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FRIDAY, JUNE 3

SPEAKER

H. L. HUDSON
Traffic Manager of the Port of Portland

SUBJECT

“The Relation of a Port to Its Patrons”

Committee Reports on Election Measures will be read by John C. Veatch, Chairman.

WORLD WAR VETERANS’ STATE AID FUND

Legislation pending in aid of veterans of the late war with Germany consists first of an enactment by the 1921 Legislature of Oregon of a law creating a fund from which long time loans may be made service men to aid them in purchasing farms and homes within the state; or in lieu thereof cash payments of $15.00 for each month in actual service; and, second, of a Constitutional amendment to be voted on June 7th providing that Article XI of the Constitution of Oregon be amended so as to permit the creation of this fund as provided in the Act passed by the Legislature.

At the Special Election to be held June 7th the Act passed by the Legislature will not be voted upon except inferentially. That matter has not been referred to the voters of the state. The proposed amendment to the Constitution is the only measure to be voted upon in the coming election. However, the two measures are so closely related that both must be considered in passing upon the Constitutional amendment.

The material provisions of the Act passed by the Legislature are:

(a) Loans of state funds to service men to aid them in purchasing farms and homes within the state, such loans not to exceed $3000 to one person and to be secured by first mortgage bearing 4% interest, payable on or before 28 years and limited in amount to 75% of the value of the security offered; or,

(b) Cash payments by the state to service men that may elect to take cash payments instead of loans provided, in the amount of $15.00 for each month in actual service and not to exceed $500.00.

(c) Creation of a special fund from which such loans or payments shall be made. In this regard it is provided that the state shall issue and sell its bonds to an amount sufficient to create the fund, which bonds shall bear not to exceed 6% interest.

(b) A tax levy of 1 mill on each dollar of taxable property within the state to defray interest payments on the bonds and provide a sinking fund to meet payment of the principal.

(e) A commission consisting of the Governor, Secretary of State and Adjutant General and two other members, one of whom shall be a service man to control and administer the fund.

Other salient features of the Act are:

The service man is not entitled to both the loan and the cash payment.

No service man receiving state aid in any other form or from another state shall be eligible to receive the benefits of the Act without first relinquishing such additional aid.

Immediate relatives of deceased soldiers and sailors shall be entitled to claim the benefits of the Act.

All loans made to service men under the Act shall be limited to $3000 in each loan.

All loans made shall in each case be secured by first mortgage and shall not exceed 75% of the fair market value of the security and shall be subject to foreclosure for non-payment as in other cases.

No loans shall be made except in bona fide cases to enable the purchase of or payment for farms or homes within the state and sale or disposal of such farm or home cannot be made prior to repayment to the state of 60% of the amount loaned.

The foregoing are provisions contained in the Act passed by the Legislature and have become law in this state.

Before the provisions of this law can be put into effect and the fund to aid service men be created by selling bonds of the state, it is neces-
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CITY CLUB NOTES

At last week's meeting E. H. Sensenich gave the Club a comprehensive digest of a report of the American Bankers' Association on present economic conditions. We regret that lack of space prevents us from giving a full account of his address.

Sinclair A. Wilson was the only nominee for the vacancy on the Board of Governors.

We will participate in the Rose Festival by holding the City Club meeting next week at the Festival Center in the Park Blocks. This will be a special feature in the activities of the Club.

WOMEN JURORS AND REVISED JURY LAW

To the Members of the City Club:

Your Committee to investigate the so-called Women Jurors and Revised Jury Law hereby respectfully submits synopses of the principal arguments which have been advanced in favor of and against the proposed measure.

THE ACT

Salient features of proposed law:
1. Permits women to serve as jurors.
2. Permits women to relieve themselves of jury service on written notice to the sheriff without assigning any reason therefor.
3. Jury lists shall be made up from tax roll, registration books and other sources of official information.
4. Requires proportionate selection from the registration books as well as tax rolls.
5. Requires at least one-half of the trial jury to be women in criminal actions involving a minor under eighteen years of age either as defendant or complaining witness.

Arguments advanced in favor of the proposed law:
1. Women pay taxes and are sued and bring suits in the courts.
2. Women are compelled to obey all laws and are prosecuted for violations thereof.
3. As voters women help to make the laws but are not allowed to sit in judgment in cases of the violation thereof.
4. Women defendants should have the privilege of women on the jury if they should be desired.
5. Women as well as men are guardians of minor children and should be allowed a share in the determination of court trials affecting them.

