League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

Copyright Notice:

Version 3
August 20, 2018

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth Street, Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

File Copy
don't remove from LWV office

May 18, 1953
Additional copies - 60¢

F 2 D 2
Leg Report
1953

1953 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

INDEX

H.F. 49 - Amendment to the Constitution which states that any revision would have to be submitted to a vote of the people. Passed by the House, 120 to 0. Heard in the Senate and amended to read that any new constitution which was submitted to the people would be ratified by 60% of those voting on the question rather than a majority of those voting in the election, and that legislators may serve as delegates to a convention. The House concurred. Passed by the Senate, 43 to 0.

Supported by the League. This measure was passed.

H.F. 100 - An act proposing a Convention to revise the Constitution, the revised constitution to be submitted to the people for approval. Required a 2/3 vote. Defeated in the House 78 yeas to 49 nays. Never heard in the Senate committee or on the floor.

Supported by the League. This measure was lost.

H.F. 238 - Amendment to the Constitution which would give the Legislature the power to turn itself into a Constitutional Convention. Passed by the House, 87 to 23. Never heard in Senate committee or on the floor.

Opposed by the League. This measure was lost.

S.F. 622 - Amended in the Senate Judiciary Committee so that recourse to the district court for appeal or enforcement was eliminated. The League went along with the amendment and the request for a Special Order passed, 55 yeas to 0 nays. The final vote in the Senate was 39 yeas, 22 nays.

H.F. 518 - Amended to conform with the Senate File 622. Request for a Special Order was made twice, in order that the bill might be heard and voted upon during the session, after a series of intentional delays in committee. The vote on the first Special Order was 84 yeas to 41 nays. A second request for a Special Order was made and it too failed by a vote of 81 yeas to 44 nays. (It needed 88 votes.)

Supported by the League. This measure was lost.

IV. VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN CIVIL SERVICE p. 39 Mrs. Arthur Down
State Civil Service Chairman

H.F. 268 - A bill designed to modify existing Veterans' Preference in Civil Service by abolition of absolute preference by giving no preference in promotional examinations and by requiring a passing grade before the addition of point preference. This bill was never heard in the House committee or on the floor.

S.F. 259 - Heard in Senate Civil Administration Committee and defeated. A second bill, S.F. 915, was introduced containing limited revisions: revising absolute preference and disability rating. This bill was heard in the Senate committee and tabled for the session.

Supported by the League. The measure was lost.

V. PARTY DESIGNATION FOR LEGISLATORS p. 47 Mrs. Hamilton Lufkin
State Party Designation Chrmn.

H.F. 329 - A bill which would allow legislators to run on a party designated basis. Passed by the House 88 to 36.

S.F. 367 - In the Senate a Special Order was requested because the bill came out of the Senate Elections Committee too late to have been heard by taking its turn on General Orders. The Special Order, which required a 2/3 vote, was defeated, 37 yeas to 25 nays.

Supported by the League. This measure was lost.

VI. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION p. 49 Miss Eleanor Salisbury
Editor, ARTICULATE VOTER

H.F. 1093 - A bill to provide for an educational television network for the State of Minnesota, the University of Minnesota to have been the licensee and operate the station. Passed out of House Education Committee on to the House Appropriation Committee. It died there.

S.F. 951 - Passed out of Senate Education Committee on to Finance Committee. Never came to a vote in either house.

Supported by the League. This measure was lost.

VII. EDUCATION (Platform Item) p. 52 Mrs. Robert Anderson
State Education Chairman

VIII. TOURS p. 53 Mrs. Carl Landgren
Tour Chairman

IX. CONCLUSION p. 54 Miss Hope Washburn

X. VOTING RECORD p. 56

I FORWARD

There were six blind men who touched the elephant, the first felt of his side, and said, "An elephant is like a wall", the second his tusk, and said, "An elephant is like a spear." Upon touching his trunk, the third man said, "An elephant is like a snake." Feeling his knee, the fourth man said "like a tree." The fifth felt his ear and said, "like a fan", and the sixth touched his tail and said, "An elephant is like a rope." Each of them was correct in analyzing that part which he touched. But, not one of them was able to get the whole picture.

