

THEIR ACTION LEGAL

**SAID THAT ATTORNEY GENERAL
CHILDS WILL SO ADVISE CAP-
ITOL COMMISSIONERS.**

HE IS STILL CONSIDERING,

**AND HAS NOT AS YET SUBMITTED
HIS FINAL OPIN-
ION.**

MR. LAMBERTON'S POSITION.

**Winona Member of the Board
Thinks It Will Do as Mr.
Child's Suggests.**

Attorney General Childs has not as yet written the supplementary opinion which he has intimated he will send to the governor, as to the capitol marble matter, but it is expected that he will do so either tomorrow or next day.

It was learned by the Globe yesterday at the capitol, on good authority, that this opinion would undoubtedly be that the action of the commission is legal. The act of 1893, under which the commission was created, gave it full power to act. This was a special law. The act of 1895 was a general law, applying to buildings generally in the state, and it is understood that the attorney general will rule that this could not by implication, at least, repeal the former special act or limit the curtail the powers of the board. This view of the law would sustain the action of the commission perfectly.

Commissioner H. W. Lamberton, asked yesterday in Winona in regard to whether or not he had received the letter which it is reported was sent to each one of the capitol commission:

"I have not as yet received any letter," he stated, "and have no opinion to express further than I did when I voted."

"What opinion have you in regard to this law of '95, as quoted?"

"When the commission acted I was fully acquainted with chapter 397, Laws of 1895, referred to, did not then think I was violating the law in voting as I did, nor do I think so now. But the attorney general is the legal adviser of the commission, and his opinion in the matter will doubtless govern the future action of the board."

"What do you think of the discussion of this matter as made in the Twin City papers?"

"The discussion in the Twin City papers," was the reply, "are a good deal like country theater sheet iron thunder and gunpowder lightning, created behind the scenes to win the applause from the galleries."

"What would be your choice in case the marble had to be rejected after all?"

"As to my action in such a case, I will cross that bridge when I come to it."

The Improvement Bulletin, discussing the agitation, Georgia Marble vs. Home Stone for the Capitol Building, says:

Certain parties directly interested in Minnesota stone quarries are making a desperate fight to prevent the carrying out of the programme, decided upon by the commission, for the use of Georgia marble, for facing a portion of the walls of the building. Other people, and some of the editors, infatuated with the local trade idea, are urging them on. Injunctions and all sorts of horrible things are threatened. It is claimed that the proposed use of material from another state violates a clause in the legislation authorizing the construction of the building. That is a matter of law, which the lawyers and courts will have to struggle over long and loud, if the parties persist in their opposition. In the meantime, everything must be brought to a standstill, all contracts and sub-contracts be hung up, the many men who have been figuring on employment this winter, will have to whistle a while longer, and in general, it will seriously inconvenience a large number of people and interests. It will be a nice thing for a few lawyers. It is a very unfortunate state of things.

It seems to be the consensus of opinion among architects and others, whose judgment is good and unclouded by local or other prejudice, that the idea of the architect and the decision of the commission were wise, and would give Minnesota the finest state structure, cost considered, in the country. It is a mistake to assume that Minnesota stone is "given a black eye" by this plan. Minnesota stone will be largely and conspicuously used in the structure. Its excellence for general building purposes is too well known, anyway, to be very seriously effected, if there did not a block of it appear. Minnesota quarries have been furnishing stone for important structures in a large number of states of the Union. Their proprietors expect to find a continued and growing market outside the Minnesota state lines. Isn't it a little dangerous doctrine for these owners and their friends to preach that the people of a state ought to confine their purchases to concerns located within its boundaries?

This home trade idea is a pretty one, if only it did not work both ways. There are others—other homes, other trades, other states, other cities. Suppose everybody adopts the local trade idea. There are concerns in Minnesota that do business in almost every state in the Union. Let all or many of the states shut out all outsiders, and these concerns will have to close down at least three-quarters of their plants, discharge that portion of their men, and come down to a hand-to-hand fight with the rest for what business can be scared up in Minnesota. If this is not the logical sequence of the policy advocated by the extreme home-traders, why not?

There is another phase of this many-faced matter. The Improvement Bulletin is informed on good authority that, should Minnesota granite have been decided on for use throughout the building, there are not anywhere near enough skilled stone cutters in Minnesota to do the work. The result would be that stone cutters would have to be imported (?) from a foreign (?) state. What a picture that makes to scare the home trade fiend out of eleven years' growth!

Home money to loan at lowest rates on good security. No charge for commission or exchange. No gold clause. We give the "on or before" privilege. The State Savings Bank, Germania Life Bldg., 4th and Minn.