressive platform at the close of his address and made an earnest plea for voter support. The speaker is an able platform orator and has the ability of making the most of his subject. The comments of a number following the meeting was that he was a clever politician.

Taking up the main argument being used by the dry forces that Volstead was needed in congress to insure effective prohibition, he sought to impress upon his audience that congress had final say in all legislation, and indirectly that Volstead could not accomplish any more in dry legislation than any other member. This statement he sought to strengthen by citing the unusual situation in this state during the war, when the Minnesota legislature with about 60 counties already dry enacted a prohibition law for the state over the heads of the wet committee that had it in charge.

Taking up the record of the present congressman he found nothing of value in his twenty odd years of service. He was branded as a reactionary and friend of the big interests. No opportunity was lost to charge upto the present and past administrations all the present depression and ills which have come as an aftermath of the greatest war in the history of man. The present representative was roundly scored for his part in the enactment of the Esch-Cummings act and the guarantee of a certain income to railroads. The talk of lower taxes he branded as a mere smoke-screen to conceal the enormous taxes which the government and corporations were preparing to levy on the common people thru a high tariff.

The speaker charged the Federal reserve board with a wilful design to profit by a deflation of prices which he claimed has cost the American farmer \$11,000,000,000 and the laboring man over \$7,000,000,000. He charged that the reserve banks speculated in its loans to the disadvantage of the farmer, and cited John Skelton Williams in proof of this statement. On the speaker's table was a large bundle of clippings from various scores to which he frequently referred but from which he quoted but little. Close attention was given the speaker during his address.

Mr. Knutson of Cottonwood, chairman of the meeting, next called upon Mr. D. H. Evans of this city who gave an excellent talk on the duty of the voter to inform themselves on the real issues of the campaign and to vote according to their convictions. He voiced the opinion of the speaker before him, Rev. Kvale, that there was no place in this country for revolution when everyone except criminals had the right to vote. He sought to show that it was not only the privilege, but the duty of every voter to exercise his or her suffrage intelligently. The present administration was branded as catering to the large interests to the ruination of the common people. The Democrats were put in the same class. The railroad policy and that of the reserve system was roundly denounced. The speaker in closing made an eloquent appeal for the voters to cut loose from the two old parties and align themselves with the new party with the assurance that they would win.

Mr. Solberg, of Yellow Medicine county, and a candidate for state senator, spoke briefly because of the late hour.

*Tracy Headley H. Donald
Oct. 20, 1922*

Norig

Redaktion og ekspedition:
Kvernådalgt. 6.

Redaktør:
Olav Hauge.

Telefonar:
Redaktionen: nr. 575.
Ekspeditionen: 650.

Bladpriser:
12 Måneder kr. 20,00
Halvåret » 10,00
Firdøgnsgaaret » 5,00

Offer til avguden.

Sekretariatet for den faglege landsorganisationen til dei norske arbeidarane hev i ein artikkel teke inn ein statistikk yver streikeutgiftene dei siste 10 aari. Den ser slik ut:

| | |
|------|---------------|
| 1911 | kr. 1,003,328 |
| 1912 | 469,866 |
| 1913 | 150,309 |
| 1914 | 205,806 |
| 1915 | 554,526 |
| 1916 | 1,384,592 |
| 1917 | 153,867 |
| 1918 | 402,955 |
| 1919 | 1,585,241 |
| 1920 | 3,395,014 |

Til alle desse millionar kroner kjem so den arbeidsfortenesta som hev gjenge tapt, noko ein sjølv sagt ikkje hev statistikk yver, men ein vil skyna at det gjeng upp i langt større summar enn det som streikane beinveges hev kosta.

Sanneleg, det er velduge summar, dei organiserte arbeidarane hev ofra!

Og ein maa spyrja um arbeidarane hev fenge so mykje att at dei hev vederlag for desse store ofri. Til det vil arbeidarar sjølve svara at desse utgiftene hev vore naudsynte for aa føra den harde kampen for betre løner og livekaar. Det er turvande krigsumkostnader.

Me hev set at i romslege oppgangstider hadde organisationane krigslukka med seg. Verre er det i tronge nedgangstider, daa er det arbeidsgjevarane som hev alle fyremunar paa si side.

Denne stadige striden millom arbeidar og arbeidsgjevar fær ein skiftande karakter, snart er det den eine part og snart den andre som gjeng av med sigeren. Men arbeidarane hev ei kolbrennartru paa kamporganisationen, det vert religion for dei, og dei er alltid reide til aa ofra det som krevst til denne avguden, denne graaduge Molok. Men det er greidt at dei med dette ikkje vinn noko av varande verd, det er som aa kasta pengane i eit botnlaust sluk. Til vaars stend arbeidarane meir trygt enn nokon gong fyrr. Og avguden krev stadig meir av offer.

Alle desse millionane som er lagt paa altaren hans, kunde vore spart dersom me hadde havt tvungen skiltsdom. Og dei store summar kunde vore nytta t. d. til samyrkertilak som arbeidarane hev fenge varig nytte og utbyte av.

Politisk løn?

Heddal skal ha ny lensmann. Det hev meldt seg mange habile søkjarar, baade innanbygds og utanbygds. Som mest alltid ved lensmannstilsetjingar vert det og so her strid i bygdi um kven som bør ha umbodet. Og utfallet i heradstyret vert avhengig av korleis heradstyret er samansett. I Heddal heradstyre hev no kommunistane tilfellegvis fleirtal. Og daa ordf. som er millom søkjarane ogso er kommunist, fær han so vidt fleirtal som nr. 1. Alle som ein av partibrørne hans røysta paa honom. I makt av sitt knipne fleirtal trumfa dei sin mann igjenom.

Naar daa «Telemark Arbeiderblad» skriv at det «ser ut som at lensmandsansettelsen i Heddal ikke skal løpe av uten intriger og kjøkkentrap-politik», so er det soleis syrgjeleg sant, men ikkje på den maaten som bladet meiner. Det er dess eigne partifrender som hev byrja med intriger. Kan godt vera at hr. Moen er ein dugande mann, men at han for skuld makelaus dugleik skulde vera sjølvskreven, stend ingenstad skrive. Dersom det hadde vore slik, hadde det sjølv sagt inkje aa seia kva politisk yvertyding mannen hev, — um det enn kan vera mange som meiner at den som skal vaka yver lovi, sjølv bør respektera landsens lov og fleirtalsrett.

Men naar det gjeld eit lensmannsombod, maa det einaste av gjerande vera aa faa den som hev den største dugleiken og ellest hev aalmenn vyrdnad og tiltru in nan bygdi.

Av søkjarane var kanskje dei mest kvalifiserte millom dei utan bygds, men naar heradstyret ynskjer aa ha ein mann fraa bygdi, er det rimeleg at det vert so. Dei som hev det avgjerande ord i lensmannstilsetjingi, er sjølv sagt ikkje bunde av eit vedtak av eit tilfeldig knipe fleirtal. Dei hev berre aa taka saklege, reelle omsyn og tilsetja den som dei finn bygdi best tent med.

Ei side av saki som ein ikkje maa leggja mindst vekt paa, er at Heddal — som hev innført nynorsken i alle skulekrinsar so nær som ein — fær ein lensmann som syner loyalitet i maalspursmaalet.

Kva ein kan venta av hr. Halvor Moen i so maate, syner skrivet nedanfor fraa ungdomslagi i bygdi.

Til

Fylkesutvalet i Telemark.

Innstillingane til lensmannsombodet i Heddal bli av ungdommen i bygdi fylgt med den største interesse. Og det er kje meir enn rett og rimeleg! For det er daa nettupp millom deim som no er ungdom, at storparten av arbeidet til den nye lensmannen vil koma til aa falle.

Den heradstyreinnstillingi som no ligg fyre, er slettes ikkje noko uttrykk for ein klar folkevilje, sidan no. 1, hr. ordf. Moen, ikkje eingong hev halvparten av heradstyret paa si sida.

Med desse ting for auga finn me det — som formenner i dei tri ungdomslag i bygdi — paa sin plass aa minna det vyrde fylkesutval um at hr. ordf. Moen ikkje kan vera den rette mannen til lensmannsombodet i Heddal.

I den vesle heite maaldebatten i heradstyret no nyleg dokumenterar han paa ein fullnøggjande maate at han heilt ignorerer ungdomen naar dei bed um at defra eige maal maa bli nytta meir i offentleg styr og stell.

Det er elles ikkje berre hans bratte stoda til maalsaki som har harma ungdomen. Det er kanskje like mykje dei ufjelge midlar som han motarbeidar ungdomens merkesaker med.

I Lisleherad ungdomslag ligg fyre vedtak som paalegg styret aa arbeida for aa faa Lisleherad til offentleg mann paa staden. No i sumar hev Lisleherad-namnet vorte handsama fleire gonger i Heddals form.skap. Det laag no i ungdomslaget interesse aa faa utskrifter av vedk. merkelege vedtak, som hr. ordf. Moen visseleg hev storparten av æra for. Form. i L.u. bed um utskriftene. Men hr. ordf. Moen nektar. Form. spør seg fyre hjaa fylkesmannen um det kan nektast sovorne utskrifter. Fylkesmannen svarar i formannens favør. Form. yverlevar den 18de januar d. a. hr. ordf. Moen fylkesmannens fraasegn og bøn um utskriftene so snart raad er. Men hr. ordf. Moen som nok ikkje hev reint mjøl i posen, finn det tenleg for seg aa drygge det ut. Og so hev form. til dags dato ingen utskrifter fenge.

Under desse umstende torer me be det vyrde fylkesutval nemna ut ein lensmann som hev fyresetnaden for aa kunna yte den naudsynlege sympati og tillit hjaa den oppveksande slekt i Heddal. Heddal den 9de febr. 1922.

Med høgvyrdnad

R. Kaasa,

form. i Lisleherad ungdomslag.

John E. Stivi,

formann i Vidar ungdomslag

Sv. Ingolfstrid,

formann i Nordbygdi ungd.

Bygd og By.

Me minner um

tilsetjingi i Festiviteten i kveld til innlekt for dei som hev let vundet i Nord-Norig. Programmet for tilsetjingi er so alsidust og formaalet so valktert, at Festiviteten vil verta fylt til siste plass.

Sjaa elles lysingj.

Til styrarinne

paa Bø gamleheim er tilsett Mari G. Bakkaas med ei aarlon av 1400 kr.

Bø heradstyre

vedtok i siste møte aa laana kr. 34000 i Bø sparebank til bygging av Mannebru.

— Likeins samr. veteke aa taka det turvande til bygging av Folkestadbrui av dei pengar som fyrr er avsett til vegbygging. 40 mann kan faa arbeid ved desse anleggi.

— Med 9 mot 8 r. vart det vedteke aa byggja nytt fbs paa Harpestaas komande sumar.

— Etter søknad vart Bø jordstyre samr. løyvd kr. 249,25 til aa dekkja utlogur til oppmøling og berekning av nybottsarbeid.

— O. Helland fekk samr. løyve til aa leggja telefonledning yver komm. sin eigeidom Grauteknapp.

— Til Ny jord sitt arbeid vart det løyvt kr. 30.

Bø stasjon

bør jarnbanestationen i Bø heite, uttalar heradstyret paa oppmøding fraa jarnbanestyret.

Telemarkingen som skreiv forbodslovi i U. S. A.



Andr. Volstead.

Redaktøren av dansk «Afholdsdagbladet», hr. Larsen-Ledet, skriv um denne merkelege mannen:

Det vyrde medlem fraa Minnesotas sjuande krins er utan sammanlikning den mest vidgjetne av alle Amerikas riksdagsmenn.

Hans stilling er eit utvista vitnemaal derum. Kvar dag fær han minst eit trugsmaalsbrev og reiser han eigong inmillom den lange veg fraa Washington til valkrinsen ved grensa til Sud-Dakota, so aatvarar «Den svarte hand» han fyraat: «Du er dødsdømd. Aldri ser du Kapitoilet meir!»

I midten av fyrr hundradtalet reiste eit par unge menneske frå Norig til «det fjerne Vesten».

Faren var fraa Vraalstad i Tørdal og mori fraa Oslo.

Utstyret var det vanlege: ein byllt fatige klæde og ein rikdom av gamall norøn ætt.

Desse tvo unge busette seg i Goodhue paa grensi millom Wisconsin og Minnesota der ein flokk av nordmenn nett heidt paa med aa leggja grunn til ein skandinavisk stat.

Her vart so Andreas Volstead ad som namnet vert skrive paa engelsk, fødd i 1860.

Her vaks so guten upp under strengt arbeid, tok til som ein vanleg tenar, vart lærar, jurist, politimeister og borgarmeister i Granite Falls, fylkesmann i Yellow Medicine County, altsaman i Minnesota, og endeleg i 1902 medlem av riksdagen i Washington, valt av republikanarane i Minne-

sotas sjuande krins.

I kongressen vart straks V. ein vel umtykt mann. Vart formann i lovtvalet, den vigugaste nemd i Kongressen, og i denne eigenskap var det at Volstead kom til aa skriva forbodslovi, og med det vart hans namn for alle tider knytt so fast til den mest vigtuge reform som til no er gjenomført i Amerika.

Volstead var ikkje avhaldsmaun. Han hadde, som dei fleste skandinavar i Riksdagen, røysta for forbod, men han hadde aldri lagt noko personlegt arbeid for saki, fyrr i den aller siste time, hans time.

Riksdagen i Washington hadde — med meir enn 2/3 fleirtal — vedteke at John Barlycorn (rusdrykkhandelen) skulde hengjast. Av dei 48 riksdage i enkelstatane hadde 45 gjeve tanken sin studnad.

Dermed var forbodet vedteke og det stod daa berre att aa skriva den tilleggslovi som fortalde korleis tanken skulde gjennomførast og seinare vernast um.

Dette var det Volstead so tok paa seg aa gjera.

Det var ikkje so like til. Det var ikkje so faa slike lovverk fyrr, men alt dette var berre ikkje aa seia. Men Volstead løyste oppgaa, og gjorde arbeidet frå seg paa ein meisterleg maate. I 67 prgf. lukkast det honom aa laga eit slikt pigtrådgj. til keiser Alkohol, at det ikkje til dessar hev vore turvande aa retta noko paa flettverket, so godt var det tvundet.

Ikkje berre aa skrive, men og so aa gjennomføra ei lov forstod hr. Volstead. Og daa Wilson gjorde «upphevelsar» yver eit eller anna slo Volstead i bordet for præsidenten og sa: Skrive skal staa! Og det vart staaande. Telemarkingen bar seiren heim.