Arguments advanced against the proposed law:
1. Jury duty is incident to citizenship. Duties of citizenship pertaining to the administration of justice are compulsory upon men with certain limited and well defined exemptions. A law qualifying women to serve as jurors should make it a duty, with certain definite exemptions, and not merely an option dependent upon whim, caprice or pleasure.
2. A law making it optional for women to serve or not as they see fit makes jury service attractive to the least desirable element amongst women—the professional juror and the curiosity seeker.
3. Women have not the requisite knowledge of business nor the opportunity to acquire that knowledge which is essential in jury service.
4. The trial of most criminal and many civil cases abounds in much unsavory matter which the becoming modesty of most women abhors. Women who would willingly serve on juries in such cases would not be of the class which would make desirable jurors.
5. That part of the proposed law which makes it necessary that half of the members of a jury in a criminal action where the defendant or the complaining witness is a minor under eighteen years of age is objectionable because the average women would prefer not to serve upon such a jury and it would be difficult to secure a jury composed of women to the number proposed. The objection to service upon such a jury could not be exercised by a woman regularly on the panel, because under the proposed law, the desire not to serve must be exercised before the date of appearance.

A. B. RIDGWAY
C. A. MARSCH
Resume of Report on Legislative Regulation and Compensation Amendment

The proposed amendment:

1. Lengthens session from 40 to 60 days.
2. Increases pay of legislators from $3.00 to $5.00 per day.
3. Limits new bills to first 40 days except:
   a. Appropriation bills.
   b. Public defense bills.

Proviso: Four-fifths consenting, new bills can be introduced after 40 days.

First.—Lengthens session to 60 days.

Affirmative arguments:

1. Will allow greater time for consideration of bills by committees and members, as well as by public.
2. Will mean fewer and wiser laws.
3. Will give presiding officers time to appoint committees with resultant greater fitness of members.
4. Experience of practically all other states favors longer session.

Negative arguments:

1. More time, more laws.
2. Economy—an additional expense of probably $20,000.
3. Legislature may now run over the 40 days if necessary though without pay.
4. Qualified citizens will not sacrifice 60 days of time as legislators.

Second.—Increases pay from $3.00 to $5.00 per day.

Affirmative arguments:

1. Expense of legislators is at least $5.00 per day, and therefore with increase they will still receive no net "pay."
2. Members should not be expected to spend 60 days in the state's service without their expenses at least being met.
3. Some fit men refuse to run for the legislature because of the State's present attitude of expecting "something for nothing."
4. 40 or more states pay $5.00 or more per day on a basis of a 60 day session.

Negative arguments:

1. Economy—$2.00 per day for ninety members equals $180.00 per day for the 40 day period.
2. A man who can be induced to go to the legislature for a pittance of $2.00 additional would not be a fit public officer.

Third.—Limits new bills with certain exceptions to the first 40 days.

Affirmative arguments:

1. Appropriation and public defense bills can be proposed at any time.
2. Cuts down last minute rush since no new bills after first 40 days.
3. Amendments to bills allowable in last 20 days thereby eliminating defects from meritorious bills.
4. Gives committees and members practically 20 days for consideration of bills without interruption of new matters.
5. Public has reasonable chance to study bills because of 20 day free period.
6. In case of need new bills may be proposed in 20 day period by four-fifths consent.
7. Resolutions and memorials affecting public welfare may be proposed in entire time.

Negative arguments:

1. Will be usual last minute rush before end of 40 day period because of difficulty of securing four-fifths consent in last 20 day period.
2. Loose and vicious bills will easily get recognition in first 40 days in false belief that defects will be caught in last 20 days.
3. Final consideration on all bills together with appropriation bills will be left to the 20 day period with consequent rush.
4. Seven senators and thirteen representatives and often less will be able in the 20 day period to become a powerful and dangerous minority, because of the four-fifths rule.
5. This is but another form of the "Divided session" measure with the same weaknesses.

Conclusion:—Your committee is of the opinion that the arguments preponderate in favor of the proposed measure.

THADDEUS W. VENESS, Chairman
STANLEY MYERS
H. M. TOMLINSON

WORLD WAR VETERANS
STATE AID FUND

Continued from Page 1

sary that Article XI of the Constitution of Oregon be amended. Article XI of the Constitution does not at present admit of lending the credit of the State to aid service men as contemplated in the Act of the Legislature.