And, so it goes in attempting an analysis of the League's work in the legislature. Each item required different strategy, testimony, and a different kind of lobbying job. The tours, which made up the "educational" part of our legislative program, presented yet another picture.

Thus, we bring you the 1953 Legislative Report in "co-operative" form. We realize that it is long, detailed and liberally sprinkled with editorial comment. Our purpose is to give you as clear a picture as possible as to precisely what happened, what can be expected in the future, and help you to a better understanding of our role in the "90 Days of Lawmaking in Minnesota".

II CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The League of Women Voters in Minnesota believes that the way to meet the question of constitutional revision is to ask the voters if they want a constitutional convention. The House of Representatives again in 1953 has refused to allow the people to vote on calling such a convention.

Three bills were introduced in the House and Senate dealing with Constitutional Revision:

1) H.F. 100 Authors: Holmquist, Langley, Peterson P.K., Reed and Wozniak
   S.F. 128 Authors: Mullin

2) H.F. 238 Authors: Johnson A.I., Appeldorn, Cina, Moore, and Nelson W.
   S.F. None

3) H.F. 49 Authors: French, Allen, Haeg
   S.F. 78 Authors: Sletvold, Dunlap, Root

The first bill H.F. 100, supported whole-heartedly by the League, provided that the following question would be submitted to the people for a vote in the November, 1954 general election:

> "Shall there be a convention to revise the constitution of the state of Minnesota, the revised constitution to be submitted to the electors for approval or rejection?"

If a majority of the voters at the election shall vote for a convention, the Legislature at its session next succeeding this election shall provide for calling such a convention.

This bill was referred to the Committee on General Legislation in the House. Proponents were heard before this committee on February 9th. Authors Holmquist and Langley, Associate Justice Mattson, Dr. Lloyd Short, Mr. Charles B. Howard, and representatives from the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Revision, the Minnesota Editorial Association, the State Grange, D.F.L. Women's Forum, Governor's Advisory Committee on Constitutional Revision, Republican Workshop, the Minnesota chapter of the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Voters,

and others spoke for passage of the bill. Many sound statements were made, but in view of the future action of the House, Mr. Langley's point seemed most significant in reviewal. He stated that in 16 states and 2 territories revision of the constitution has been or is being considered, and in every instance the pattern is the same-- the Legislatures of the states lag behind the people in seeing the need for change in the constitutions.

Opponents spoke before the committee on February 16. Mr. Mike Galvin, attorney for the railroads, spoke for an hour in opposition to H.F. 100. The railroads have a vested interest in the present constitution because it requires a referendum to change the rate or method of taxation of a railroad corporation.

Mr. George French, representative from the 33rd district, was the other principal opponent. The testimony of these two men was depressing in that their statements could not be verified by actual facts and yet they spoke so long that there was no opportunity for rebuttal.

Mr. Galvin emphasized the possibility that a convention might scrap the entire constitution (no study of constitutional reform in the states has borne out this fear) and that there is no assurance that the arguments for revision would be met by a convention. He also stressed the fact that it is a bad time to revise a constitution because of the tendencies today toward socialism. In view of the conservative nature of our Legislature and the fact that delegates to a convention would be elected in the same manner and in the same number as the House of Representatives, there seems to be little validity for this fear.

