# NESTOS ON THE U. S. SENATORSIHP

The primary election in June resulted in the Republican nomination of a ticket composed partly of Independent Republicans and partly of Leaguers. The opposition have now put up a complete League ticket replacing those Independents who were nominated in the June primary by such as belong to their own organization and are in sympathy with their political ideals and administration practices. It was reliably reported as early as July that Mr. Frazier and other League nominees as well as many of the League leaders were in favor thus again following their usual practice and to indorse a complete League ticket for the fall election, and that this would be done.

The portion of the League press which is inspired by the League leadership, shortly thereafter commenced to ask me to declare far in advance of the campaign whom I was going to support for Senator when their own Mr. Frazier, and other League nominees on the Republican ticket refrained from making any public declaration of their purposes, but were nevertheless known to be in favor of a full League ticket.

Their purpose in asking me to make such a statement was plain. They were confident that with my knowledge of Mr. Frazier's party record, his record as Governor of the state, and chairman of the Industrial Commission, and his attitude on certain fundamental doctrines of Republicanism, that I could not possibly support him for the Senatorship, and that by making such a statement in July or August, they would then use it as an excuse for doing exactly what they had already decided to do; to ignore the primary results and to put a full League ticket in the field.

### FRAZIER HAS ALWAYS FOUGHT REPUBLICAN NOMINEES

In this attitude neither the League leaders nor Mr. Frazier are inconsistent with their political or party record. They have supported in any state in each election whatever party the time best served their selfish or factional purposes, and know no party fealty, or loyalty to party principle and ideals. Ever since Mr. Frazier came into prominence in public life he has refused to abide by the results of the republican primaries, unless those results were as he personally wished them to be. He has never by word or deed recognized that the verdict of our Republican primaries had any binding affect upon him or was entitled to any weight. Instead of announcing his support of the entire ticket nominated and urging all Republicans, regardless of faction, to abide by the result, he permits the former Attorney General, re-called in October, 1921, the man who during all the administration of Mr. Frazier as Governor, according to the Courier-News controlled the administration, to name himself as candidate for Governor and to fill the other places upon the ticket which were not already filled by persons satisfactory to him, by men of his own selection. I am not referring to these things in a spirit of complaining; I am simply reciting facts. It is perhaps just as well that Mr. Frazier and Mr. Lemke did those things. **Mr. Frazier's record ever since he entered public life is, in the main, a record of warfare and hostility towards the Republican party.**

In 1916, when he first became candidate for a state office with the endorsement of the Non-Partisan League, but upon the Republican ballot, he refused to abide by the verdict of the Republican primaries and supported a Democrat for State Treasurer against the candidate, Mr. John Steen, who was regularly nominated by the Republicans in June at the same time when Mr. Frazier himself was nominated. In 1918, he supported two men for Congress in the first and in the Third Congressional Districts who he and his friends induced to certify themselves into the Republican column, who had been life long Democrats. The first J. M. Baer, was appointed by President Wilson to office in North Dakota. The other J. H. Sinclair, had been elected to the State Legislature by the Democrats and always had been a Democrat. In addition, it was reliably reported and is generally understood that these two men promised the Democratic National organization to enter the Democratic caucus and to act with the Democrats if the House should thereby be controlled by the Democratic party. These things were known to Mr. Frazier. He nevertheless, supported them because they were willing to accept the endorsement of the faction to which he belonged.

In 1920, he refused to support the regularly nominated Republican candidate for Congress in the First District, Hon. O. B. Burtness, but supported a man who had always been a Democrat, who was nominated by petition, who ran in the Independent column and who had never done anything to further the cause of the Republican party. In 1920, many of his followers and the newspapers which were controlled by his supporters did everything they could to embarrass the Republican organization. In fact it will be remembered that in a great many counties in North Dakota **the faction to which Mr. Frazier belongs passed resolutions denouncing the national platform and the candidate of the Republican party for President, and openly supported a third party candidate.** At no time did Mr. Frazier offer any remonstrance against such action, and it was generally stated and believed that he was in full sympathy with the assaults upon the Republican candidates, and that he refrained from open attack upon them merely because he feared it would hurt the candidacy of Professor Ladd.