Motmennene reiste sensasjon og meinte paa at slik ein mann aldri kunde verta attvald til kongressen. Ein «rødnaas» prest vart sett som motkandidat i Minnesotas 7de krins og dei ofra likeins nokre tusund dollars paa valet hans. Men det var faanyttes. For tiande gong vart Volstead valt med eit knusande fleirtal. Og han vert sitjande framleis.

Kvitseid heradstyre

(Framhald).

Varselbrev fraa Smaabrukarbanken dagsett 5. 10 f.a. og 7. og 13. d. m. um forfaldne laan, vart samr. sendt formannen i arbeidsnemdi med vanleg fullmakt til aa varetaka kommunaa si tarv.

— Skriv fraa Aslak Nordskog av 24. f. m. og skriv fraa Smaabr. bankens styre av 9. s. m. vart samr. sendt formannen i arbeidsnemdi medu pmoding um aa gjera det som trengst.

— Rundskriv fraa R. F. A. av novbr. f. a. um lønene til funksjonarane i krinssjukekassa, vart samr. sendt til styret i krinssjukekassa med ei oppmøding um aa uttala seg um lønsspursmaalet i krinssjukekassa i Kvitseid.

— Skriv fraa styret i R. F. A. av 8. m. um pensjon til forretningsfører og faste tenestmenn i sjukekassa, vart samr. sendt styret i krinssjukek. Heradst. gjeng ut fraa at spursmaalet um sjukekassa i tilfelle skal yvertaka pensionsinnkotet i tilfelle maa godkjennast av heradstyret.

— Restanceliste for provianteringsraadet og decisjon av rekneskaper for prov.raadet, vart

samr. utsett til neste møte.

— Telemark landbrukslag sender reglar for stutte landbrukskaid for smaabrukarar. Det vart samr. vedlagt møteboki.

— Søknad fraa Vraadals landbrukslag um kr. 150 i tilskot til ljøs og brenne for tvo vevkurs.

Heradst. vedtok samr. at dei ikkje kunde løyva noko til dette.

— Søknad fraa Aust-Telem. automobilselskap og Josef Bommen um løyve til aa køyra bil i ruta Kvitseid-Notodden sumaren 1922.

Heradst. vedtok samr. at dei vilde tilraade at desse tvo søknadene vart innvilga

— Søknad fraa L. Flatin um løyve til aa køyra bil fraa Seljord til Kvitseid.

Heradstyret uttala samr. at dei ikkje hadde noko imot dette.

— Søknad fraa Halvor Haugan um aafaa løyve til aa køyra lastebil i ruta Notodden—Kvitseid sumaren 1922.

Heradstyret uttala seg samr. mot denne søknaden.

— Søknad fraa Bj. T. Lia og Kjetil Teigen ved Sv. Gotuholdt um aa faa kaupa jord paa Uppigard Midtsund, vart samr. sendt nemdi for Uppigard Midtsund.

— Heradstyret oppnemde til aa revidera kommunerekneskaper, krinssjukekassa, prov.raadet og næringsnemdi sine rekneskaper Tor Larsen og furer Sundsbarm,

Her vart det "Norig" som printet i "Norig" og "Norig" som printet i "Norig".

frys burt klokkesang.
Stjerner brenn og glitrar.
Nordlys-skimmer
snøglans, glimmer.
Kva er livet?
Er det berre leik?
Fata morgana?
Hildring, illusion?
Vænleik, du er ei gaate!
Vigleik Velle.

Skirenn,

Manheim skule,

ytre Seljord, hadde skirenn paa Manheim sundag 5. febr. Det vart gjort mange stilfulle, lange hopp. Premilista ser slik ut:

1. klasse. 12—15 aar.

1. Johans Manheim
 2. Hans Sollid
 3. Olav Manheim
 4. Tov Rugtveit
 5. Halvor Rugtveit
- Iste umframpremie tilfall Eivind Manheim og 2dre Hans Sollid.

2. klasse. 7—12 aar.

1. Hans Manheim
 2. Torkjel Sollid
 3. Olav Gullbekk
 4. Isak Grave
 5. Sveinung Gullbekk
 6. Olav Grave
- Iste umframtpr. fekk Johans Manheim og 2dre Olav Gullbekk. Ytre Seljord 6. 2. 22.

Jon Bekkhus.

H. K. Aaland.
Telef. Ulefoss. Telef.
byd no fraa lager og etter tinging:
Spisestove, Soverom, Bufear, Bord, Komodar, Servantar, Dobb.og enkl. sengier, barne-sengier, stolar og taburettar.
Divanar paa kasse og bein.
Alt til rimelige priser.

Transportspand.
Avkjølingsspand.
Melkebøtter.
Melkesiler.
Silbrikker.
G. Coward.

A. L. Scholen
Etabl. 1847
Guldsmed
Guld, Sølv, Plat & Merskur
Forlovsringsringe.
Utvælg. Billige Priser.
Tlf. 120 c.

Attestar vert avskrivne og retkjende.
Alt avskrivningsarbeid og mangfoldiggjering vert motteke.
Ordres kan og sendast i posten.
Maskinavskrivningskontoret
i Skien A/S.
Torvgt. 3. Telefon 2505.

O. J. Frøberg's
Blomsterforretning
Prinsensgate - anbefales
KRANSE og BUKETTER leveres paa korteste varsel **BILLIGST**
Telefon 446.

Nyt i ———
Herre- og guttedresser
til rimelige priser.
—————
Johs. Odden & Co. A/S
Notodden.

„Folkets venn“
— redaktør Julius From —
Sandefjord
anbefales alle som ynder sund og god lesning. Bladet bringer stadig interessante fortellinger gode artikler om almene ting, dikte, opskrifter for hus og hjem m. v. Det utkommer med et 8-sidig illustreret nummer hver uke og koster med porto kun 2 kr. kvartalet. **Nye abonnenter**, som betaler bladet for siste kvartal i år og første 1922 med 4 kroner, får gratis — saa langt oplaget rekker — bladets store og smukke **julenummer** for 1920 og et likeså innholdsrikt og pent **julnr.** til jul i år. Julenumrenes bokladepris er 1 kr. pr. stykke.
Bestil „Folkets venn“ på nærmeste poststed.

Den beste margarin som fremstilles er
STAVANGER SMØRFABRIKS
SOLO
Kommissjonslager for Skiensfjorden og Telemarken hos
Gisholt & Co., Skien.
Telef. 2555. Telef. 2555.

A/S Skiensfjordens Annoncebureau.
(S.A.B.) — SKIEN — (S.A.B.)
Forretningsfører: **TRYGVE PEDERSEN.**
Besørger annonser til alle norske og utenlandske aviser og tidsskrifter til disse originalpriser.
Kun et manuskript nødvendig. — Hurtig ekspedition. — Grøtt oppgjør.
Kontor: Bragegården vis a vis brandstationen, Skien.
Telefon 838 og 942. Telegramadresse SAB, Skien.

Kjole-, Dragtstoffer
I stort utvalg. Billige Priser.
Sengeutstyr
Gardiner.
H. JOH. AASOLISEN
MANUFAKTURFORRETNING
(vis a vis Victoria hotel)
Tlf. 251. Porsgrund. Telf. 251

Laurdals uldspinderi
laver nu **golfjakkegarn** i alle farver: rutede og striped **bluseter** av sortert uid. **Jaquardtæpper** — rosete — av 1/1 uid og **filler** i brunt, blaatt og rosa.

Gravmonumenter! Hevde ein kjær som er død, og som de vil heidra med eit minnesmerkje, so vil de hjaa oss finna monumenter i alle storleikar og til billige priser. Me fører berre dei vænaste steinarter. — Skriv etter katalog. — Agenter tilset ma.
Eriksrøds Stenhuggeri,
Ligata — Skien

Lys i „Norig“.

Bankverksemd
i fylket.
Gjerpens Sparebank
— SKIEN —
Oprettet 1848.
Eget fond kr. 1 273 500. — Forvaltningskapital 18 900 000.
Indskud mottages. — Vexler og Vexelobl. diskonteres. Driftslaan til Jord- og Skogbruk bevilges.

Skiens Sparebank
modtager Indskud paa 6 maaneders Opsigelse og Sparebankvilkaar til høiestgjældende rentefot.

A/S Skiens og Oplands Privatbank
Filialer:
Privatbanken i Brevik.
Privatbanken i Langesund.
Aktiekapital kr. 6.000.000.-
Reserver „ 2.600.000.-
Indskudsrenten er for Tiden
6 % paa 6 Maaneders Opsigelse.
5 % „ Sparebankvilkaar.
Forevrigt utføres alle alm. Bankforretninger

Hiterdals Sparebank, Notodden
(Stedets eldste bank)
Mottar Indskud til høieste rentesatser.
Utfører alle almindelige bankforretninger..

Solum sparebank.
Indskud forrentes for tiden:
paa 6 mdr. opsigelse med 6 %
„ sparebankvilkaar „ 5 1/2 %
Øvrige banforretninger utføres billigst.
(SAB)

Skiens Ørebank
Aktiekapital 200,000. kr. + fond 70,000 kr.
Kontor: Egen gaard no. 4. Telemarksgaten.
Aapent alle hverdage 10—2 og 5—7.
Modtager indskud til 6 og 6 1/2 %.
Mindste indskud 50 øre. Yderaan ned til 5 kr. mot sikkerhet i akcepte rede regninger, vexler, veksobligationer og værdipapirer av enhver sort.
Husk hjemmesparebanken.

Kvitseid sparebank.
Open kvar yrkjedag fraa 10—1.
Vanleg bankverksemd.

Fyresdal sparebank
Open kvar maandag, onsdag og laurdag fraa kl. 10 til 1.
Vanleg bankverksemd.

Rauland Sparebank
Open kvar tysdag og laurdag.

Vinje privatbank
— Ytre Vinje —
tek imot innskot paa vanlege sparebankvilkaar og paa 6 mdr. oppsegging og gjev til kvar tid vanleg bank-rente, og laaner ut pengar mot vekselskuldrebrev med endossement eller handfeng i vissa.

Seljord Sparebank.
Open kvar maandag, onsdag og laurdag fraa kl. 10—1/2.
Vanleg bankverksemd.
Gjev kassakredit.

Skiens Møbellager -- Liegt. 4.
Firma-ansvarlige:
Bernh. Matre.
Største lager, beste utval av ferdige møblar og skal me avgrensa oss til aa nemna:
Salon-, spise-, soveroms-, kontor- og haagemøblar.
Divanar, solar, korenmøblar, barnevogner, golv- og divanteppa
Prisane er faste, men rimelige.
TELEFON 753. TELEFON 753

The Minnesota Mascot

Gunnar B. Björnson, Editor.

Established 1891. Price \$1.50 Per Year

Published By The G. B. Björnson Printing & Publishing Company

Entered at the Post Office in Minnesota, Minnesota, as second class mail matter.



Volstead Characteristics

TWENTY YEARS AGO a country lawyer was elected to represent the people of this district in Congress.

Every two years since, that same man has been re-elected to the same position.

He is a native of the state of Minnesota, the son of pioneer parents, a typical product of the commonality.

During his first term he was viciously attacked by every metropolitan paper that held a brief for the milling and grain trust of the country because he stood for what he thought was for the best interests of the farmers of the Northwest in the manner of grain tariffs.

That was in the days of the convention system of politics and Andrew J. Volstead several times faced determined opposition from those who were willing to do the errand work of corporate greed.

But the farmers of the district rallied to his support and it was they who thwarted every effort to beat him in those early days of his congressional career.

BUT twenty years in congress bring about many changes.

Mr. Volstead has developed into one of the big men in the national legislature and his name has become a household word throughout the country.

Naturally, a man who touches legislative and political life at as many angles as that brings on himself opposition.

And Mr. Volstead low has opposition.

It is good for a man in politics to have opposition.

The ideal condition under a representative form of government is when there are two political parties of about equal strength so that, whichever one is in office, it dare not go too far in any direction inimical to the interests of the people.

Mr. Volstead began his career surrounded by opposition, the opposition of special interests. He still has that same opposition.

But in addition to that he has the opposition of a new political movement among the people, which is seeking to bring about radical political changes.

MR. VOLSTEAD is by nature a conservative man.

His temperament is of the constructive type.

He is a man who works and digs and plods—there is nothing of the sensational or the picturesque about him. He does not fit into a radical movement.

If he were building a house, he would be sure to begin on the foundation. He would not attempt to put up the rafters before he had the posts and the plates in place.

He probably feels the necessity of making changes in the political machinery, from time to time, as keenly as anyone. But his is the type that makes changes gradually. A functioning economic order, that it has taken a generation or more to build up, he would hesitate to scrap, just for its defects. He recognizes the chaos that destruction brings and so his efforts would be to adapt the older order to the new conditions and work out the solution of economic problems along some line that would not spell disaster while the change was being wrought.

NO, Mr. Volstead is not a radical.

He probably believes with William Jennings Bryan that "you can not run this country by mass meeting."

He belongs to that school of political thought which believes that the fundamental principles upon which this nation and its government was founded are still paramount and that representative government has not outlived its usefulness,

Mr. Volstead is not one of those who would substitute the chaos of democracy for the orderly workings of representative government.

Men are very differently constituted. Some are radical in their ideas, others are conservative. Some are not satisfied unless they can find employment in a wrecking crew, others again want to work only with the construction gang.

Mr. Volstead would never fit into a wreck-

ing crew—his work is with the crowd that goes out to construct.

THAT which is giving Mr. Volstead his greatest opposition at this time is the fact that he framed and was active in securing the passage of a law that has since born his name.

There are those who will not hesitate to say that however much Mr. Volstead is a constructive statesman he joined the ranks of the destructionists when he fathered the Volstead Act.

But this is not correct.

The trouble is that so many confuse the Eighteenth Amendment with the Volstead Act.

That which made this country permanently dry was the Eighteenth Amendment. Mr. Volstead had no more to do with that than any other man who voted for it.

In order to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that amendment must first pass both branches of Congress by a two-thirds vote of each branch and then it must be submitted to the legislatures of the different states and it must be ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states.

The prohibition amendment was passed this way—two-thirds of both branches of Congress voted for it and three-fourths of the legislatures of the several states passed it.

It is well to remember this in talking about prohibition for it will help one from falling into the error of blaming one man for the drought that has been visited upon the nation.

