

Remonstrance

To the Board of County Commissioners
of Anoka County, Minnesota.

John Hansen

Whereas, by proceedings had by the County
Commissioners of said Anoka County, whereby
a ditch was established and built, said ditch
forming the part of the township of Ham Lake
and town of said County, and known as ditch
No. 21. The record and description of same, being now
on file in the office of the County Auditor of said
Anoka County,

And whereas, a tax has been levied against the
property affected by said ditch No. 21 and the amount
of levies and damages forced, and that several years
taxes so levied have been collected according to law,
for the purpose of defraying the expenses of a ditch
And whereas, proceedings are now pending before the
Jury and Board of County Commissioners for a ditch
said ditch being known as ditch No. 29, we hereby
draw the attention of said Board to the fact that
the portion of ditch No. 29, across and exactly de-
scribes the same course and direction from starting
^{point} to outlet as that of ditch No. 21 and is identical
with ditch No. 21, with the addition that a large amount
of new logging is added thereto, and that to make
said ditch No. 29, available for the use for which it
is intended namely to drain the adjacent lands,
and branches made tributary to ditch No. 21, as demands
and embraced in the report of the assessors of ditch No. 29
it becomes necessary to enlarge the channel of ditch
No. 21, and said enlargement is only merited as

To send April 1901.

We would like that there is no decree or order to order a paid and equitable tax for the benefit to be assessed by a suitable Act, but we hardly enter our protest against paying two or more such taxes for one Act, which would be the case if the present proceedings are completed as we understand they are liable to be by your honorable body.

The property owners affected by Act 1901 have already complied with all the conditions required by law to entitle them to a Act to drain their lands, and although it is a conceded fact that Act 1901 is entirely inadequate for the use for which it was intended, the owners of said Act removed in return bills of any benefit for the taxes that would nevertheless the money has been collected and gone into the county treasury and the owners shall have the balance of taxes.

The tax payers for Act 1901 are not in any way to blame for the ineffectiveness of said Act, and should not be held responsible for it.

If any law is to be considered therefore, it should be done by the party responsible for the ineffectiveness and that responsibility rests with the county through whom the law is administered and the work done and not with the property owners.

Therefore as tax payers affected by your action we pray that further proceedings with Act 1901 be stopped unless the tax for said Act 1901 be confined to the now-remaining owners by said Act 1901.

1 On me here through that Order No 21. be declared
2 breached and the balance of unpaid tax on said
3 Order No 21 be abated from the tax list and said
4 tax abated to that extent and the proper officers
5 notified to that effect.

6 And in that event, then all the lands affected by
7 Order No 21 and 29, shall pay their share of the
8 tax on Order No 29 according to the assessments
9 made by the assessors of said Order No 29. During
10 the unexpired term of the ten years,

11 By the foregoing provisions the tax payers of
12 Order No 21, will have to pay their full share,
13 while if your former proceedings are carried out
14 without this remedy, they would have to pay the
15 full amount of both taxes for ten years each
16 with a possibility of not a probability of their
17 taxes for a Order being multiplied from year to
18 year, without any additional benefit to be derived
19 there.

20 Signed J. G. Downing

21 John Downing