### FRAZIER HAS OPPOSED THE REPUBLICAN TICKET IN OTHER STATES

In 1920, Mr. Frazier, though running on the Republican ticket as candidate for Governor, nominated at the primaries of that party, **went into the state of Montana and advocated the election of the entire Democratic ticket,** state and national, against the regularly nominated Republican candidates. During this same year and in this same campaign he **went into the state of Minnesota and opposed the election of the regularly nominated Republican candidates for state and national offices.** There he advocated the election of what they called in that state "Farmer-Labor Candidates," that belonged to neither party as far as political affiliation is concerned.

This year, I am informed that **Mr. Frazier, the Republican nominee for U. S. Senator,** has gone into the state of South Dakota and probably is there now or has just returned, advocating the election, not of the regularly nominated candidates on the Republican ticket, but of candidates endorsed by the Non-Partisan League, who are openly opposing and berating the Republican candidate. In a speech in the Twin Cities, this summer of 1922, as reported in his own press, Mr. Frazier severely and unjustly denounced President Harding and the Republican administration. His denunciation of the record of the Republican party nationally was fully as severe as any Democratic criticism.

### FRAZIER HAS BEEN DISLOYAL TO REPUBLICAN PARTY AND ITS PRINCIPLES

These are but few of the numerous illustrations that could be adduced to show Mr. Frazier's complete lack of loyalty or adherence to the Republican party and its principles. With a facility which the chameleon might envy, Mr. Frazier has changed his political hues as a temporary or local expediency seemed to require. With a record of adherence to the Republican party so entirely evanescent and unreliable, I feel, myself, as a Republican wholly unable to give him my confidence or support. I cannot reconcile his record with any of the principles of the Republican party. When a man persistently and consistently refuses to support the candidates nominated by his own party in the regular way as provided by law, I believe it is proper to pause and inquire into the sincerity of his professed Republicanism. Personally I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that a man who wears the Republican label before the election, but repudiates the principles of the party after he gains office, can be considered a Republican.

The record made by Mr. Frazier as Governor of North Dakota for a period of five years condemns him as utterly unfit to represent the Republican party or the State of North Dakota in the United States Senate. **Were we to accept him as a Republican the Republican party must needs accept full responsibility, as a party, for five years of the grossest misrule that was ever visited upon a state. As Republicans we do not accept such responsibility and the Democrats of the state do not insist that we shall.** The administration of Governor Frazier ruined the credit of our state with the result that our bonds could not be sold in the financial marts of the country and outside investors withdrew their capital from our state; **were we to elect him United States Senator that credit, now to some extent rehabiliated and restored, would unquestionably suffer again.** As Governor of the State of North Dakota and as candidate for re-election as Governor, I may be presumed to be sufficiently interested in the welfare of the state during the next two years and in the maintenance of its credit, to aid in preventing such calamity.

### PLAIN WORDS

Mr. Frazier has demonstrated—I speak plainly for the time for plain speaking has come, since the people's interests are at stake—that he possesses neither the spirit, capacity nor the independence necessary to properly discharge the duties of a great office. We have for the past three years, since the irefficiency, misconduct and corruption that marked his administration became known, listened to the apologies made for Mr. Frazier by his friends until it has become humiliating to realize that we have had a Governor, though re-called—and are now threatened with a United States Senator—whose record as a public servant cannot be defended or justified except by saying, "he did the best he could" or by the further apology that he was in the hands of dishonest men who advised him corruptly for dishonest and selfish purposes and whose advice he implicitly followed. This apology may exhonerate him from the moral standpoint but it is scarcely a compliment to his intelligence or his administrative ability. **The people of our country do not wish to risk the affairs of the Nation in the hands of people who have not been able or willing in other positions to prevent grafting and mismanagement of public affairs.**

With such a record of hostility towards the Republican party and with such a record as a public servant, nominated on the Republican ticket but repudiated by our own state, he would be a liability to the Republican party as United States Senator and a detriment to the state and nation. I cannot support him, he is not Republican. **It has been demonstrated in our own state during the past five or six years that a man may by accident win the nomination upon the Republican ticket although he never embraced any of the principles of the Republican party and never before even openly professed to adhere to its principles.**