But the Eighteenth Amendment was not a complete piece of legislation. Even from the standpoint of those who supported the amendment the strongest, it was not a complete job.

It prohibited the sale, manufacture, transportation and importation of intoxicating liquors—but it did not say what constituted "intoxicating liquors."

Here is where Mr. Volstead entered upon the scene with his constructive statesmanship.

The Constitution had to be supplemented with legislation and Mr. Volstead worked out the law that defined intoxicating liquor.

The theory that Mr. Volstead worked on was that the Congress of the United States and all the different legislatures of the several states that ratified the Eighteenth Amendment had meant just what they said when they said "intoxicating liquors," and that what they meant was liquor that would have the effect of intoxicating.

He worked out the law defining the meaning along just that line.

It was not a matter of making the country dry—that had already been done, the Eighteenth Amendment had done that. The Volstead Act merely clarified the meaning of the Constitution and left no opportunity for haggling about what was meant by the words in the Constitution.

THE Volstead Act was a constructive piece of legislation.

It was just the kind of legislation that might be expected from a man like Mr. Volstead.

It went right to the very heart of the situation and furnished a working program for the Constitution to function under.

It matters not what men think of prohibition.

The fact remains that the sovereign people, through their representatives in the Congress of the United States and in the several legislative bodies of the different states, have put prohibition into the federal constitution. It is a part of the supreme law of the land and there is but one thing for the Congress of the United States to do and that is to provide the machinery for the enforcement of the Constitution.

To do that is the sworn duty of every member of Congress.

When Congressman Volstead wrote the Volstead Act he was merely doing a bit of constructive work designed to uphold the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

If the Eighteenth Amendment is as bad as its enemies hold, then the best and the quickest and the surest way to get rid of it is to enforce it.

The machinery for enforcement is provided in the Volstead Act. In some form, Congress had to pass an act embodying the things in the Volstead Act. Congress could not get away from that duty if it tried. And the Volstead Act was passed by a substantial majority in both houses.

WE are not putting any sentimental considerations into this article. We are merely stating facts. Mr. Volstead's whole career in Congress has been one of sane, substantial, constructive work.

Maybe he has not the scintillating brilliancy of those whose meteoric flights cleave the azure heavens and leave behind them an evanescent trail which, for the moment, illumines the sky.

Maybe he has not that brilliancy—and we rather incline to think that he has not.

But, he has that which is far more important—the power to work long and hard and the ability to build for time.

Mr. Volstead is one of those men who never will "go up like a rocket," and by the same token people may know that he never will "come down like a stick."

No longer would an observer think of the elk as the forest monarch. He was but a pretender, after all. The real king had just wakened from his afternoon nap and was starting forth to hunt.

Even his little cousins, the black bears, did not wait to make conversation. They tumbled awkwardly down the hill to get out of his way. For the massive gray form—weighing over half a ton—was none other than that of the last of the grizzly bears, that terrible forest hunter and monarch, the Killer himself.

Long ago, when Oregon was a new land to white men, in the days of the clipper ships and the Old Oregon Trail, the breed to which the Killer belonged were really numerous through the little corner north of the Siskiyou and west of the Cascades. They were a worthy breed! If the words of certain old men could be believed, the southern Oregon grizzly occasionally, in the bountiful fall days, attained a weight of two thousand pounds. No doubt whatever remains that thousand-pound bears were numerous.

But unlike the little black bears, the grizzlies developed displeasing habits. They were much more carnivorous in character than the blacks, and their great bodily strength and power enabled them to master all of the myriad forms of game in the Oregon woods. By the same token, they could take a full-grown steer and carry it off as a woman carries her baby.

It couldn't be endured. The cattlemen had begun to settle the valleys, and it was either a case of killing the grizzlies or yielding the valleys to them. In the relentless war that followed, the breed had been practically wiped out. A few of them, perhaps, fled farther and farther up the Cascades, finding refuges in the Canadian mountains. Others traveled east, locating at last in the Rocky mountains, and countless numbers of them died. At last, as far as the frontiersmen knew, only one great specimen remained. This was a famous bear that men called Slewfoot—a magnificent animal that ranged far and hunted relentlessly, and no one ever knew just when they were going to run across him. He was apt suddenly to loom up, like a gray cliff, at any turn in the trail, and his disposition grew querulous with age. In fact, instead of fleeing as most wild creatures have learned to do, he was rather likely to make sudden and unexpected charges.

He was killed at last; and seemingly the southern Oregon grizzlies were wiped out. But it is rather easy to believe that in some of his wanderings he encountered—lost and far in the deepest heart of the land called Trill's End—a female of his own breed. There must have been cubs who, in their turn, mated and fought and died, and perhaps two generations after them. And out of the last brood had emerged a single great male, a worthy descendant of his famous ancestor. This was the Killer, who in a few months since he had left his fastnesses, was beginning to ruin the cattle business in Trill's End.

As he came growling from his bed this September evening he was not a creature to speak of lightly. He was down on all fours, his vast head was lowered, his huge fangs gleamed in the dark red mouth. The eyes were small, and curious little red lights glowed in each of them. The Killer was cross; and he didn't care who knew it. He was hungry too; but hunger is an emotion for the beasts of prey to keep carefully to themselves.

The Killer moved quite softly. One would have marveled how silently his great feet fell upon the dry earth and with what slight sound his heavy form moved through the thickets. He moved slowly, cautiously—all the time mounting farther up the little hill that rose from the banks of the stream. He came to an opening in the thicket, a little brown pathway that vanished quickly into the shadows of the coverts.

The Killer slipped softly into the heavy brush just at its mouth. It was his ambush. Soon, he knew, some of the creatures that had bowers in the heart of the thicket would be coming along that trail onto the feeding grounds on the ridge. He had only to wait.

The night wind, rising somewhere in the region of the snow banks on the highest mountains, blew down into the Killer's face and brought messages that no human being may ever receive. Then his sharp ears heard the sound of brush cracked softly as some one of the larger forest creatures came up the trail toward him.

The steps drew nearer and the Killer recognized them. They were plainly the soft footfall of some member of the deer tribe, yet they were too pronounced to be the step of any

of the lesser deer. The bull elk had left his bed. The red eyes of the grizzly seemed to glow as he waited. Great though the stag was, only one little blow of the massive forearm would be needed. The huge fangs would have to close down but once.

The bear did not move a single tell-tale muscle. He scarcely breathed. The bull was almost within striking range now. The wicked red eyes could already discern the dimmest shadow of his outline through the thickets. But all at once he stopped, head lifting. The Killer knew that the elk had neither detected his odor nor heard him, and he had made no movements that the sharp eyes could detect. Yet the bull was evidently alarmed. He stood immobile, one foot lifted, nostrils open, head raised. Then, the wind blowing true, the grizzly understood.

A pungent smell reached him from below—evidently the smell of a living creature that followed the trail along the stream that flowed through the glen. He recognized it in an instant



The Killer Was Cross; and He Didn't Care Who Knew It.

He had detected it many times, particularly when he went into the cleared lands to kill cattle. It was man, an odor almost unknown in this lonely glen. Dave Turner, brother of Simon, was walking down the stream toward Hudson's camp.

To the elk this smell was Fear itself. He knew the ways of men only too well. Too many times he had seen members of his herd fall stricken at a word from the glittering sticks they carried in their hands. He uttered a far-ringing snort.

It was a distinctive sound, beginning rather high on the scale as a loud whistle and descending into a deep bass bawl. And the Killer knew perfectly what that sound meant. It was a simple way of saying that the elk would progress no farther down that trail. The bear leaped in wild fury.

The bull seemed to leap straight up. His muscles had been set at his first alarm from Turner's smell on the wind, and they drove forth the powerful limbs as if by a powder explosion. He was full in the air when the forepaws battered down where he had been. Then he darted away into the coverts.

The grizzly knew better than to try to overtake him. Almost rabid with wrath he turned back to his ambush.

"Hunt up Hudson, the one living man who witnessed that agreement between Ross and old Folger."

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Legend of Wandering Jew.

The wandering Jew was a legendary personage condemned to wander upon the earth until the second coming of Christ, for reviling the Savior while on his way to Calvary. Some say he was a porter in the service of Pontius Pilate, named Cartaphilus; but others identify him with Ahasuerus, a cobbler on whose doorstep Christ attempted to rest when overcome with the weight of the cross. Tradition has it that Ahasuerus drove the Savior from his door with curses, whereupon Jesus calmly replied: "I truly am going; but thou shalt wander over the earth until I return." Southey's "Curse of Kehama," Croly's "Sathiel," and the Sue's "Le Juif Errant" make use of this legend, although not in its original form.—Kansas City Star.

One Good Merchant in Every Town

can establish a profitable and permanent shoe business on limited capital through the W. L. DOUGLAS NEW SALES METHOD

Retailers Reserve System Men's, Women's & Boys' Shoes This new plan of distribution has been arranged for your benefit, and through it Profits Are Guaranteed



W. L. Douglas shoes are the world's best-known trademarked shoes. High quality, honest workmanship coupled with low prices and latest styles make easy sales and quick turn-over of your small investment. Prepaid express and freight, 10 cents per pair allowance west of the Mississippi, and bonded 24 hour shipping service help increase profits and make large investments unnecessary. Write now for catalog and full information. If there is no Douglas dealer in your town you may be awarded

EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS to handle this great nationally advertised product. Any dealer who sells shoes can increase his profits by adding W. L. Douglas shoes to his line.

REMEMBER that \$6,000,000 has been spent in advertising W. L. Douglas shoes. No other shoes can equal W. L. Douglas in quick sales, because people call for them. The results of this advertising and 46 years of honest shoemaking means sales and profits for you.

Write today. The first application will have first consideration. W. L. DOUGLAS SHOE CO., 10 Spark Street, Brookton, Mass. Ask your Dealer for W. L. Douglas shoes.

Pat. Process **Lloyd** Products Baby Carriages & Furniture

Ask Your Local Dealer

Write Now For 32-Page Illustrated Booklet

The Lloyd Manufacturing Company (Heywood-Wakefield Co.) Dept. E Menominee, Michigan (17)

QUALITY AND QUANTITY

2 IN 1

SHOE POLISH AMERICA'S FASTEST SELLING POLISH

"I hereby solemnly promise to fill any man's pipe"

This promise is made in the letter that follows. We had sent Mr. Lewis some free samples of Edgeworth (as we do to all who ask for them). We didn't know that he was an Edgeworth smoker until we received this letter.

Niagara Falls, N. Y. Messrs. Larus & Brother Company, Richmond, Va.

Gentlemen: I am a smoker of good tobacco for over 40 years and have no hesitancy in saying that of all smoking tobacco Edgeworth in my estimation occupies the first place.

Having smoked it for a number of years in many different parts of our own good U. S. A., and also Alaska and Cuba—it has always given me supreme smoke-satisfaction, at all times, anywhere, everywhere, regardless of climatic changes or any other hocus-pocus.

My object in sending for the free samples (if you will forgive me) was to determine whether or not Edgeworth was being made any different—that possibly the samples (like whiskey samples used to be) were the best and finest of the whole output.

But on smoking the samples I find no difference whatever, and so I am convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that Edgeworth always is of the same superior quality in all its forms, and further, that my little joke in asking for and receiving something for nothing will be excused by you on the plea of curiosity.

In thanking you kindly for your courtesy in sending free samples, I hereby solemnly promise to fill any man's (reasonable-sized) pipe with Edgeworth tobacco of my own purchase, to convert him to that really good smoke, "Edgeworth."

Very sincerely, (Signed) Arthur John Lewis.

Edgeworth samples are no different from the regular Edgeworth tobacco you can buy in a store. We wouldn't keep "special" samples any more than we would have a special kind of tobacco in a different pouch in our pocket to hand to a friend.



We feel that Edgeworth is good enough, that its pleasant fragrance and mellowness will appeal to most pipe-smokers. We do not think our effort is wasted if we send free samples of Edgeworth to a man who doesn't find it exactly suited to his taste.

If you never tried Edgeworth, let us send you enough to fill your pipe a few times. Smoke it, and then decide whether or not Edgeworth was "made for you."

If you'll add the name and address of your tobacco dealer, we'd appreciate the courtesy.

When you send for samples, address Larus & Brother Company, 41 South 21st St., Richmond, Va.

To Retail Tobacco Merchants: If your jobber cannot supply you with Edgeworth, Larus & Brother Company will gladly send you prepaid by parcel post a one- or two-dozen carton of any size Edgeworth Plug Slice or Ready-Rubbed for the same price you would pay the jobber.

Save \$5.00 Per Ton on Your Coal—Send for full particulars, etc. Write at once. Bureau of Coal Conservation, Robbinsdale, Minn.

DATES BACK AS FAR AS STONE AGE

English Industry, Still Carried On, Estimated to Be Nine Thousand Years Old.

While science and invention have blotted out many of the old and time-honored industries in the country, some still exist which not only date back centuries, but succeed in holding their own against their modern rivals, remarks London Tit-Bits.

Perhaps the oldest and yet least-known surviving industry is carried on in Brandon in East Anglia. Long years ago the dwellers in the Stone and Neolithic ages discovered that the ground in this district was full of flints, which they proceeded to unearth and fashion into polished tools and weapons.

That was at least 9,000 years ago. Today the industry still flourishes, and it is believed that the Brandon "flint-knappers" are the direct descendants of those oldtime workers. In their work they use curiously shaped iron picks, closely resembling reindeer's horns, which, as a matter of fact, were the tools used by the Stone age workers.

The flint is found in large blocks, which are left to dry and then broken into pieces six inches square. These, in turn, are shaped with hammers, and then trimmed. Few flint-

knappers live to be old men, for the particles of the material that are thrown off enter the lungs and bring on consumption.

Whitman Had a Checkered Career.

Walt Whitman began his career as an errand boy in a lawyer's office and tried in turn working in a printer's office, teaching in a country school and editing the Brooklyn Eagle. He founded and edited his own paper, the Long Islander, but gave it up and tried building and selling small houses in Brooklyn. During this checkerboard career, Whitman was continually writing poetry, and finally in 1855 he published a small book containing a collection of his poems, under the title of "Leaves of Grass." It was characterized by Emerson as "the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom that America had yet contributed."

Whitman's life was a poet's life—free, unburied, unworldly, unconventional, unselfish, cheerful, optimistic, and it was contented and joyously lived.

Philadelphia Hosiery Center.