Mr. French reiterated that there was not so much wrong with our constitution that it needed changing tomorrow. His theme was that there was real reason to fear that the courts might not uphold the need to submit a new constitution to the people for approval or rejection unless we had an amendment to the constitution requiring such ratification. He passed out printed material from Corpus Juris, a lawyer's encyclopedia, to substantiate his views about the sovereignity of a constitutional convention. Statements in this material which bore out his thinking were underlined but there was very much more which did not entirely support his train of thought. At the February 23rd meeting of the committee, a memorandum from Mr. Charles B. Howard, chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Reform of the Minnesota State Bar Association, answered Mr. French's argument. This memorandum dealt with the necessity of submission of a proposed constitution to the electors, and it stated that "no court has held that a constitutional convention had the right to declare a new constitution in effect without a vote of the people". There are instances where a new constitution has been put into effect without submission to the voters, but "it appears that all of these cases actually fall into a single category; they all were revolutionary constitutions which were put into effect by those in control of the government. On the other hand, it can be said positively that none of the present state constitutions in any of the northern states were put into effect except upon approval of the voters. It is inconceivable that any other procedure would be attempted".

After Mr. French had passed out the printed material from Corpus Juris, he asked that H.F. 49 of which he was chief author be discussed also by the committee. This bill, approved by the League, provided for an ammendment to the constitution requiring that a new constitution would have to be submitted to the people for rejection or approval. It also would allow legislators to serve as delegates to a convention.

H.F. 238 was also brought up. This bill proposed a constitutional amendment providing for revision of the constitution at a special session of the legislature

to be called by the governor within three months following adoption of the proposal by the people. The revision by the legislature would be submitted to the voters for ratification. The League opposed this bill because in a democracy the constitution is an instrument of the people and the people should have the right to elect delegates specifically for revising the constitution. No objection should be raised to some legislators sitting in the convention; however, the constitution does outline functions and powers of the legislature and it does not seem proper for legislators alone to pass on these functions and powers. Authors of 238 indicated that they offered this bill only as an alternative in case H.F. 100 were not acceptable to the people. Neither of these last two bills were discussed in any great length because of the time element on February 16th.

At a third meeting on February 23rd, there was committee discussion of all three bills and the vote was taken. Mr. Holmquist gave the rebuttal for H.F. 100 and Mr. French the rebuttal against. Mr. Holmquist made a good point--the opponents had said that the people were against constitutional revision. If that were the case, then there was no need to fear their vote on the call of a convention. He felt it was serious to fear the people's vote and to be afraid of the democratic process.

Most of the opposition outside of Mr. French's discussion seemed to come from those representatives fearing reapportionment-- Mr. Duxbury, Mr. Forbes, and Mr. Iverson. Mr. Duxbury felt that there were no good reasons why we needed a new constitution and yet he voted to pass H.F. 238 out of committee and that would allow the legislature to revise the constitution. Mr. Duxbury stressed that fact that people who support a convention usually emphasize reapportionment and he saw no need for it. Mr. Verne Johnson of the 30th district, who was a strong proponent for H.F.100, asked Mr. Duxbury why he feared reapportionment under a new constitution when the convention would be elected on the same basis as the House of Representatives and the rural majority holds there. Mr. Duxbury's answer to this was "Why is it necessary to revise the constitution ?"

Mr. Johnson was the only committee member who spoke and voted against H.F. 238. He stated that our government consists of three departments. Each is considered in a new constitution. How could the legislature write a constitution and have to determine how sound the legislative branch is? "You wouldn't ask the State Department to examine the State Department". The wording of H.F. 238 was not clear so Mr. Johnson felt it should not be voted on until it was rewritten, but his thinking did not carry. Mr. Iverson made the motion that H.F. 238 be recommended to pass and Mr. Daley seconded. Both these men have been opposed to allowing the people to vote on the calling of a convention.

All three bills were recommended to pass out of committee and the vote was as follows:

H.F. 100 - - - - - - - 11 yeas - - - - 9 nays
H.F. 238 - - - - - - - 17 yeas - - - - 1 nay - - - - - - 2 not voting
H.F. 49 - - - - - - - was just a voice vote.