### RADICALISM VS. CONSTITUTIONALISM

Sometimes issues arise that transcend mere partisan consideration. They are beyond self interest, beyond mere party interest, as that is superficially interpreted, and reach the very fundamentals of citizenship and of constitutional government. On these issues all good citizens stand together. We rise from the lower levels of personal and selfish strife, ascend to a plane on which we stand together upon these great fundamentals. **There is going on in the United States today a struggle that involves the existence of the fundamental principles of the constitution and of the Republican form of Government.** The forces of radicalism are massed against the forces of constitutionalism. **The one or the other must go down.** We have fought the fight in our state for five years and are fighting it today. We won the first battle when the infamous House Bill No. 44, which sought to eliminate any reference to patriotism and morality from the constitution, was defeated, notwithstanding the support given it by Mr. Frazier and Mr. Lemke.

When Mr. Frazier's Republicanism is questioned, he responds that he is a Lincoln Republican. He evidently feels that he is safe, and that his Republicanism cannot successfully be challenged when he goes back that far. Just so he does not commit himself in approval of any Republican policies, traditions or leaders of the last half century. But even when he goes back that far he is not safe. **If you compare the statements made by Mr. Frazier on fundamentals of Republicanism with the statement made by the immortal Lincoln on the same subject, you will find that Mr. Frazier is as badly out of harmony with Lincoln Republicanism as he is with Republicanism today.** The great founder of the Republican party, Abraham Lincoln, gave expression to the fundamental principle of the supremacy of the law and the constitution in immortal words. It will not be forgotten that Abraham Lincoln gave his life that the Union and the constitution might be saved. that he was stricken down by the hand of a man who did not believe in accepting the verdicts of the ballot, but who, when the verdict was contrary to his own prejudices and his own passions, resorted to violence and assassination, Mr. Lincoln said;

**"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the revolution never to violate in the best particular the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be written in primers, spelling books and almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed from legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice. In short, let it become the political religion of the nation."**

It is not impertinent to ask where **the candidate for United States Senator, who won the nomination upon the Republican ticket in the primaries in June, stands upon these questions.** Fortunately it is not necessary to speculate, it is not necessary to guess, it is not even necessary to place our own construction on the numerous acts of his administration which indicate his attitude. In addresing a labor gathering in September, 1919, Mr. Frazier as reported in his own organ said:

**"Our forefathers in 1776 had no voice in the taxes they had to pay, so they organized the revolution and broke away from tyranny. It was a just revolution.**

**"I hope to God that we can change things here by the use of the ballot. I think we can. But if we can't, it may be necessary to have another just revolution."**

From the evidence thus presented on Mr. Frazier's attitude of opposition to Republican candidates, fundamental Republican doctrines, and to the Republican party itself, it must be evident also that he has been, and would be wholly out of harmony with the plans, purposes and legislative policies of the Republican party of today.

### REPUBLICAN PARTY CHAMPION OF REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Upon these great and fundamental principles I plant my feet squarely, upon the ground occupied by the fathers of the Republic and by the founders of the Republican party. **I have always preferred to believe that the Republican party represented something more than mere desire for office holding.** I have always assumed that it stood for certain fundamental principles of government as well as principles of administrative policy. One of these principles, which in my judgment constituted the cornerstone of its existence, is respect for the law and obedience to the mandates of the Constitution. The Republican party is the historical champion of a republican form of government. The essence of the Republican form of government is that the people shall have unhampered opportunity to express their will through the ballot box and that minority should obey the law enacted by such a majority, and act according to its prescribed forms. **Appeals to the sword and to revolutionary violence cannot exist side by side with devotion to the principles of our Republican form of government and the Constitution.** Through the ballot all governmental change should come. It is the sceptor of the sovereign citizen. By the ballot, and not by the sword of revolution, the true American settles all political questions.