It is now proposed that the Constitution of Oregon be amended so as to allow the Act of the Legislature to be put into effect, and it is now for the voters of Oregon to say whether or not this constructive piece of Legislation passed by the Legislature shall go into effect and whether the state shall lend its credit to service men to enable them to secure farms and homes within the state or in lieu thereof cash payments as provided in the Act.

The arguments in favor of this measure are almost as numerous and diverse in character as there are service men within the state of Oregon.

Unfortunately the popular argument in favor of the measure is the so called patriotic argument that the service man is entitled to state aid as a
reward for patriotic service and sacrifice in defense of the Nation. This is a superficial argument and is not a credit to the service men of Oregon, and does not represent the opinions of the rank and file of the service men in the state. It commercializes patriotism. It detracts from, rather than adds to the glory and honor of the service rendered.

Another superficial argument in favor of this measure is that while the service man was engaged in mortal combat on the battlefield, the shipyard worker and the profiteer reaped unheard of profits from the war that was waging. In view of this it is urged that the compensation of the two classes should be equalized. This is also a superficial argument and is not a credit to the service men. Such trends to place the service men in the same class with the shipyard worker and the profiteer. Be it said to the credit of the American Legion that the majority of its members do not support this view of the matter.

It is justly urged in favor of the measure that it is a constructive measure, giving constructive aid that will benefit both the service man and the state of Oregon. It is a re-constructive measure that will to a marked degree alleviate economic conditions resulting from the war. It will enable the best type of citizenship of the state to secure farms and homes within the state. In short, it is extending the credit of the state in developing both its citizenship and natural resources—than which there can be no better investment by the state.

Another argument in support of this measure is that it is in line with other forms of state aid. The state now lends its credit to the farmer. For more than 40 years the state has loaned its school funds to the farmer at a low rate of interest. In 1917 the state further, by direct vote of the people, passed the State Rural Credit law providing for extending additional credit of the state to farmers. The state also lends its credit in backing irrigation and reclamation projects throughout the state. It is rightfully urged that lending the credit of the state in aiding its veterans of the late war in purchasing farms and homes is simply in line with the present and past policy of the state in developing its resources.

It is further urged in support of the measure that it affords constructive aid that will enable the service man to help himself. This argument merits consideration.

Another argument is that it will develop the agricultural and domestic resources of the state. The state will add to the number of its farm and home owners. This argument merits most careful consideration.

Unfortunately no reliable estimate of the probable cost to the state in carrying out the provisions of the measure has as yet been furnished. It is a difficult matter to determine because of the contingencies involved.

It is estimated on reliable authority that only a relatively small percentage of service men will elect to apply for the cash payments as the loan feature is decidedly more attractive to the vast majority of service men. Figures submitted by the Adjutant General’s office place the probable number applying for the cash bonus at not exceeding 10,000. Figures from the same office fix the average period of service at 10 months. If 10,000 men should elect to apply for the cash bonus the cost to the state would be about $1,300,000 under this feature of the Act.

No accurate estimate of the probable cost to the state under the loan feature can be offered. The cost will depend largely on the advantageous or disadvantageous sale of bonds issued under the Act. The interest rate to the service men is 4%. The state would be required to absorb the difference in interest rates. It is estimated on reliable authority that the cost to the state under this feature will not be large. While it is probable that the cost to the state will be considerable, the gain, however, to the service men and the state of Oregon should more than counter-balance the cost of putting the law in effect.

Some of the arguments urged against this measure are the following:

It commercializes patriotism.

Cost to the state will be prohibitive.

Abuses will arise in its administration.

Cash payment feature is undesirable.

It is a matter coming particularly within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Some but not all of these objections have merit. It is true that abuses will arise in administering the fund. This will be unavoidable and is an incident to every piece of legislation of this character. The main result will, however, far transcend any abuses that may arise.

The cash payment feature is perhaps undesirable. We are advised that the Legislature sought to eliminate this feature but was unable to do so because in many cases immediate relief is needed in which cases the loan feature would not be adequate.

It is true that this matter comes particularly within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The fact remains, however, that the Federal Government will do nothing and any aid that may be offered will have to come from the individual states.

It is earnestly recommended that the City Club unqualifiedly endorse this measure on the ground that it is a piece of constructive legislation and affords constructive aid to the service man and will result in lasting benefit to the state at large.

Prescott W. Cookingham
C. L. Whealdon Committee.