The first week in March H.F. 49 and H.F. 238 passed the House. H.F. 238 received 85 yeas and 23 nays. H.F. 100 was progressed, and discussed in the House on March 11th. The debate ran for nearly three hours on the 11th and many of the points covered in committee by both opponents and proponents were brought out again. The proponents seemed to do a better job before the whole House than they had done in committee, however, and excellently answered many of the opponents' fears and criticisms. The opponents again used the argument that there is a question whether the legislature could limit the powers of a convention by requiring ratification of the new constitution by the people. They also stressed

that there are no sound urgent reasons for revising the present constitution and indirectly hit upon their fear of reapportionment. Main opponents who spoke were: Duxbury, Forbes, French, Iverson, and Moriarty. Main proponents were: Cummings, Grittner, Holmquist, Langley, Mosier, O'Dea, Peterson P.K., and Wozniak. Mr. Moore and Mr. A.I. Johnson who were authors of H.F. 238 urged passage of H.F. 100. Mrs. Luther made a significant contribution when she stated that all of the opponents had said that it was not necessary to revise the constitution and yet they had supported H.F. 238. Mr. Peterson gave the strongest arguments for H.F.100 with this main point--if we believe in representative government, the legislators should not be afraid to submit the question of calling a convention to the people and allowing the majority to rule.. The opposition had also mentioned that special interests were trying to get the constitution revised, and Mr. Peterson answered that the strongest opposition in committee came from a special interest, namely, the railroads.

The final vote on H.F. 100 was 78 yeas, 49 nays with 4 not voting. This was only 10 short of the necessary 88 or 2/3 for passage. This was encouraging because in 1951 a similar bill lost by 35 votes.

Because H.F. 100 was defeated in the House, the Senate held no committee hearings on a like bill.

H. F. 238 just fell by the wayside in the Senate even though it passed the House.

S.F. 78, companion bill to H.F. 49 (referred to the Judiciary committee) was amended upon motion of Senator Rosenmeier in the Senate to require only 60 percent of the voters voting on the question to ratify a new constitution. The bill as it came from the House would have required a majority of all votes cast at the election for ratification. This amendment was accepted by the House so we have an identical amendment to Number 2 which was voted on and defeated at the November 4, 1952 election.

How did the League act to get H.F. 49 and H.F. 100 passed by the House? League people saw General Legislation committee members prior to vote in the committee, they attended committee meetings and then began seeing House members before the vote in the House. Material had been sent out about the bills in the "Lady in the Lobby" letters and members had been urged to get in touch with any of their legislators who might be General Legislation committee members. Just prior to March 2nd, it was learned that H.F. 100 and H.F. 49 would be voted upon in the House that week so a hurried Call to Action went out by telephone and telegraph. In responding to this Call many league members either telephoned or telegraphed their representatives urging passage of H.F. 49 and H.F. 100.

All of us agree that constitutional revision is a long and slow process, but we still are not discouraged. We were disappointed that H.F. 100 did not pass, but we feel that steps ahead have been made. Right after H. F. 100 was defeated, an editorial on constitutional revision appeared in the Minneapolis Star Journal, and the last paragraph of this editorial read thus: "The vote this session was the most favorable in years-- 78 for the bill for a vote on a constitutional convention, 48 against. Needed was a 2/3 approval, or 88 votes. If the League of Women Voters and other groups keep up their educational campaigns, a constitutional convention may not be too far off."

Apparently the League is considered a vital instrument in bringing the need for constitutional revision not only to the people but also to the legislators because the League was often mentioned in the debate by opponents. Mr. Duxbury who kept insisting even on the floor of the House that there was no need for revision of our constitution read our reasons for desiring change in the constitu-

tion from our "Lobby by Letter" material, in a derogatory way to be sure. Because he read only first sentences, our points were not made clear so Mr. O'Dea asked and received permission to read our entire statement. On a television program in which Mr. Duxbury appeared as the opponent to reapportionment, he stated that he at least could vote as he wished because he had no League of Women Voters sitting in the gallery of the House watching his vote. Mr. Duxbury's voting record might seem to indicate the need for such a "watch dog" from his district.

