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members of the Bar in behalf of such bills, the possibilities of accomplish-
ment would be greatly enhanced.

Unless the members, generally, are interested in devoting some time
to the legislative program after the convention is over, and are willing to
concentrate upon a more limited program, the Bar Association might as
well adopt the following policy: "The purpose of the legislative program
of the Minnesota State Bar Association is to give the various pre-
convention committees an opportunity to work and make recommenda-
tions pleasing to the members of the convention, but without serious
expectation or hope of accomplishment."

Respectfully submitted,

Beldin H. Loftsgaarden, Chairman
Claude H. Allen
Erving Berg
M. J. Galvin
David L. Grannis

Douglas Hall
C. A. Johnson
Duncan L. Kennedy
T. J. Mangan
J. J. McCaughey

REPORT OF THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

To the Minnesota State Bar Association:

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends:

That upon the election of the President, the Committee on
Membership be appointed and confirmed at the first meeting of
the Board of Governors, July 14, 1944.

REPORT

The purpose of the recommendation of your Committee is to keep
the Membership work on a twelve month basis. There should be no lapse
in this important task; hence, your Committee feels that the appointment
of this committee should be made at an early date so that the Membership
Drive which was commenced in 1944 may be continued throughout the
coming year. 149 new members have been brought into the Association as
of April 24, 1944.

The splendid cooperation of the District Associations and the local Mem-
bership Committees has been most gratifying. The result of the 1944 Mem-
bership Drive in no small part is due to the hearty support of District
Officers and Committees as well as the members of the State-wide Com-
mittee.

The Membership of the Association on April 24, 1944, the date of the
submission of this report is 1391 members, as compared with a total on
April 29, 1943, of 1261 members, and a total of 1737 for the entire year of
1943. Unfortunately, approximately 50 of our members die during each
twelve month period, and a similar number are taken into the armed
forces, hence, it will be seen that the first 100 new members brought into
the Association each year merely fill the ranks of those who have left, but
do not add to our total paid membership. It therefore becomes apparent
that working on the Membership Committee is like working on a tread
mill. We can't stand still, we must go forward. World War II has so far
taken into the armed forces a total of approximately 250 members of the
Association. A large percentage of applicants for admission to the Bar
of this state are inducted into the armed forces at the time of their admis-
sion to the Bar, and consequently, will have no opportunity of joining the
Association until they return to civilian life. We must continue to attract
to the Association older practitioners who are fortunate enough to remain
at home. We hope that our goal of 2,000 members will be reached before
the convening of the Annual Meeting of the Association on July 13 and
14, 1944. Your committee will continue its efforts until that time and sug-
gests that the new committee continue the work thereafter.

In order for the Minnesota State Bar Association to properly repre-
sent the Bar of this state, it should have the vast majority of practicing lawyers on its membership roll. A goal of 2,000 from a possible number of 3,000 is not too much to expect.

The records of the Central Office indicate that at the date of the submission of this report there are 391 members who have not paid their 1944 dues. Assuming these dues will all be paid and then adding this number of 391 to our April 24th total of 1391 gives us a projected total of 1782. This would be an increase over last year of approximately 50 members, however, we would still be more than 200 members short of our goal of 2,000. We therefore ask your renewed efforts in bringing in new members between now and the end of the year.

One of the problems which faces the Membership Committee each year is the burdensome task of re-soliciting lawyers who have not paid current dues. It seems to be a needless burden to impose upon the Membership Committee the necessity of re-selling old members, year after year, on the idea of paying current dues to their own organization. Perhaps a special committee should study the advisability of recommending to the District Associations the feasibility of carrying a member on its rolls so long as he remains in the District and bill him for current dues as well as delinquent dues. The practice now seems to be to drop delinquent members for non-payment of dues and then re-solicit them for membership in subsequent years.

The following figures show the membership of the District Associations on December 31, 1943, as compared with the membership of April 24, 1944.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>December 31, 1943 Total</th>
<th>April 24, 1944 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Judges</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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T H. WANGENSTEEN, Chairman
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