Philadelphia leads the world in the manufacture of hosiery and underwear.

Speech of Andrew J. Volstead at Glenwood, Minn., Oct. 23, 1922

Ladies and Gentlemen:—I am very glad to see so many of you here and especially gratified to see so many ladies. Two years ago women voted for the first time and many of them took a very earnest interest in the election; I hope that in this election the same interest will be shown. I have no doubt, whether they are in this audience or not, that they will be out on election day to share with the men the responsibilities and the burdens of running this government. It is the electors who in the end shape the policies under which the government is carried on.

When the Constitution was framed its authors were impressed with the idea that the men chosen to represent the people in the House of Representatives should stand for election every two years so as to give the people a chance if they did not approve of the record their Representative made to elect others in their places. I am going to try tonight as briefly as possible to explain to you what I have been trying to do, and what the party I represent has been trying to do to solve the many difficulties inherited from the great war. First I want to call your attention to the fact that in a great many of the speeches made against the Republican party an attempt is being made to charge the Republicans with things that happened while the Democrats controlled this government. I am not going to defend or accuse the Democrats; they can take care of themselves; but I want to call attention to the fact that up to the 4th of March, last year, the Democrats were in control of the executive branch of the government; as such they were the ones that were running the government.

When President Harding took office there was a Republican House and a Republican Senate. What took place during the eight years prior to that was under the Democratic Administration. The curtailment of credit, the suspending of business activity resulting from it, and the crash that came to farm prices, occurred under the Democratic Administration. It was a crash, however, that would have come no matter what party had been in power, as there had been a senseless boom; you can't always live in a balloon.

Emergency Tariff Law Increased Prices of Farm Products

The first thing we did after the 4th of March was to enact an emergency tariff bill to exclude as much as possible foreign agricultural products. President Harding signed it and it became a law in May. Well some people say, "Why that didn't amount to anything." I want to show you what it did amount to. Before it was enacted we were importing from Canada vast quantities of wheat, some months ten to twelve million bushels. Such imports naturally had the effect of depressing the price of wheat in this market. As soon as this tariff bill was passed very little came across the line and it had an effect upon prices, as shown by a report of the Tariff Commission, a body created by the government for the purpose of investigating tariffs and their effect. When the bill was passed the price of wheat in Minneapolis was \$1.64, and \$1.65 in Winnipeg. Ordinarily the corresponding grade of wheat ought to be four or five cents higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, because the grain is usually of a better quality in Canada than here, being raised on newer soil. The next month, June, there was a difference of only one cent. This time, however, the one cent was in favor of Minneapolis, which would indicate an increase of five or six cents over the normal price. In July the price at Minneapolis was \$1.74 and in Winnipeg \$1.61, a difference of thirteen cents. In September the price in Minneapolis was \$1.53 and in Winnipeg \$1.32; by that time you see there was a difference of twenty-one cents in favor of the American market. In October the price in Minneapolis was \$1.36 and in Winnipeg \$1.07; in November Minneapolis was \$1.30, in Winnipeg \$1.01; in December, \$1.31 and \$1.05; January, this year, Minneapolis \$1.35, Winnipeg \$1.05; in February, Minneapolis \$1.55, Winnipeg \$1.28; in March, Minneapolis \$1.58;

Winnipeg \$1.36; in April, the last figure I have, Minneapolis was \$1.64 and Winnipeg \$1.39. As wide a difference as this will not always prevail, but it will mean in the future as it has in the past a substantial advantage to the American over the Canadian farmers.

That tariff law did not only affect wheat prices, it affected practically the prices of all farm products. Let us take steers—most of the farmers in this section are engaged in raising stock. The Chicago price in May, 1921, was \$8.51, Winnipeg was \$7.21 per hundred pounds, there was a difference of \$1.30 in favor of Chicago; in June the difference was \$2.08, in July \$3.75, in August \$4.69, in September \$4.35, in October \$5.20, in November \$4.89, in December \$4.36, in January \$3.34, in February \$4.44, in March \$2.79, and in April \$2.24; and at present Canada I am told is paying a substantial duty and still exporting live stock to this country.

I could give you a statement as to a large number of other farm products, but I shall only mention one more, butter. When the emergency tariff went into effect the price of butter in the London market was thirty-six cents, while in New York it was only twenty-eight cents. Immediately after its passage the price of butter in New York more than evened up with London. New York has since paid on the average some four to five cents more per pound for butter than has London.

More Adequate Provision for Agriculture Finance Provided

I shall drop the tariff question for a few moments, but expect to take it up again in discussing the permanent tariff law enacted at this last session of Congress. We were confronted with a great many other difficulties. We found that it was almost impossible to sell farm products abroad, as the European countries were bankrupt and had no money or credit with which to purchase. For the purpose of relieving this situation we revived what has been known as the War Finance Corporation, an organization created by the government for the purpose of financing war activities. We gave it a billion dollars in money with directions that it use it for the purpose of guaranteeing the purchase price agreed to be paid by foreign purchasers. This had a very salutary effect. It helped to maintain prices and it made it possible for us to export very large quantities of agricultural products. Another difficulty confronted us. The banks all through the agricultural sections were pressed for money. Any one who had money in the bank was taking it out and banks were constantly in danger of bankruptcy. That forced them to press the farmers for the payment of their debts, but the farmers were not in position to pay. So we again amended the War Finance Corporation law and authorized the loan of money on farm paper. For that purpose we turned over to it some five hundred million dollars. Senator Kellogg was the author and the leading champion for this amendment as it was finally passed. At the time the matter was being considered I discussed with a number of people the question of whether some scheme could not be devised by which the money could be loaned directly to the farmers, but I was assured that any attempt to enact such a law would prove disastrous, for the reason that the farmers would be broke before we could set up the necessary machinery to do that. However, we turned over ninety million dollars of that money to farm organizations so that a very large part of it reached the farmers directly. In all we loaned on farm paper more than three hundred million dollars through banks and through farm organizations. This corporation is authorized to extend the time of payment of farm paper up to three years.

Farm Loan Act Amended
Owing to the financial stringency the farmers were unable to secure loans upon their farms. We created some years ago an organization to loan money direct to the farmers, the Farm Loan Banks and the Farm Loan Association. Money for that purpose

is secured by issuing and selling bonds. We found that we could not under the existing law get the money, because we had fixed the maximum rate of interest upon those bonds at five per cent and the market would not then absorb five per cent bonds. So we amended that law by increasing the rate half of one per cent; that made it possible to sell bonds, and many bonds were then sold and a large amount of money secured. In discussing that matter it was sought to have the limit removed upon the size of the loan. Under the law as it stood and as it stands today it only permits the loaning of \$10,000, to any one person. But we were told that it would be useless to make any change at that time for the reason that we could not obtain, as the money market then was, enough money to supply the mortgage loans that were below \$10,000, and it was insisted that we ought to relieve those wanting the smaller loans first, and not allow those wanting larger loans to absorb the money. Some day I have no doubt we shall change that law so as to allow a larger limit.

Relieved Shippers from Transportation Tax

We were confronted with still another trouble; one that is still unsolved. Transportation charges were and still are a great burden upon the people because they are too high. We had a tax amounting to more than \$300,000,000, a year upon freight charges and passenger fares. We sought to get rid of that because it was a heavy load upon shippers and others using transportation and we succeeded in getting that repealed. That did not relieve the railroads in any way because the railroads did not pay it—they simply collected it from the shipper and paid it to the government. I shall discuss a little later on the Esch-Cummins law, and explain to you why the present rates are a good deal higher than they were before the war.

Passed Laws to Regulate Stock and Grain Exchanges

For many years complaints have been made against stock exchanges and grain exchanges. It has been contended and no doubt with a good deal of justice that in many ways those exchanges have manipulated prices of farm products and thus robbed the producers. It has been a difficult problem to solve. The Supreme Court in a number of cases had practically held that the federal government had no authority over such exchanges. It was insisted that they were state institutions, which Congress could not control. But gradually the doctrines of these decisions had broadened until we thought we saw a chance to reach out and regulate them. We first passed a law for the purpose of regulating grain exchanges. That was drawn under decisions that would seem to permit control under what we know as the taxing power. That law, however, was declared unconstitutional. But in the meantime, we had drawn another law to regulate stock yards and stock exchanges. That also went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court held that valid. As soon as that was declared valid we redrew the law under which we sought to regulate exchanges, and just before the end of this session of Congress that became a law. Now I do not want to hold out the hope that those measures will solve all difficulties. I realize how extremely difficult it is to deal with a problem of that kind, but I want to assure you that those laws were passed in an honest effort to solve the problem and I do believe that they will to a large extent prevent the manipulation in prices of which so much complaint has been made. They give to the Secretary of Agriculture power to regulate such exchanges. He may prescribe fair charges, rules and regulations to apply upon them. There is one thing these laws will do; they will give to farm organizations power to act as members of those exchanges. They can not be excluded because the law absolutely directs that they shall be permitted to operate upon them. In that way it will give to farm organizations an opportunity to deal with the same knowledge and with the same power as any other business man; they are put on an equality with the ordinary business man in that respect. I think that will prove of very great value.

Drew Farmers' Co-operative Marketing Act

An effort was made to secure a law under which farm organizations could function in interstate and foreign commerce. They had been prosecuted, investigated and threatened time and again because it was contended that they were acting in violation of what is known as the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Officers of various national farm organizations came to me and asked if I would not secure for them the passage of a law of that kind. Some three or four years ago a bill was introduced for that purpose. I secured a hearing on that bill before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman. People were given an opportunity to explain what they wanted and what they needed. It became evident that this bill could not pass, the committee refused to approve it, but I said to some of those officers, "I believe I can draw a bill that will serve your purpose and will give you everything that this bill would give if it were passed, one against which there would be very much less objection." I drew a bill, turned it over to the attorneys for some of these organizations and they, after carefully examining it, approved it. I succeeded in getting it through the House. It went to the Senate but the Senate amended it so I considered it worthless. I was unwilling to accept those amendments, and it died at the end of the last Congress. But I reintroduced it in this Congress and succeeded in getting it through the House again. I then saw Senator Kellogg, Senator Kenyon and a number of other senators, and asked them if they would not make an effort to pass it in the Senate substantially in the form that I had succeeded in getting it through the House. A conference was had on several occasions in reference to it. In the Senate, Senator Kellogg assumed the leadership in passing this bill there, and after a strenuous fight it was passed there in almost the exact language we had passed it in the House.

I want to say that though a good many people seem to think that Senator Kellogg has no interest in the farmers, no sympathy with them, in all the fights that we have made for farm legislation Senator Kellogg has not only stood by us throughout but he has been one of the prominent leaders for such legislation. He has been a very useful member in the Senate because of his influence, ability and industry, and has done splendid work.

The Co-operative Marketing law in my judgment will do more good than any other law that you can name because it will make it possible for the farmers through farm organizations to sell their products upon an equal footing with the business man. If the farmers are going to be successful it is my judgment that they must secure success in that way. It has been the method relied on by the European farmers. It has been adopted in practically every European country, and it is the one thing above all others upon which they rely for success.

On the day this bill was signed by the President many members of Congress and representatives of farm organizations gathered at the White House. After affixing his signature which made the bill a law, the President handed the pen which he had used to me in recognition of my authorship of the law. The national farm organizations think so much of this law that after it was passed officers of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Board of Farm Organizations, the National Milk Producers Federation, and other farm organizations, joined in a letter thanking me for my work.

The Esch-Cummins Law

Let me discuss with you briefly the so-called Esch-Cummins law. That seems to be the one thing that our opponents are charging against the Republicans and I might also say against many Democrats, because a great many Democrats as well as Republicans voted for it. It was approved by ex-President Wilson, a Democrat. When the railroads were taken over the wages of railroad employees, the cost of coal, of steel and everything else needed by the roads was comparatively cheap. Prices had not greatly advanced at that time, but as we continued to prosecute the war all those things rose, rose and rose, and it was not long before the railroads failed to pay operating expenses. The government did not raise rates as fast as the increase in the cost of operation and, as a consequence, after the

thing like two years and two months there was a deficit of over a billion two hundred million dollars. The government had agreed to pay for the use of the roads an amount equal to the average annual earnings for the three preceding years, as we had no power to take them without paying for their use. When we came to turn the roads back some arrangement had to be made to meet that situation. We could not continue to pay the losses out of the public treasury as we did during government operation. The rates had to be raised so that the roads would be self-sustaining. An arrangement was made at that time under which it was agreed that for the first six months after the roads were turned back, which was regarded as the period needed for reorganizing, the government would see that they received the same rate of income as they had received during government control. That amounted to a guarantee—a guarantee that the roads would not lose anything during that six months period. But during this six months railroad wages were increased six hundred and fifty million dollars, so, for the purpose of making the rates high enough to pay the running expenses and a reasonable return on the property, it was directed by the Interstate Commerce Commission that the rates should be increased so as to cover that \$650,000,000, annual increase in wages and an additional amount which it was calculated was necessary to make up the losses under the rates imposed during government operation. You see, at the time the roads were turned over to the owners they were running behind under the rates then in force, and there was pending a claim of \$800,000,000, for an increase in wages that was finally made retroactive. This claim was settled by the Labor Board, created by the government, at \$650,000,000, so when the roads were turned back to their owners the rates had to be raised so they might earn this deficit and increase in wages in addition to what they earned during government operation. Still the bulk of the increases in railway rates took place not after the government turned the roads back to their owners but before that time. The government increased railway rates to pay an increase of \$1,578,000,000 for wages alone, in addition to large increases to pay for increased cost of coal, rails and other material. The three-cent a mile for passenger fares, for instance, was fixed during government operation.

Guarantee Claim Exploded

Now it is claimed that there has been and is a guarantee of income. I have said to my Nonpartisan friends who have been talking that guarantee that if they can find in the law anywhere a provision under which the railroads now, or at any time since August 31, 1920, have been or are guaranteed one penny of income, I will give any one who points it out one hundred dollars. Anyone who can point to any such provision can have the money. There is no such guarantee. I have the law here and will give any one a chance to point it out. The law simply provides that railroads shall have rates that under honest, efficient and economic management are sufficient to earn a reasonable return upon the value of the property used for transportation. That has always been the law, the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the railroads are entitled to that, and that is all the Esch-Cummins law gives any railroad.