Only if we get a new constitution in Minnesota will our state be able to realize its full potentialities. The League is one of the groups which has to keep on working so our citizens and our legislators will recognize this.

TESTIMONY GIVEN BEFORE THE GENERAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING BILL H.F. 100 ON BEHALF OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA ON FEBRUARY 9, 1953

I am Mrs. Gordon Grunditz, constitutional revision chairman of the League of Women Voters in Minneapolis.

The League of Women Voters in Minnesota has worked for constitutional revision since 1948 because we believe that only when we get a new constitution will our state have the kind of efficient, democratic, and responsible government which all of us want it to have.

In behalf of the League, I want to make just four points relative to our support of the bill H.F. 100:

1) We believe that a convention should be called to write a new constitution because our present constitution is unfair. Democracy means equal representation for citizens but all citizens are not equally represented in Minnesota. There are inequalities not just in the large cities but all over the state. To describe this inequality, I should like to compare the representation of the 28th and 33rd legislative districts of Minneapolis. The 28th district has a population of 24,400 and has 1 senator and 2 representatives. The 33rd district with a population of 148,300-- more than six times as many people-- has the same representation. This may be an extreme example, but it is not the worst in the state. A new constitution would put teeth in the reapportionment article.

2) The constitution is also rigid. Changing times mean changing financial needs. Nearly one half of the 75 amendments to the constitution have dealt with taxes and financing. While many of these amendments have provided new ways of getting revenue, they have also set down rigidly how this money must be allocated. If revenues were not so rigidly earmarked, perhaps a more efficient use of the tax dollar would result, and we would have a better way of handling the tax problem in Minnesota.

3) We, of course, were disappointed that amendment number 2 did not pass at the November 4th election, but we feel its failure is a great talking point for the need to call a convention to write a new constitution. Let me clarify this statement: The official vote on the first four amendments on the November 4th ballot shows how difficult it is to get an amendment to our constitution passed even though the majority of the people voting on an issue approve it. Although the League of Women Voters took no stand on the third amendment, it was not controversial and even opponents to constitutional revision were said to favor it because the amendment would merely have brought our constitution in line with the Federal constitution in regard to voting. Yet even that amendment failed although 65.8 percent of the people voting on it approved it. 60.7 percent of

those voting on amendment number 2 voted "yes". It seems we need a change in the amending process so that the will of the people can be expressed.

4) My fourth and final point -- We believe that the members of the Legislature are aware of the need for constitutional change also as evidenced by their support of acts which created commissions to study aspects of our state government. In 1937 the legislature set up a State Judicial Council to make a continuing study of the judicial system, the Constitutional Commission was created by an act of the 1947 Legislature, in 1949 the Legislature established the "Little Hoover Commission". The recommendations of all these groups would require some constitutional change. These actions by the Legislature plus all the interest shown here today by people who represent many citizens point out forceably, it seems to us, that there are a great many people in Minnesota who feel we need a new constitution if our state is to realize its full potentialities.

III EMPLOYMENT ON MERIT

The Employment on Merit bill was passed by 3 House and 2 Senate committees, and was passed by the Minnesota Senate by a vote of 39 to 22 on April 6, 1953. A majority of the House is 66 votes, but since it was so late in the session, the only hope of bringing it to a vote was to win the two-thirds majority, or 88 votes, necessary to put it on Special Orders. On April 15th there were 84 votes for and 41 votes against the bill; by April 18, 19 men had changed their votes but the net result was 81 votes for it and 44 against it. The Legislature adjourned on April 22.

We may say, therefore, that shortage of time killed the bill. We may note, also, that the House Labor Committee, of which Rep. John Kinzer of Cold Spring is chairman, was expected to vote on the bill on March 2 at the end of the public hearing at which both proponents and opponents were heard, or at latest on March 9; but that they did not have an opportunity to vote until March 23rd, when Representatives Dominick, Karth, and Harold R. Anderson helped the authors to force it through.

