

ORDINANCE NO. 1.

An Ordinance annexing the School grounds of Common School District No. Ninety-two, (92), of Lacqui Parle County, Minnesota, to the Village of Louisburg, Minnesota, and including the same within the limits of said Village.

The Village Council of the Village of Louisburg, Minnesota, do ordain as follows;

ARTICLE 1.

Section 1.

Whereas a petition in due form by Common School District No. Ninety-two, (92), of Lacqui Parle County, Minnesota, by its Board of Trustees has been presented to the Council praying that the following described tract of land abutting upon the Village of Louisburg, Minnesota, but without the limits thereof to wit

Beginning at the South east corner of the South West quarter of the South East quarter, (SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$), of Section Twenty-eight, (28), Township One hundred twenty, (120), Range Forty-four, (44), Lacqui Parle County, Minnesota, running thence North Twenty-six and two-thirds, (26 $\frac{2}{3}$), rods, thence west twelve, (12) rods, thence south Twenty-six and two-thirds, (26 $\frac{2}{3}$) rods, thence East Twelve, (12) rods, to the place of beginning, be annexed to said Village and included in the limits thereof.

THEREFORE it is hereby ordained that the said tract of land above described be and is hereby annexed to the said Village of Louisburg, Minnesota and incorporated within the limits thereof, and is hereby declared to be an addition thereto.

Section 2. Said tract of land so annexed, shall be known hereafter as a part of said Village, as School District Addition to the Village of Louisburg.

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and publication.

Dated at Louisburg, Minnesota, April 27th 1912.

Attest.

John W. Schenner
Village Recorder.

J. L. Philly

President of Village Council.

1022

10²
J. L. W. Clegg
July 1968
Dear Sirs,
I am enclosing a copy of the letter I sent you on 26th June. I have now had time to consider your comments and would like to add a few points:
1. The figures given in the letter of 26th June were based on the results of a single experiment. The results of a second experiment, carried out under similar conditions, showed a much smaller increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant. This was probably due to the fact that the plants used in the second experiment were older than those used in the first.
2. The results of the experiments show that the increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant is not due to an increase in the rate of respiration of the plant. The results of the experiments show that the increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant is not due to an increase in the rate of respiration of the plant.

Yours sincerely,
J. L. W. Clegg
Dr. J. L. W. Clegg
Department of Botany
University of Bristol
Bristol BS8 1TQ
England

Enclosed is a copy of the letter I sent you on 26th June. I have now had time to consider your comments and would like to add a few points:
1. The figures given in the letter of 26th June were based on the results of a single experiment. The results of a second experiment, carried out under similar conditions, showed a much smaller increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant. This was probably due to the fact that the plants used in the second experiment were older than those used in the first.
2. The results of the experiments show that the increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant is not due to an increase in the rate of respiration of the plant. The results of the experiments show that the increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant is not due to an increase in the rate of respiration of the plant.

Yours sincerely,
J. L. W. Clegg
Dr. J. L. W. Clegg
Department of Botany
University of Bristol
Bristol BS8 1TQ
England

Enclosed is a copy of the letter I sent you on 26th June. I have now had time to consider your comments and would like to add a few points:
1. The figures given in the letter of 26th June were based on the results of a single experiment. The results of a second experiment, carried out under similar conditions, showed a much smaller increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant. This was probably due to the fact that the plants used in the second experiment were older than those used in the first.
2. The results of the experiments show that the increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant is not due to an increase in the rate of respiration of the plant. The results of the experiments show that the increase in the rate of absorption of oxygen by the plant is not due to an increase in the rate of respiration of the plant.