The only provision that has been pointed to as a guarantee is one that expired several months ago, and that never was a guarantee. Instead of being a guarantee it was a limitation upon the amount that railroads could receive in returns upon their property. Here it is:

"That during the two years beginning March 1, 1920, the Commission shall take as such fair return a sum equal to 5% per centum of such aggregate value, but may, in its discretion, add thereto a sum not exceeding one-half of one per centum of such aggregate value to make provision in whole or in part for improvements, betterments or equipment, which, according to the accounting system prescribed by the Commission, are chargeable to capital account."

That does not guarantee anything; that was simply a direction to the commission that in fixing rates it should not allow a larger income on the average than six per cent. During those two years the railroad com-

panies did not get six per cent, nor five and one-half per cent; they only got in the neighborhood of three per cent. No railroad is asking for any more, they are not claiming a guarantee; no one claims it except somebody on the hustings trying to prejudice the people against this law. When the last provision I read was put into the statute we looked at it as a drastic limitation upon the railroads, because at that time, if you remember, interest rates were seven or eight per cent. Long time bonds were sold by the railroads secured by mortgages, some of them running ten years, drawing seven or eight per cent, and still we directed that railway income must not be more than six per cent, and only five and one-half per cent for dividends, and nothing if the road does not earn it. I repeat again, there is no guarantee.

If I am correctly informed my opponent says that it is only a quibble to contend that there is no guarantee, and that the direction to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates so the roads will get a reasonable return upon their property is in effect a guarantee. Nothing can be further from the truth. That is the one provision under which the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to determine what is a reasonable rate and to reduce rates if too high. He certainly cannot be asking to have that repealed, if he knows what he is talking about. Does he want the railroads to be at liberty to raise rates at will?

Freight and passenger rates are practically the same in Canada as here, though they have no Esch-Cummins law there. When we talk about high rates we should remember that in 1916 the roads paid only \$1,468,576,394 in wages, while in 1920 they paid \$3,698,216,351, besides increased prices for coal and other material. While there has been some decreases in wages and corresponding decreases in freight rates, the cost of operation is still very much greater than before the war.

Why, they tell so many fake stories about this law that it is absolutely ridiculous. Some of the parties traveling back and forth over this state making speeches insisted that this law created a burden of a dollar a day upon each family of five. Just think what that means! I don't think the man who made that statement can be credited with much sense. With the population that we have today that would amount to \$8,000,000,000. The total operating income of the railroads last year was only \$5,517,000,000.

How can you make \$8,000,000,000 out of that? It costs something to run the railroads before this law was passed and that necessarily would have to be deducted. When you do that you will see how foolish this statement is. Take the last year in which the government operated these roads, 1919, and the year 1921, the last years for which there are any figures, and let us see just what the increase was. The total railway receipts in 1921 was \$5,517,000,000. The last year the government ran the roads it was \$5,144,000,000. The total increase then could only be \$373,000,000. That sum is all the extra amount collected by the railroads during 1921 over what was collected in 1919. But remember that during 1921 they had to pay not only the deficit under the government rates but in the vicinity of \$650,000,000 more for labor than the government paid in 1919. To make that payment they only got this \$373,000,000. This is the way that sum paid it: They discharged about four hundred thousand employees and cut other expenses in every way possible. Instead of the American public paying that \$650,000,000, the increase in railway wages, they only paid for that increase \$373,000,000, and that sum also paid the deficit the government was paying out of taxes. If the government had continued the operation of those roads, in all human probability it would have had to charge you the \$650,000,000, extra. While the operating income in 1919 was less than in 1921 the American people did not pay less; they paid out of the treasury of the United States an amount much larger than the increase in operating income.

It is under the Esch-Cummins law that we are getting our coal today; under that law the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to direct the movement of cars and trains, it has the right to say to the Great Northern railroad or any other railroad in this country: "You ship cars to the coal mines and carry coal to the Lakes. It doesn't matter

whether it is a part of your business or not." Under that law we practically dominate the railroads. We practically tell them what they can do and what they must not do. We require that every item of receipt and expense shall be kept accurately so that we may know just what is done, and we impose a heavy penalty upon any one that makes a false entry in these accounts. Under it we have taken from them the power to prescribe rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission does that for them. We have taken from them the control over the issuance of stocks and bonds. I tried for many years to secure a law of that kind. Finally it was written into the Esch-Cummins law, and no watered stocks or bonds can hereafter be issued.

Is In Effect an Excess Profits Tax on Railroads

This law provides further that if any railroad earns more than six per cent, one-half of everything that it earns above that rate goes to the government and is its property. You may ask us why we do that. We do it for this reason: The rates necessarily must be the same. If you allowed one line to charge less than another, all the towns on that line would thrive and business on other lines would be driven out of existence. Cities and communities are constantly fighting for equal rates. If the aggregate of the property of the railroads pays, for instance, five or six per cent, some of the roads will earn a large amount, and others perhaps nothing. Take for instance the Chicago Great Western between Chicago and Minneapolis. That road has for many years earned nothing upon its stock, and the stock has been worth only a few pennies on the dollar, while other roads between those cities are earning perhaps a large return. As we need all the roads, rates have to be high enough so they may all continue to operate, but as we must make the rate the same we felt that if any company earned more than a fair rate the excess should at least in part go to the government.

Public Represented on Labor Board

This law provides for a Labor Board, in which the public has a voice, to settle disputes between the railroads and their employees. Heretofore all labor boards have consisted of a certain number of men representing the railroads and a certain number of men representing the employees of the roads. This board is composed of three men representing the railroads, three men representing the employees, and three men representing the public. In creating this board we tried to be fair, we did not give to it arbitrary powers; we did not say to this board, "You can regulate wages in any fashion you see fit." We directed that in reducing or increasing wages the board must take into consideration the cost of living, the wages paid in other industries, the risk and responsibility of employment and other things that necessarily enter into the fixing of a wage. We felt that wages was a matter in which the public was deeply interested. Every railroad strike spells disaster to the public; so does every coal strike, and the public is paying millions as a result of the recent railway and coal strikes. It is my belief that we must find some way to settle strikes of railway employees and coal miners, because if we don't the public will be at the mercy of coal operators, railway managers and a few labor leaders. These parties should be willing to submit to what is fair and just and ought not be allowed to disregard the public interest.

Valuation Not Based on Stocks and Bonds

Just a word or two more about this law. It is claimed that it authorizes rates to be based on watered stocks and bonds. That is absolutely false. It does nothing of the kind. This does not change the old law in that respect, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that rates can not be based on stocks and bonds but must be based on the actual value of the property of the roads. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been at work since 1913 with a large force of men to find such actual value. Instead of valuing the roads at what the railroads claim they have paid in to them, they value them at about \$1,250,000,000 less. The law does not value the roads; we left that with the only body that knows anything about that value. If any complaint can be made against the valuation

it must be made against the Interstate Commerce Commission and not against the Esch-Cummins law. No one has suggested any other way of finding the value.

How New Tariff Law Benefits Farmers

The new tariff law imposes substantial protective duties on all that the farmer has to sell. At the same time it puts upon the free list his harvesters, his threshers, seeders, drills, cultivators, mowers, drags, fanning mills, and practically every other tool he uses on the farm. It puts on the free list his lumber, both rough, matched, grooved and planed; it puts on the free list his shoes, boots, harness and other leather goods; it puts on the free list his coal, oil, fence wire, posts and practically everything that the farmer has to buy for the purpose of operating his farm, and still, as I have said, everything that he produces is protected. Now it did not seem to me that I could vote against a bill of that kind. If protection has any value, this bill certainly gives it in full measure to the farmers. It is always claimed that protection is of great advantage to the manufacturers. As to many products raised on the farm protection is equally vital to the farmers, though on some items it may not at times be of much value.

When you come to other products that you have to buy (and I don't claim to be a tariff expert) it is insisted by those who ought to know that this is the lowest tariff law that the Republicans ever passed. Instead of trying to boost prices sky high by putting up a high tariff wall as it is called, we have tried to make that tariff as low as possible; low enough so that monopoly can not hide behind it. For fear that some article might be too high we gave to the President of the United States, for the first time in our history, power to reduce those duties in the event that any one should attempt to profiteer under it. Not only will it not boost the price of manufactured products but it is my judgment that its effect will be the opposite. At present we are importing vast quantities of such products from foreign countries, importing them at very low figures; but as we are not getting a full supply many of those who are doing the importing are outrageous profiteers. But you will say, "Why don't our factories open then?" I will tell you why. Because if they attempted to open they would be driven out of business, if they produced large stocks of goods under present prices of labor and material they would be in a position where they could be ruined any moment by the importers. Hence they have not dared to accumulate stocks or do much business while this threat hung over them. It is for this reason that I believe that this law instead of tending to increase prices will tend materially to reduce prices by creating a normal condition of competition among our own people that will work out a lower and fairer adjustment of values.

Fight for Prohibition Important

Speaking of prohibition, there are but very few people anywhere who are openly in favor of restoring the old saloon. The man who says he is in favor of doing that is almost a curiosity. Suppose you had saloons here, what would be the situation? Would the highways of this town be safe with all these automobiles? Isn't it true that the town is infinitely better off without them? Let us be honest with ourselves. Some say, "We don't want the saloon, but we want some beer to take home and drink there." If that was allowed, how could you stop it from being drunk anywhere in any store, club or room? If you allow any one to sell liquor on which a person can get drunk, you never can tell when the law has been violated, but if you make it illegal to sell anything intoxicating you know when you see a drunken person that somebody has broken the law. The sale for use in the home would be infinitely worse than to sell it in an open saloon for consumption there, because there you can have some police regulation. Such sales would debauch women and children in a way the saloon never was able to do; you would have all sorts of homes, you would have homes provided where people would sit and drink all night, where gambling, vice and crime would thrive unmolested. You would have all sorts of "clubs" that would be worse than the old public saloon.

The committee of which I am chairman has control of liquor legislation, and the chairman has a good deal of power in dealing with this subject. He largely determines what bills will receive consideration; a bill reported by the committee is usually handled by him in the House; he often has the power to prevent the adoption of unfriendly amendments by forcing a direct vote without giving any one a chance to offer any amendments. When a bill is amended by one house and the other house refuses to agree to such amendments a committee, three from the House and three from the Senate, is usually appointed to suggest a solution. The chairman of the committee in practice names this committee; you can readily see what that means as nearly all important bills go to such a committee. The man right below me on the Judiciary Committee is a wet, a very bright, keen lawyer, one of the very ablest in the east. A few years ago he defended Du Pont when he was sued for I think two million dollars. They don't employ cheap lawyers for such a case. If he had been chairman, I doubt very much that the co-operative marketing bill would have seen daylight. He represents a large city and his interests are naturally with the large city population, not with the farming community. If I am defeated, he will no doubt be chairman.

There is another reason why the anti-saloon forces are interested. My name has been so closely connected with the prohibition law that in many ways I have an influence upon the floor that no other man has in regard to prohibition legislation. Men who come from dry districts hesitate to vote against any proposition that I support because of the effect on the people of their district. The friends of the cause usually support me in practically any legislation that I seek.

Falsehoods

I find that in this campaign there is a good deal of the same methods pursued as were pursued two years ago. I was accused at that time of almost everything under the sun. It is a thing I don't like to talk about. Two years ago I only mentioned it on two or three occasions, but it is being repeated and repeated and I naturally resent it. Let me give you a sample of what they are circulating: Here is a quotation from the Canby Press, one of the Nonpartisan papers: "Volstead's recent vote in favor of the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill was only a sham, a smooth attempt to make the ex-soldiers believe he was for them in the hope that ex-soldiers have all forgotten how he favored the bonus veto before." The man that wrote that uttered a deliberate falsehood. There never was the slightest thing on earth to base that sort of accusation on. But that is the kind of campaign I have had to meet. There never was any chance for a veto of the compensation bill until the end of this session of Congress. I then voted to over-ride the veto. I have supported the bill each time it has come up and have constantly spoken in favor of it. When the bill finally passed both houses a good many of my friends went home and didn't pay any more attention to it. I could have gone home too, but as there were rumors that this bill might be vetoed I stayed there in Washington so I might vote to over-ride the President's veto; and that is the kind of reward I got from the Nonpartisan League, posing as a friend of this legislation. Is that honest?

To show how utterly baseless this charge is, I have here a letter from Hanford MacNider, national Commander of the American Legion, thanking me for what I have done on behalf of the ex-service men.

I have favored ex-service men much beyond the preference given by law. In examinations for post office appointments ex-service men get five points extra over others, which gives them a substantial advantage. Now only have all ex-service men that have attained the highest rating been appointed but many not so fortunate, and I have constantly urged my friends to select ex-service men as their candidates which has greatly aided them in securing the support of their townpeople—a thing that has made it possible to appoint many that could not otherwise be appointed.

Two years ago I was accused of being an atheist. You know the story—anything fair about that? When my opponent put himself upon the stand at the trial at Benson he did not furnish the slightest excuse on earth for making that statement. He didn't even pretend that he had found a person in Granite Falls who said I was an atheist, though in a speech at Clarkfield he claimed he had come to Granite Falls to inquire in regard to that very thing. Two years ago they accused me of having two barrels of whiskey in my cellar; some said I had two dray-loads. They didn't quite make the stories harmonize. They claimed that I favored compulsory military training, though I have always opposed it. Two years ago my opponent just before election made the statement, as it was reported to me, that \$500,000 had been spent by the Republican National Committee for the election of congressmen and that the greater part of it was spent in this district. Any man with any sense knew that was utterly false, but still it was used. This year I understand he is circulating the statement that some one has told him that the Anti-Saloon League spent \$48,000 in this district two years ago—another ridiculous falsehood. Only a small fraction of that sum could possibly have been spent in the district. But my friends, let me say to you who are Nonpartisans (if there are any such here) that you ought not talk about money. You are the last ones that can with any grace ask a hearing on that subject. You claimed two years ago that you had sixty thousand members in the League in this state, no doubt largely in this district. Just figure out what that means at \$18 apiece—a million and eighty thousand dollars. That is your own claim—a million and eighty thousand dollars according to the lowest estimate of the number of members that you had. Another thing: You traveled back and forth over this district asking and insisting on getting \$100 each from one hundred persons in each county. You know what that means. That amounts to \$10,000 a county, and would make \$140,000 in this district. I don't know how much you got, but I know that a number of men paid \$100. I have been told that you actually got the \$140,000. Another thing that you did: You started some eight or ten newspapers in this district, and they have been nothing but propaganda sheets from start to finish. They must have cost you from five to ten thousand dollars apiece, some of them almost twice that figure. Why, you talk about Newberryism; Newberry was a piker compared to the League.