### ENDORSEMENT OF O'CONNOR

As a Republican I regret that the man who got the Republican nomination as candidate for United States Senator in the regular way is not a Republican whom all Republicans could support. Naturally, that is where my support would go as a citizen of lifelong affiliation with the Republican party. Mr. Frazier's opponent belongs to the Democratic party and his name will be found in the Democratic column. As a citizen, owing an obligation under the Constitution and the law to exercise the right of suffrage in the best interest of my state and of the Nation, I am compelled to choose between Mr. Frazier in the Republican column, and a Democrat. As a citizen, I experience no difficulty in arriving at a choice. Mr. O'Connor served in the Legislature of our State in 1917 and again in 1919. He was a member of the lower House when the infamous House Bill No. 44, subversive of the very principle of constitutional Government, was introduced, with the support of Mr. Frazier, Mr. Lemke and their associates. Mr. O'Connor was one of the mainstays of the opposition to House Bill 44, standing side by side with the Republicans who opposed it as un-American and unconstitutional. Upon every question in our state involving law and order, involving support of the constitutional principles and of the fundamentals of Republican government, Mr. O'Connor has alwaws stood upon that high ground, which the founder of the Republican party and the Republicans have always occupied. If Mr. O'Connor be elected United States Senator from North Dakota this fall he will be a creditable representative of the State. He understands its economic needs, and he will faithfully represent it in the Capitol of the Nation. He stands solidly upon constitutional principles and upon the principles of Republican government, which Republicans have always adhered to, and he will defend and champion them on all proper occasions and at all times. **The issue in this state is between Radicalism and Constitutionalism, and that issue is being fought out in the National Forum. When the champion of radicalism, of revolutionary agitation, as against the champion of constitutionalism and respect for the law and for the verdict of the ballot box, asks my vote, be he in the Republican column or elsewhere, I cannot give it to him.** When there is opposed to him a man who stands for the principles of constitutional government for the very principles for which the founder of the Republican party laid down his life, and I have to choose between the two, I do not hesitate to say that I shall cast my vote and my influence for that other man. In this instance, he happens to be a Democrat running on the Democratic ticket with his name in the Democratic column. He also happens to be a citizen devoted to the essential and fundamental principles of constitutional government that needs champions today, not only in the state, but in the National Forum as well. Mr. O'Connor can be depended on to champion these principles in Washington fearlessly and well. In the great fights that we have gone through, he has stood for law and the constitution at all times and has supported candidates, whether they were nominally Republicans or nominally Democrats, who stood for these principles. It is time we look through sham and lay hold of the substance of things.

### NOT NEW PRECEDENT

In taking this position in support of Mr. O'Connor in the Democratic column, I am not setting a new precedent. I have not forgotten that a Democratic president, Woodrow Wilson, urged the support of a Republican for United States Senator in the State of Minnesota in 1918. I have not forgotten that a Democrat and a United States Senator in the State of Montana, Mr. Myers, in 1920, with his pen and with his tongue urged the election of the Republican nominee from the State of Montana because the other nominee represented fundamental principles of government that he believed were antagonistic to our constitution and a Republican form of government. I have not forgotten that President Wilson, himself a Democrat, telegraphed congratulations to Calvin Coolidge when he won the election as Governor of Massachusetts over a Democrat, saying that "his victory was a victory for law and order." It is a sign that augurs well for the permanence of our constitution that men are able and willing to look through sham, to tear off labels and to plant their feet squarely upon the principles of the Constitution, regardless of party names, when such great issues are involved. Even the great founder of the Republican party, Abraham Lincoln, supported a Democrat for United States Senator in Judge Trumbull, and history has never censored him for it. He supported him because he believed great and fundamental principles were at stake and that party labels were less important than principles.

**The people of the State of North Dakota are put to the test his fall. They have before them the great issues that divide the country into two camps and that are fast rising above the issues that have been dividing lines between Republicans and Democrats.** The people of the state will be called upon to decide whether they will vote for the men who represent the sound principles of government for which the founders of this Republic laid down their lives, regardless of the party label that they carry, or whether they will support men regardless of what they stand for because they carry a certain party label. For my part, I trust that in the interest of my state and my country all the independent candidates endorsed by the joint committee will receive the support of the people of the state regardless of party. **The people of our state have demonstrated that to them principles are more important than labels and names. I am confident that their verdict this fall will vindicate their patriotism.**

---

### THE PRICE OF WHEAT

The opposition, with their usual campaign tactics of diverting the attention of the voters from the real issues of the campaign by raising false issues, have claimed that the state administration is responsible for the recent fall in grain prices. This claim is so silly that it seems almost incredible that any voter should be deceived thereby. Yet, I have been informed that there are men who believe even such a statement.