My friends, I am charged with belonging to big business and being a tool of Wall Street. Every man that is opposed to the Nonpartisan League is charged with that. How did it happen that they got them all separated so neatly that only those that were inside the League were free from such a taint and that everybody else was a tool of Wall Street? Why, my opponent insisted two years ago that the Norwegian Lutheran clergymen were tools of Wall Street, that the Anti-Saloon League was a tool of Wall Street, that the W. C. T. U. was a tool of Wall Street. I am told he repeated that statement on a number of different occasions. (I am glad I am in good company.) It is easy to make that sort of charges, but is it fair or decent? I am perfectly willing to admit that the rank and file of the Nonpartisan League are honest, that they are trying to do the best they can to secure relief from the difficulties under which we are all suffering, but I am not willing to admit that they are any more honest than the rank and file of the Republican party or of the Democratic party. You don't get to be honest by joining a party.

Facts Shown by Record

Now what is my opponent going to do with Wall Street? What does he tell you that he can do to Wall Street? I want to tell you something that I have done against Wall Street and big business, to show you that the charge that he makes is utterly unjust and uncalculated. I introduced the first bill to take from the railroads the right to issue stocks and bonds without the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission and secured President Roosevelt's approval and promise to recommend such a law. I appeared before committees and made several speeches in the House in favor of it, and I steadily pushed it until it became a law. Now big business cer-

tainly didn't want me to do anything of that kind, because big business would thrive on this form of robbery. I supported the Hepburn Railway Act, the first act under which the government controlled railway rates, and I supported the Cummins amendment to it, under which the railroads were compelled to show that there was a necessity for increasing rates before they could increase them. I supported the parcel post law, which the express companies and the railroads fought as bitterly as they could, and the provision in that law under which packages of seventy pounds can be shipped, though we are paying a large deficit every year because of parcel post packages. I opposed Canadian Reciprocity when the railroads, the elevators, mills and other business interests in Minneapolis and St. Paul did everything they could to secure Canadian Reciprocity. I supported the constitutional amendment imposing an income tax, an amendment that was passed for the very purpose of shifting a large part of the burden of federal taxation from the common people to big business and to Wall Street. I supported the prohibition law—perhaps some of you have heard about that—and the prohibition amendment. That took millions of dollars out of the hands of Wall Street and big business. If I had been dishonest, those men would today do everything they could to elect me instead of getting out on the hustings and doing everything they can to defeat me. I helped draw a law which forfeited a vast amount of railway lands in the States of Washington and Oregon. Those lands were owned all over the country; many of them in this state. It saved to the government perhaps a hundred million dollars. Big business wasn't in favor of that sort of a law. I supported the soldiers' compensation bill. If there is any bill that big business is bitterly opposed to, it is that very bill. I opposed the Federal Reserve Bank. The Federal Reserve law is perhaps the one law above all others that big business and Wall Street did more to secure the passage of than any other and in which they are most deeply interested. I voted against it during every step in its passage and made at least two speeches against it on the floor. In some ways it is a helpful law, but I did not consider that it contained the necessary restrictions upon the issue of currency, restrictions that experience in foreign countries had shown to be necessary. I felt that the very thing that did occur during the period of the war and the period since the Armistice up to the crash of 1920, would be likely to occur under it and I opposed it. I have introduced bills and secured the passage of them, to punish those who engaged in war frauds, and have supported all legislation designed to accomplish that purpose. Still I am charged with trying to shield profiteers by not doing the very thing that the profiteers and lawless radicals are seeking to have done, to embarrass and prevent the Attorney General from punishing them.

The claim that I opposed the so-called Johnson-Woodruff resolution asking for an investigation of the Attorney General is simply another falsehood. It was an attempt to take up for consideration in the House that resolution in violation of the rules of the House; the Speaker held that could not be done, and I simply voted with a vast majority of the members to sustain the rules of the House. That will not however prevent an investigation. The so-called Keller impeachment proceeding was simply an attempt on the part of the radical labor group to discredit and embarrass the Attorney General while he was fighting the cause of the people in the injunction suit issued to prevent violence and destruction of property by railway strikers seeking to prevent all transportation—a thing that was necessary so we might get coal and move our crops. This occurred a few days before the end of the session of Congress; a great many of the members had already gone home. There will be a full investigation of both these matters when we meet again in December, but I doubt that anybody will want an investigation then as it cannot serve the purpose of embarrassing the Attorney General in the prosecution of war grafters or to prevent him protesting the public against the effect of the late railroad strike which was led by a lot of lawless radicals. The Attorney General is himself insisting on a full investigation

so that these charges can be threshed out.

I opposed the repeal of the excess-profits tax and voted to increase the income tax on the very large incomes from twenty-five to fifty per cent. I also supported an increase of the tax on the inheritance of the very large fortunes from twenty-five to fifty per cent.

There is another project that big business and Wall Street are very much opposed to. I have always supported and urged a canal from Duluth to the ocean, because I believe that that will do more than almost anything else to break the grip of New York upon this western country. It will tend to reduce railroad freight rates very materially and in many ways be a great blessing to this section of the country. I supported and helped to pass the law regulating stock exchanges and grain exchanges and was consulted about it on several occasions. Do you suppose that that is in favor of Wall Street and big business? They fought it bitterly throughout. I could go on and enumerate one thing after another that I have done for the purpose not of helping Wall Street and big business, but for the purpose of serving those I represent. Still persons go out on the hustings and make these charges without specifying anything except perhaps the Esch-Cummins law as grounds for them. My opponent says he would repeal that law. It has been examined and re-examined by the two committees in charge of that legislation. Of course I won't suggest that it won't be amended. It will be amended like any other law, and I shall be glad to do anything I can to improve it; but the main principles of that law will undoubtedly remain, regardless of who is elected. Your Nonpartisans, Mr. Sinclair and Senator Ladd, from North Dakota, have neither of them introduced a bill for the purpose of repealing any part of the Esch-Cummins law. When they had hearings in the Senate committee and the House committee on the matter (they had long hearings on the subject last fall and this spring) neither of them appeared before either of those committees to urge that any provision of that law be repealed or even amended. It is easy to go out here and tell all sorts of stories about it, but when a man has to face the duty of framing amendments it is quite a different matter.

Value of Party Associates

My opponent does not belong to any party. Now, how is he going to be able to accomplish things without party associates to help him? Congress is run by parties. It always has been and in all human probability always will be. As far back as there is any English history you will find that the English government has been run by parties, and as long as we have had any government in this country parties have run it. Parties are absolutely necessary if you are going to accomplish anything. You must associate yourself with somebody—work with somebody to accomplish things. I can not think of anybody who has played a lone hand that has ever accomplished anything worth while in Congress, and I do not believe that you can name any one that ever has.

Under Republican administration this country has as a rule been prosperous. The Republicans have always relied upon the farmers and small city people as their mainstay because the very large cities like New York have usually been Democratic. To retain power the Republicans have always sought to give to the farmers every possible consideration. Most of you have been Republicans in the years past. It seems to me that it would be good policy, good sense for you to support the party that is in position to help you. To get things you must ask it of those who have power to give. It does not help you to ask help from an organization that has no such power.

Now my friends, I want to thank you for the kindness you have shown me and for your courtesy in listening to me so patiently.

Speech of Andrew J. Volstead at Glenwood, Minn., Oct. 23, 1922

Ladies and Gentlemen:—I am very glad to see so many of you here and especially gratified to see so many ladies. Two years ago women voted for the first time and many of them took a very earnest interest in the election; I hope that in this election the same interest will be shown. I have no doubt, whether they are in this audience or not, that they will be out on election day to share with the men the responsibilities and the burdens of running this government. It is the electors who in the end shape the policies under which the government is carried on.

When the Constitution was framed its authors were impressed with the idea that the men chosen to represent the people in the House of Representatives should stand for election every two years so as to give the people a chance if they did not approve of the record their Representative made to elect others in their places. I am going to try tonight as briefly as possible to explain to you what I have been trying to do, and what the party-I represent has been trying to do to solve the many difficulties inherited from the great war. First I want to call your attention to the fact that in a great many of the speeches made against the Republican party an attempt is being made to charge the Republicans with things that happened while the Democrats controlled this government. I am not going to defend or accuse the Democrats; they can take care of themselves; but I want to call attention to the fact that up to the 4th of March, last year, the Democrats were in control of the executive branch of the government; as such they were the ones that were running the government.

When President Harding took office there was a Republican House and a Republican Senate. What took place during the eight years prior to that was under the Democratic Administration. The curtailment of credit, the suspending of business activity resulting from it, and the crash that came to farm prices, occurred under the Democratic Administration. It was a crash, however, that would have come no matter what party had been in power, as there had been a senseless boom; you can't always live in a balloon.

Emergency Tariff Law Increased Prices of Farm Products

The first thing we did after the 4th of March was to enact an emergency tariff bill to exclude as much as possible foreign agricultural products. President Harding signed it and it became a law in May. Well some people say, "Why that didn't amount to anything." I want to show you what it did amount to. Before it was enacted we were importing from Canada vast quantities of wheat, some months ten to twelve million bushels. Such imports naturally had the effect of depressing the price of wheat in this market. As soon as this tariff bill was passed very little came across the line and it had an effect upon prices, as shown by a report of the Tariff Commission, a body created by the government for the purpose of investigating tariffs and their effect. When the bill was passed the price of wheat in Minneapolis was \$1.64, and \$1.65 in Winnipeg. Ordinarily the corresponding grade of wheat ought to be four or five cents higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg, because the grain is usually of a better quality in Canada than here, being raised on newer soil. The next month, June, there was a difference of only one cent. This time, however, the one cent was in favor of Minneapolis, which would indicate an increase of five or six cents over the normal price. In July the price at Minneapolis was \$1.74 and in Winnipeg \$1.61, a difference of thirteen cents. In September the price in Minneapolis was \$1.53 and in Winnipeg \$1.32; by that time you see there was a difference of twenty-one cents in favor of the American market. In October the price in Minneapolis was \$1.30 and in Winnipeg \$1.09; in November Minneapolis was \$1.30, in Winnipeg \$1.01; in December, \$1.31 and \$1.05; January, this year, Minneapolis \$1.35, Winnipeg \$1.05; in February, Minneapolis \$1.55, Winnipeg \$1.28; in March, Minneapolis \$1.53;

Winnipeg \$1.36; in April, the last figure I have, Minneapolis was \$1.64 and Winnipeg \$1.39. As wide a difference as this will not always prevail, but it will mean in the future as it has in the past a substantial advantage to the American over the Canadian farmers.

That tariff law did not only affect wheat prices, it affected practically the prices of all farm products. Let us take steers—most of the farmers in this section are engaged in raising stock. The Chicago price in May, 1921, was \$3.51, Winnipeg was \$7.21 per hundred pounds, there was a difference of \$1.30 in favor of Chicago; in June the difference was \$2.08, in July \$3.75, in August \$4.69, in September \$4.35, in October \$5.20, in November \$4.89, in December \$4.36, in January \$3.34, in February \$4.44, in March \$2.79, and in April \$2.24; and at present Canada I am told is paying a substantial duty and still exporting live stock to this country.

I could give you a statement as to a large number of other farm products, but I shall only mention one more, butter. When the emergency tariff went into effect the price of butter on the London market was thirty-six cents, while in New York it was only twenty-eight cents. Immediately after its passage the price of butter in New York more than evened up with London. New York has since paid on the average some four to five cents more per pound for butter than has London.

More Adequate Provision for Agriculture Finance Provided

I shall drop the tariff question for a few moments, but expect to take it up again in discussing the permanent tariff law enacted at this last session of Congress. We were confronted with a great many other difficulties. We found that it was almost impossible to sell farm products abroad, as the European countries were bankrupt and had no money or credit with which to purchase. For the purpose of relieving this situation we revived what has been known as the War Finance Corporation, an organization created by the government for the purpose of financing war activities. We gave to it a billion dollars in money with directions that it use it for the purpose of guaranteeing the purchase price agreed to be paid by foreign purchasers. This had a very salutary effect. It helped to maintain prices and it made it possible for us to export very large quantities of agricultural products. Another difficulty confronted us. The banks all through the agricultural sections were pressed for money. Any one who had money in the bank was taking it out and banks were constantly in danger of bankruptcy. That forced them to press the farmers for the payment of their debts, but the farmers were not in position to pay. So we again amended the War Finance Corporation law and authorized the loan of money on farm paper. For that purpose we turned over to it some five hundred million dollars. Senator Kellogg was the author and the leading champion for this amendment as it was finally passed. At the time the matter was being considered I discussed with a number of people the question of whether some scheme could not be devised by which the money could be loaned directly to the farmers, but I was assured that any attempt to enact such a law would prove disastrous, for the reason that the farmers would be broke before we could set up the necessary machinery to do that. However, we turned over ninety million dollars of that money to farm organizations so that a very large part of it reached the farmers directly. In all we loaned on farm paper more than three hundred million dollars through banks and through farm organizations. This corporation is authorized to extend the time of payment of farm paper up to three years.

Farm Loan Act Amended

Owing to the financial stringency the farmers were unable to secure loans upon their farms. We created some years ago an organization to loan money direct to the farmers, the Farm Loan Banks and the Farm Loan Association. Money for that purpose

is secured by issuing and selling bonds. We found that we could not under the existing law get the money, because we had fixed the maximum rate of interest upon those bonds at five per cent and the market would not then absorb five per cent bonds. So we amended that law by increasing the rate half of one per cent; that made it possible to sell bonds, and many bonds were then sold and a large amount of money secured. In discussing that matter it was sought to have the limit removed upon the size of the loan. Under the law as it stood and as it stands today it only permits the loaning of \$10,000 to any one person. But we were told that it would be useless to make any change at that time for the reason that we could not obtain, as the money market then was, enough money to supply the mortgage loans that were below \$10,000, and it was insisted that we ought to relieve those wanting the smaller loans first, and not allow those wanting larger loans to absorb the money. Some day I have no doubt we shall change that law so as to allow a larger limit.

Relieved Shippers from Transportation Tax

We were confronted with still another trouble; one that is still unsolved. Transportation charges were and still are a great burden upon the people because they are too high. We had a tax amounting to more than \$300,000,000 a year upon freight charges and passenger fares. We sought to get rid of that because it was a heavy load upon shippers and others using transportation and we succeeded in getting that repealed. That did not relieve the railroads in any way because the railroads did not pay it—they simply collected it from the shipper and paid it to the government. I shall discuss a little later on the Esch-Cummins law, and explain to you why the present rates are a good deal higher than they were before the war.

Passed Laws to Regulate Stock and Grain Exchanges

For many years complaints have been made against stock exchanges and grain exchanges. It has been contended and no doubt with a good deal of justice that in many ways those exchanges have manipulated prices of farm products and thus robbed the producers. It has been a difficult problem to solve. The Supreme Court in a number of cases had practically held that the federal government had no authority over such exchanges. It was insisted that they were state institutions, which Congress could not control. But gradually the doctrines of these decisions had broadened until we thought we saw a chance to reach out and regulate them. We first passed a law for the purpose of regulating grain exchanges. That was drawn under decisions that would seem to permit control under what we know as the taxing power. That law, however, was declared unconstitutional. But, in the meantime, we had drawn another law to regulate stock yards and stock exchanges. That also went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court held that valid. As soon as that was declared valid we redrew the law under which we sought to regulate exchanges, and just before the end of this session of Congress that became a law. Now I do not want to hold out the hope that those two measures will solve all difficulties. I realize how extremely difficult it is to deal with a problem of that kind, but I want to assure you that those laws were passed in an honest effort to solve the problem and I do believe that they will to a large extent prevent the manipulation in prices of which so much complaint has been made. They give to the Secretary of Agriculture power to regulate such exchanges. He may prescribe fair charges, rules and regulations to apply upon them. There is one thing these laws will do; they will give to farm organizations power to act as members of those exchanges. They can not be excluded because the law absolutely directs that they shall be permitted to operate upon them. In that way it will give to farm organizations an opportunity to deal with the same knowledge and with the same power as any other business men; they are put on an equality with the ordinary business man in that respect. I think that will prove of very great value.

Drew Farmers' Co-operative Marketing Act

An effort was made to secure a law under which farm organizations could

function in interstate and foreign commerce. They had been prosecuted, investigated and threatened time and again because it was contended that they were acting in violation of what is known as the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Officers of various national farm organizations came to me and asked if I would not secure for them the passage of a law of that kind. Some three or four years ago a bill was introduced for that purpose. I secured a hearing on that bill before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman. People were given an opportunity to explain what they wanted and what they needed. It became evident that this bill could not pass, the committee refused to approve it, but I said to some of those officers, "I believe I can draw a bill that will serve your purpose and will give you everything that this bill would give if it were passed, one against which there would be very much less objection." I drew a bill, turned it over to the attorneys for some of these organizations and they, after carefully examining it, approved it. I succeeded in getting it through the House. It went to the Senate but the Senate amended it so I considered it worthless. I was unwilling to accept those amendments, and it died at the end of the last Congress. But I reintroduced it in this Congress and succeeded in getting it through the House again. I then saw Senator Kellogg, Senator Kenyon and a number of other senators, and asked them if they would not make an effort to pass it in the Senate substantially in the form that I had succeeded in getting it through the House. A conference was had on several occasions in reference to it. In the Senate, Senator Kellogg assumed the leadership in passing this bill there, and after a strenuous fight it was passed there in almost the exact language we had passed it in the House.

I want to say that though a good many people seem to think that Senator Kellogg has no interest in the farmers, no sympathy with them, in all the fights that we have made for farm legislation Senator Kellogg has not only stood by us throughout but he has been one of the prominent leaders for such legislation. He has been a very useful member in the Senate because of his influence, ability and industry, and has done splendid work.

The Co-operative Marketing law in my judgment will do more good than any other law that you can name because it will make it possible for the farmers through farm organizations to sell their products upon an equal footing with the business man. If the farmers are going to be successful it is my judgment that they must secure success in that way. It has been the method relied on by the European farmers. It has been adopted in practically every European country, and it is the one thing above all others upon which they rely for success.

On the day this bill was signed by the President many members of Congress and representatives of farm organizations gathered at the White House. After affixing his signature which made the bill a law, the President handed the pen which he had used to me in recognition of my authorship of the law. The national farm organizations think so much of this law that after it was passed officers of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Board of Farm Organizations, the National Milk Producers Federation, and other farm organizations, joined in a letter thanking me for my work.

The Esch-Cummins Law

Let me discuss with you briefly the so-called Esch-Cummins law. That seems to be the one thing that our opponents are charging against the Republicans and I might also say, against many Democrats, because a great many Democrats as well as Republicans voted for it. It was approved by ex-President Wilson, a Democrat. When the railroads were taken over the wages of railroad employees, the cost of coal, of steel and everything else needed by the roads was comparatively cheap. Prices had not greatly advanced at that time, but as we continued to prosecute the war all those things rose, rose and rose, and it was not long before the railroads failed to pay operating expenses. The government did not raise rates as fast as the increase in the cost of operation and, as a consequence, after the government had run the roads some-

thing like two years and two months there was a deficit of over a billion two hundred million dollars. The government had agreed to pay for the use of the roads an amount equal to the average annual earnings for the three preceding years, as we had no power to take them without paying for their use. When we came to turn the roads back some arrangement had to be made to meet that situation. We could not continue to pay the losses out of the public treasury as we did during government operation. The rates had to be raised so that the roads would be self-sustaining. An arrangement was made at that time under which it was agreed that for the first six months after the roads were turned back, which was regarded as the period needed for reorganizing, the government would see that they received the same rate of income as they had received during government control. That amounted to a guarantee—a guarantee that the roads would not lose anything during that six months period. But during this six months railroad wages were increased six hundred and fifty million dollars, so, for the purpose of making the rates high enough to pay the running expenses and a reasonable return on the property, it was directed by the Interstate Commerce Commission that the rates should be increased so as to cover that \$650,000,000 annual increase in wages and an additional amount which it was calculated was necessary to make up the losses under the rates imposed during government operation. You see, at the time the roads were turned over to the owners they were running behind under the rates then in force, and there was pending a claim of \$800,000,000 for an increase in wages that was finally made retroactive. This claim was settled by the Labor Board, created by the government, at \$650,000,000, so when the roads were turned back to their owners the rates had to be raised so they might earn this deficit and increase in wages in addition to what they earned during government operation. Still the bulk of the increases in railway rates took place not after the government turned the roads back to their owners but before that time. The government increased railway rates to pay an increase of \$1,578,000,000 for wages alone, in addition to large increases to pay for increased cost of coal, rails and other material. The three-cent a mile for passenger fares, for instance, was fixed during government operation.

Guarantee Claim Exploded

Now it is claimed that there has been and is a guarantee of income. I have said to my Nonpartisan friends who have been talking that guarantee that if they can find in the law anywhere a provision under which the railroads now, or at any time since August 31, 1920, have been or are guaranteed one penny of income, I will give any one who points it out one hundred dollars. Anyone who can point to any such provision can have the money. There is no such guarantee. I have the law here and will give any one a chance to point it out. The law simply provides that railroads shall have rates that under honest, efficient and economic management are sufficient to earn a reasonable return upon the value of the property used for transportation. That has always been the law, the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the railroads are entitled to that, and that is all the Esch-Cummins law gives any railroad.

The only provision that has been pointed to as a guarantee is one that expired several months ago, and that never was a guarantee. Instead of being a guarantee it was a limitation upon the amount that railroads could receive in returns upon their property. Here it is:

"That during the two years beginning March 1, 1920, the Commission shall take as such fair return a sum equal to 5½ per centum of such aggregate value, but may, in its discretion, add thereto a sum not exceeding one-half of one per centum of such aggregate value to make provision in whole or in part for improvements, betterments or equipment, which, according to the accounting system prescribed by the Commission, are chargeable to capital account."

That does not guarantee anything; that was simply a direction to the commission that in fixing rates it should not allow a larger income on the average than six per cent. During those two years the railroad com-

panies did not get six per cent, nor five and one-half per cent; they only got in the neighborhood of three per cent. No railroad is asking for any more, they are not claiming a guarantee; no one claims it except somebody on the hustings trying to prejudice the people against this law. When the last provision I read was put into the statute we looked at it as a drastic limitation upon the railroads, because at that time, if you remember, interest rates were seven or eight per cent. Long time bonds were sold by the railroads secured by mortgages, some of them running ten years, drawing seven or eight per cent, and still we directed that railway income must not be more than six per cent, and only five and one-half per cent for dividends, and nothing if the road does not earn it. I repeat again, there is no guarantee.

If I am correctly informed my opponent says that it is only a quibble to contend that there is no guarantee, and that the direction to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates so the roads will get a reasonable return upon their property is in effect a guarantee. Nothing can be further from the truth. That is the one provision under which the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to determine what is a reasonable rate and to reduce rates if too high. He certainly cannot be asking to have that repealed, if he knows what he is talking about. Does he want the railroads to be at liberty to raise rates at will?

Freight and passenger rates are practically the same in Canada as here, though they have no Esch-Cummins law there. When we talk about high rates we should remember that in 1916 the roads paid only \$1,468,576,394 in wages, while in 1920 they paid \$3,698,216,351, besides increased prices for coal and other material. While there has been some decreases in wages and corresponding decreases in freight rates, the cost of operation is still very much greater than before the war.

Why, they tell so many fake stories about this law that it is absolutely ridiculous. Some of the parties traveling back and forth over this state making speeches insisted that this law created a burden of a dollar a day upon each family of five. Just think what that means! I don't think the man who made that statement can be credited with much sense. With the population that we have today that would amount to \$8,000,000,000. The total operating income of the railroads last year was only \$5,517,000,000. How can you make \$8,000,000,000 out of that? It costs something to run the railroads before this law was passed and that necessarily would have to be deducted. When you do that you will see how foolish this statement is. Take the last year in which the government operated these roads, 1919, and the year 1921, the last year for which there are any figures, and let us see just what the increase was. The total railway receipts in 1921 was \$5,517,000,000. The last year the government ran the roads it was \$5,144,000,000. The total increase then could only be \$373,000,000. That sum is all the extra amount collected by the railroads during 1921 over what was collected in 1919. But remember that during 1921 they had to pay not only the deficit under the government rates but in the vicinity of \$650,000,000 more for labor than the government paid in 1919. To make that payment they only got this \$373,000,000. This is the way that sum paid it: They discharged about four hundred thousand employees and cut other expenses in every way possible. Instead of the American public paying that \$650,000,000, the increase in railway wages, they only paid for that increase \$373,000,000, and that sum also paid the deficit the government was paying out of taxes. If the government had continued the operation of those roads, in all human probability it would have had to charge you the \$650,000,000, extra. While the operating income in 1919 was less than in 1921 the American people did not pay less; they paid out of the treasury of the United States an amount much larger than the increase in operating income.

It is under the Esch-Cummins law that we are getting our coal today; under that law the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to direct the movement of cars and trains, it has the right to say to the Great Northern railroad or any other railroad in this country: "You ship cars to the coal mines and carry coal to the lakes. It doesn't matter

whether it is a part of your business or not." Under that law we practically dominate the railroads. We practically tell them what they can do and what they must not do. We require that every item of receipt and expense shall be kept accurately so that we may know just what is done, and we impose a heavy penalty upon any one that makes a false entry in these accounts. Under it we have taken from them the power to prescribe rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission does that for them. We have taken from them the control over the issuance of stocks and bonds. I tried for many years to secure a law of that kind. Finally it was written into the Esch-Cummins law, and no watered stocks or bonds can hereafter be issued.

Is In Effect an Excess Profits Tax on Railroads

This law provides further that if any railroad earns more than six per cent, one-half of everything that it earns above that rate goes to the government and is its property. You may ask us why we do that. We do it for this reason: The rates necessarily must be the same. If you allowed one line to charge less than another, all the towns on that line would thrive and business on other lines would be driven out of existence. Cities and communities are constantly fighting for equal rates. If the aggregate of the property of the railroads pays, for instance, five or six per cent, some of the roads will earn a large amount, and others perhaps nothing. Take for instance the Chicago Great Western between Chicago and Minneapolis. That road has for many years earned nothing upon its stock, and the stock has been worth only a few pennies on the dollar, while other roads between those cities are earning perhaps a large return. As we need all the roads, rates have to be high enough so they may all continue to operate, but as we must make the rate the same we felt that if any company earned more than a fair rate the excess should at least in part go to the government.

Public Represented on Labor Board

This law provides for a Labor Board, in which the public has a voice, to settle disputes between the railroads and their employees. Heretofore all labor boards have consisted of a certain number of men representing the railroads and a certain number of men representing the employees of the roads. This board is composed of three men representing the railroads, three men representing the employees, and three men representing the public. In creating this board we tried to be fair, we did not give to it arbitrary powers; we did not say to this board, "You can regulate wages in any fashion you see fit." We directed that in reducing or increasing wages the board must take into consideration the cost of living, the wages paid in other industries, the risk and responsibility of employment and other things that necessarily enter into the fixing of a wage. We felt that wages was a matter in which the public was deeply interested. Every railroad strike spells disaster to the public; so does every coal strike, and the public is paying millions as a result of the recent railway and coal strikes. It is my belief that we must find some way to settle strikes of railway employees and coal miners, because if we don't the public will be at the mercy of coal operators, railway managers and a few labor leaders. These parties should be willing to submit to what is fair and just and ought not be allowed to disregard the public interest.

Valuation Not Based on Stocks and Bonds

Just a word or two more about this law. It is claimed that it authorizes rates to be based on watered stocks and bonds. That is absolutely false. It does nothing of the kind. This does not change the old law in that respect, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that rates can not be based on stocks and bonds but must be based on the actual value of the property of the roads. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been at work since 1913 with a large force of men to find such actual value. Instead of valuing the roads at what the railroads claim they have paid in to them, they value them at about \$1,250,000,000 less. The law does not value the roads; we left that with the only body that knows anything about that value. If any complaint can be made against the valuation

it must be made against the Interstate Commerce Commission and not against the Esch-Cummins law. No one has suggested any other way of finding the value.

How New Tariff Law Benefits Farmers

The new tariff law imposes substantial protective duties on all that the farmer has to sell. At the same time it puts upon the free list his harvesters, both grain and corn harvesters, his threshers, seeders, drills, cultivators, mowers, drags, fanning mills, and practically every other tool he uses on the farm. It puts on the free list his lumber, both rough, matched, grooved and planed; it puts on the free list his shoes, boots, harness and other leather goods; it puts on the free list his coal, oil, fence wire, posts and practically everything that the farmer has to buy for the purpose of operating his farm, and still, as I have said, everything that he produces is protected. Now it did not seem to me that I could vote against a bill of that kind. If protection has any value, this bill certainly gives it in full measure to the farmers. It is always claimed that protection is of great advantage to the manufacturers. As to many products raised on the farm protection is equally vital to the farmers, though on some items it may not at times be of much value.