It must be plain to all thinking men that the administration has no power to influence the rise or fall of grain prices. It is a product of the world markets and the rise and fall in price is governed altogether by national and international conditions over which the state administration has no control.

**If the state administration has had the power to influence the rise and fall in grain prices, then surely Governor Frazier who was in full sympathy with Professor Ladd and with William Lemke, when in the fall of 1920 they foolishly told the farmers to hold their wheat for $2.65 per bushel, would have done something to prevent the disastrous decline in prices during the fall and winter, which was much greater than the decline this fall.** But the fact is that neither Frazier in 1920 nor I in 1922 had any power to prevent the decline. It was caused by conditions which neither of us was in a position to change.—**Gov. Nestos in opening address.**

# FEAR OF CHURCH CONTROL OF OUR GOVERNMENT ABSURD

**Some excitable people at times become greatly exercised over what to them seems to be a danger that our government will pass into the control of one of the many religious denominations which exist in this country. Some times it is the Mormons that they fear will secure control of the government, and sometimes it is some other denomination. Certain papers have in the past traded on this fear for their own gain, and unscrupulous political agitators have at times tried to arouse religious prejudices in order to assist in bringing about the election or defeat of certain candidates. It may be said, however, that the small effect that this sort of propaganda usually has shows the sound judgment and good sense of the overwhelming majority of the people in this country.**

**A survey made by the Methodist Church and published in the August, 1922, issue of the Builder, a magazine published by The National Masonic Research Society of Anamosa, Iowa, gives the following as the church affiliation of the members of Congress:**

**SENATE**

4 Non-members.
23 Unknown.
1 Protestant Episcopalian.
1 Christian.
2 Lutheran.
2 Dutch Reformed.
2 Unitarian.
2 Mormons.
6 Catholics.
6 Baptist.
7 Congregationalist.
11 Presbyterian.
12 Episcopalian.
17 Methodist.

**HOUSE**

24 Non-members.
101 Unknown.
1 United Brethren.
1 Mormon.
1 Independent.
1 Mennonite.
1 Dutch Reformed.
1 Evangelical.
2 Universalists.
3 Quaker.
5 Unitarian.
10 Disciples.
10 Lutheran.
11 Christian.
3 Jewish.
18 Catholic.
23 Congregational.
35 Episcopalian.
29 Baptist.
99 Methodist.
56 Presbyterian.

**Taking into consideration only the leading denominations in this country, there are more Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and fewer Baptists, Lutherans and Catholics in the two Houses in view of the total membership of the different churches. But the ordinary citizen who calmly contemplates the situation will not be greatly perturbed over any danger of one or the other of the various denominations seeking or securing control of the government. If one should try it all the others would immediately get busy to prevent it. One against the whole field would have no chance.**

---

# ECONOMIES OF BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

**The new State Board of Administration, which controls the state institutions, after an investigation into the methods adopted by the Board during the previous administration, has affected a reorganization of the different departments so as to insure their functioning with greater efficiency and less waste than in the past.**

**Among the things discovered in their investigation was a shortage of $12,000 in the supply department, which the members of the Board attribute chiefly to carelessness and inefficiency.**

**It was also discovered that materials worth thousands of dollars have been allowed to go to waste or be sold for junk, because of the lack of care in determining the needs of the various institutions.**

**Two of the state institution were found to be under-insured to such an extent that their destruction by fire would have meant a loss to the state of several hundred thousand dollars.**

**The practice of the former purchasing agent in grouping articles required in such a way that only a few supply houses could furnish all of them, resulted in the state paying a higher price for many supplies than was necessary. On one article alone a change in the method of purchasing has resulted in a saving equal to 33 per cent of the cost.**

**The total value of the property of the institutions under the direction of the Board was in 1921 estimated at $8,200,000.**