When you come to other products that you have to buy (and I don't claim to be a tariff expert) it is insisted by those who ought to know that this is the lowest tariff law that the Republicans ever passed. Instead of trying to boost prices sky high by putting up a high tariff wall as it is called, we have tried to make that tariff as low as possible; low enough so that monopoly can not hide behind it. For fear that some article might be too high we gave to the President of the United States, for the first time in our history, power to reduce those duties in the event that any one should attempt to profiteer under it. Not only will it not boost the price of manufactured products but it is my judgment that its effect will be the opposite. At present we are importing vast quantities of such products from foreign countries, importing them at very low figures; but as we are not getting a full supply many of those who are doing the importing are outrageous profiteers. But you will say, "Why don't our factories open then?" I will tell you why. Because if they attempted to open they would be driven out of business. If they produced large stocks of goods under present prices of labor and material they would be in a position where they could be ruined any moment by the importers. Hence they have not dared to accumulate stocks or do much business while this threat hung over them. It is for this reason that I believe that this law instead of tending to increase prices will tend materially to reduce prices by creating a normal condition of competition among our own people that will work out a lower and fairer adjustment of values.

Fight for Prohibition Important

Speaking of prohibition, there are but very few people anywhere who are openly in favor of restoring the old saloon. The man who says he is in favor of doing that is almost a curiosity. Suppose you had saloons here, what would be the situation? Would the highways of this town be safe with all these automobiles? Isn't it true that the town is infinitely better off without them? Let us be honest with ourselves. Some say, "We don't want the saloon, but we want some beer to take home and drink there." If that was allowed, how could you stop it from being drunk anywhere in any store, club or room? If you allow any one to sell liquor on which a person can get drunk, you never can tell when the law has been violated, but if you make it illegal to sell anything intoxicating you know when you see a drunken person that somebody has broken the law. The sale for use in the home would be infinitely worse than to sell it in an open saloon for consumption there, because there you can have some police regulation. Such sales would debauch women and children in a way the saloon never was able to do; you would have all sorts of homes, you would have homes provided where people would sit and drink all night, where gambling, vice and crime would thrive unmolested. You would have all sorts of "clubs" that would be worse than the old public saloon.

The committee of which I am chairman has control of liquor legislation, and the chairman has a good deal of power in dealing with this subject. He largely determines what bills will receive consideration; a bill reported by the committee is usually handled by him in the House; he often has the power to prevent the adoption of unfriendly amendments by forcing a direct vote without giving any one a chance to offer any amendments. When a bill is amended by one house and the other house refuses to agree to such amendments a committee, three from the House and three from the Senate, is usually appointed to suggest a solution. The chairman of the committee in practice names this committee; you can readily see what that means as nearly all important bills go to such a committee. The man right below me on the Judiciary Committee is a wet, a very bright, keen lawyer, one of the very ablest in the east. A few years ago he defended Du Pont when he was sued for I think two million dollars. They don't employ cheap lawyers for such a case. If he had been chairman, I doubt very much that the co-operative marketing bill would have seen daylight. He represents a large city and his interests are naturally with the large city population, not with the farming community. If I am defeated, he will no doubt be chairman.

There is another reason why the anti-saloon forces are interested. My name has been so closely connected with the prohibition law that in many ways I have an influence upon the floor that no other man has in regard to prohibition legislation. Men who come from dry districts hesitate to vote against any proposition that I support because of the effect on the people of their district. The friends of the cause usually support me in practically any legislation that I seek.

Falsehoods

I find that in this campaign there is a good deal of the same methods pursued as were pursued two years ago. I was accused at that time of almost everything under the sun. It is a thing I don't like to talk about. Two years ago I only mentioned it on two or three occasions, but it is being repeated and repeated and I naturally resent it. Let me give you a sample of what they are circulating: Here is a quotation from the Canby Press, one of the Nonpartisan papers: "Volstead's recent veto in favor of the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill was only a sham, a smooth attempt to make the ex-soldiers believe he was for them in the hope that ex-soldiers have all forgotten how he favored the bonus veto before." The man that wrote that uttered a deliberate falsehood. There never was the slightest thing on earth to base that sort of accusation on. But that is the kind of campaign I have had to meet. There never was any chance for a veto of the compensation bill until the end of this session of Congress. I then voted to override the veto. I have supported the bill each time it has come up and have constantly spoken in favor of it. When the bill finally passed both houses a good many of my friends went home and didn't pay any more attention to it. I could have gone home too, but as there were rumors that this bill might be vetoed I stayed there in Washington so I might vote to override the President's veto; and that is the kind of reward I got from the Nonpartisan League, posing as a friend of this legislation. Is that honest?

To show how utterly baseless this charge is, I have here a letter from Hanford MacNider, national Commander of the American Legion, thanking me for what I have done on behalf of the ex-service men.

I have favored ex-service men much beyond the preference given by law. In examinations for post office appointments ex-service men get five points extra over others, which gives them a substantial advantage. Not only have all ex-service men that have attained the highest rating been appointed but many not so fortunate, and I have constantly urged my friends to select ex-service men as their candidates which has greatly aided them in securing the support of their townpeople—a thing that has made it possible to appoint many that could not otherwise be appointed.

Two years ago I was accused of being an atheist. You know the story—anything fair about that? When my opponent put himself upon the stand at the trial at Benson he did not furnish the slightest excuse on earth for making that statement. He didn't even pretend that he had found a person in Granite Falls who said I was an atheist, though in a speech at Clarkfield he claimed he had come to Granite Falls to inquire in regard to that very thing. Two years ago they accused me of having two barrels of whiskey in my cellar; some said I had two dray-loads. They didn't quite make the stories harmonize. They claimed that I favored compulsory military training, though I have always opposed it. Two years ago my opponent just before election made the statement, as it was reported to me, that \$500,000 had been spent by the Republican National Committee for the election of congressmen and that the greater part of it was spent in this district. Any man with any sense knew that was utterly false, but still it was used. This year I understand he is circulating the statement that some one has told him that the Anti-Saloon League spent \$48,000 in this district two years ago—another ridiculous falsehood. Only a small fraction of that sum could possibly have been spent in the district. But my friends, let me say to you who are Nonpartisans (if there are any such here) that you ought not talk about money. You are the last ones that can with any grace ask a hearing on that subject. You claimed two years ago that you had sixty thousand members in the League in this state, no doubt largely in this district. Just figure out what that means at \$18 apiece—a million and eighty thousand dollars. That is your own claim—a million and eighty thousand dollars according to the lowest estimate of the number of members that you had. Another thing: You traveled back and forth over this district asking and insisting on getting \$100 each from one hundred persons in each county. You know what that means. That amounts to \$10,000 a county, and would make \$140,000 in this district. I don't know how much you got, but I know that a number of men paid \$100. I have been told that you actually got the \$140,000. Another thing that you did: You started some eight or ten newspapers in this district, and they have been nothing but propaganda sheets from start to finish. They must have cost you from five to ten thousand dollars apiece, some of them almost twice that figure. Why, you talk about Newberryism; Newberry was a piker compared to the League.

My friends, I am charged with belonging to big business and being a tool of Wall Street. Every man that is opposed to the Nonpartisan League is charged with that. How did it happen that they got them all separated so neatly that only those that were inside the League were free from such a taint and that everybody else was a tool of Wall Street? Why, my opponent insisted two years ago that the Norwegian Lutheran clergymen were tools of Wall Street, that the Anti-Saloon League was a tool of Wall Street, that the W. C. T. U. was a tool of Wall Street. I am told he repeated that statement on a number of different occasions. (I am glad I am in good company.) It is easy to make that sort of charges, but is it fair or decent? I am perfectly willing to admit that the rank and file of the Nonpartisan League are honest, that they are trying to do the best they can to secure relief from the difficulties under which we are all suffering, but I am not willing to admit that they are any more honest than the rank and file of the Republican party or of the Democratic party. You don't get to be honest by joining a party.

Facts Shown by Record

Now what is my opponent going to do with Wall Street? What does he tell you that he can do to Wall Street? I want to tell you something that I have done against Wall Street and big business, to show you that the charge that he makes is utterly unjust and uncalculated. I introduced the first bill to take from the railroads the right to issue stocks and bonds without the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission and secured President Roosevelt's approval and promise to recommend such a law. I appeared before committees and made several speeches in the House in favor of it, and I steadily pushed it until it became a law. Now big business cer-

tainly didn't want me to do anything of that kind, because big business would thrive on this form of robbery. I supported the Hepburn Railway Act, the first act under which the government controlled railway rates, and I supported the Cummins amendment to it, under which the railroads were compelled to show that there was a necessity for increasing rates before they could increase them. I supported the parcel post law, which the express companies and the railroads fought as bitterly as they could, and the provision in that law under which packages of seventy pounds can be shipped, though we are paying a large deficit every year because of parcel post packages. I opposed Canadian Reciprocity when the railroads, the elevators, mills and other business interests in Minneapolis and St. Paul did everything they could to secure Canadian Reciprocity. I supported the constitutional amendment imposing an income tax, an amendment that was passed for the very purpose of shifting a large part of the burden of federal taxation from the common people to big business and to Wall Street. I supported the prohibition law—perhaps some of you have heard about that—and the prohibition amendment. That took millions of dollars out of the hands of Wall Street and big business. If I had been dishonest, those men would today do everything they could to elect me instead of getting out on the hustings and doing everything they can to defeat me. I helped draw a law which forfeited a vast amount of railway lands in the States of Washington and Oregon. Those lands were owned all over the country; many of them in this state. It saved to the government perhaps a hundred million dollars. Big business wasn't in favor of that sort of a law. I supported the soldiers' compensation bill. If there is any bill that big business is bitterly opposed to, it is that very bill. I opposed the Federal Reserve Bank. The Federal Reserve law is perhaps the one law above all others that big business and Wall Street did more to secure the passage of than any other and in which they are most deeply interested. I voted against it during every step in its passage and made at least two speeches against it on the floor. In some ways it is a helpful law, but I did not consider that it contained the necessary restrictions upon the issue of currency, restrictions that experience in foreign countries had shown to be necessary. I felt that the very thing that did occur during the period of the war and the period since the Armistice up to the crash of 1920, would be likely to occur under it and I opposed it. I have introduced bills and secured the passage of them, to punish those who engaged in war frauds, and have supported all legislation designed to accomplish that purpose. Still I am charged with trying to shield profiteers by not doing the very thing that the profiteers and lawless radicals are seeking to have done, to embarrass and prevent the Attorney General from punishing them.

The claim that I opposed the so-called Johnson-Woodruff resolution asking for an investigation of the Attorney General is simply another falsehood. It was an attempt to take up for consideration in the House that resolution in violation of the rules of the House; the Speaker held, that could not be done, and I simply voted with a vast majority of the members to sustain the rules of the House. That will not however prevent an investigation. The so-called Keller impeachment proceeding was simply an attempt on the part of the radical labor group to discredit and embarrass the Attorney General while he was fighting the cause of the people in the injunction suit issued to prevent violence and destruction of property by railway strikers seeking to prevent all transportation—a thing that was necessary so we might get coal and move our crops. This occurred a few days before the end of the session of Congress; a great many of the members had already gone home. There will be a full investigation of both these matters when we meet again in December, but I doubt that anybody will want an investigation then as it cannot serve the purpose of embarrassing the Attorney General in the prosecution of war grafters or to prevent him protesting the public against the effect of the late railroad strike which was led by a lot of lawless radicals. The Attorney General is himself insisting on a full investigation

so that these charges can be threshed out.

I opposed the repeal of the excess profits tax and voted to increase the income tax on the very large incomes from twenty-five to fifty per cent. I also supported an increase of the tax on the inheritance of the very large fortunes from twenty-five to fifty per cent.

There is another project that big business and Wall Street are very much opposed to. I have always supported and urged a canal from Duluth to the ocean, because I believe that that will do more than almost anything else to break the grip of New York upon this western country. It will tend to reduce railroad freight rates very materially and in many ways be a great blessing to this section of the country. I supported and helped to pass the law regulating stock exchanges and grain exchanges and was consulted about it on several occasions. Do you suppose that that is in favor of Wall Street and big business? They fought it bitterly throughout. I could go on and enumerate one thing after another that I have done for the purpose of helping Wall Street and big business, but for the purpose of serving those I represent. Still persons go out on the hustings and make these charges without specifying anything except perhaps the Esch-Cummins law as grounds for them. My opponent says he would repeal that law. It has been examined and re-examined by the two committees in charge of that legislation. Of course I won't suggest that it won't be amended. It will be amended like any other law, and I shall be glad to do anything I can to improve it; but the main principles of that law will undoubtedly remain, regardless of who is elected. Your Nonpartisans, Mr. Sinclair and Senator Ladd, from North Dakota, have neither of them introduced a bill for the purpose of repealing any part of the Esch-Cummins law. When they had hearings in the Senate committee and the House committee on the matter (they had long hearings on the subject last fall and this spring) neither of them appeared before either of those committees to urge that any provision of that law be repealed or even amended. It is easy to go out here and tell all sorts of stories about it, but when a man has to face the duty of framing amendments it is quite a different matter.

Value of Party Associates

My opponent does not belong to any party. Now, how is he going to be able to accomplish things without party associates to help him? Congress is run by parties. It always has been and in all human probability always will be. As far back as there is any English history you will find that the English government has been run by parties, and as long as we have had any government in this country parties have run it. Parties are absolutely necessary if you are going to accomplish anything. You must associate yourself with somebody—work with somebody to accomplish things. I can not think of anybody who has played a lone hand that has ever accomplished anything worth while in Congress, and I do not believe that you can name any one that ever has.

Under Republican administration this country has as a rule been prosperous. The Republicans have always rallied upon the farmers and small city people as their mainstay because the very large cities like New York have usually been Democratic. To retain power the Republicans have always sought to give to the farmers every possible consideration. Most of you have been Republicans in the years past. It seems to me that it would be good policy, good sense for you to support the party that is in position to help you. To get things you must ask it of those who have power to give. It does not help you to ask help from an organization that has no such power.

Now my friends, I want to thank you for the kindness you have shown me and for your courtesy in listening to me so patiently.