Even then another week's delay was accomplished by Rep. Kinzer singlehandedly when he failed to send the bill on to the Civil Administration Committee, which was meeting 2 days later.

The delay in the House Appropriations Committee lasted only a few days, partly because constituents of the chairman, Claude Allen, overwhelmed him with letters urging action. Even those few days, however, seemed an eternity to supporters of the bill.

One can be safe in saying, therefore, that the Employment on Merit bill was defeated in the 1953 legislature, not because it could not command a majority in both houses; but because legislative procedure made it possible for a few individuals to prevent an open democratic discussion and show-down vote on the bill itself - legislation which, the Minnesota Poll revealed, was of interest to 84% of the people in our state.

Charges and recriminations between the political parties, alleging hypocrisy and desertion of their platforms, have been unfortunate. The authors and other leaders in both parties put their hearts into passing this bill. There were strong supporters and opponents in both parties. It is probable that personal political jealousies, which have little connection with employment on merit, were a factor particularly in the house. Certain votes can almost certainly be traced to special interest pressure.

The House has 131 members, 86 of whom caucus with the Conservatives and 45 of whom caucus with the Liberals. (While Conservatives can be assumed in the majority of cases to be Republicans and many Liberals are members of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, there are exceptions).

This is how they voted:*

	Conservatives	Liberals
yes	44%	78%
no	39%	13%
split on the 2 votes	17%	9%

In the Senate this was the record:

	Conservatives	Liberals
yes	52%	80%
no	48%	13%
absent		7%

(Since there are only 15 Liberal senators, the one who was absent, represented 7% of the Liberal vote.)

Geographically, we find comparatively few areas where there was 100% agreement between all the senators and representatives. The largest concentrations of "yes" votes came from the 3 large cities. If Rep. Biernat had not absented himself from one vote, Minneapolis would have had a 100% favorable record in its 9 legislative districts. Three of St. Paul's 5 districts and 2 of Duluth's 3 districts were 100% favorable. In addition the following districts were 100% favorable:

District	County
5	Dodge
20	Dakota
22	McLeod
25	Kandiyohi
43	Washington
60	St. Louis
61	St. Louis
65	Pennington, Red Lake, Clearwater

100% negative districts do not adjoin, but are, except for Polk County, somewhat distributed throughout the southeast quarter of the state. They are:

District	County
1	Houston and Fillmore
3	Wabasha
6	Freeborn
9	Watonwan
17	LeSueur
18	Rice
44	Isanti
66	Polk

Throughout the remaining 59 counties of the state there seems to be at least some leavening for the lump.

An interesting sidelight is that in districts where there are units of the LWV, there was approximately 65% support for the F.O.M. bill, while in districts where there are no Leagues, there was only approximately 43% support.

Whether we should interpret that as an indication that the Civil Rights chairmen have been active and effective or that the entire League program develops an alert citizenry with a sensitivity to civic responsibility and responsive representatives, we cannot guess unless we make a similar analysis of votes on other League items.

* Not voting has been counted as a "no" vote.

Prognosis

Condolences we receive upon failure of the E.O.M. bill to pass usually take the form of, "Well, anyway, we made progress; we came closer than ever before; next time it will probably go through." Let's analyze these statements. Many League members put everything they had into this fight. We talked individually with practically every senator and with about 100 members of the House. The teamwork was superb. Vi Kohout, Minneapolis Civil Rights Chairman, tirelessly rounded up competent volunteer lobbyists, many of whom could come only occasionally because they had small children. Just how much progress did we make and how?

It is true that the Senate Judiciary Committee, which killed the bill in 1951, recommended it to pass in 1953, after removing the court enforcement powers, and that the bill passed the Senate for the first time. It is also true that the first Special Order vote in the House was more than 2 to 1 in favor of the bill, and that we lacked only 4 votes of having the two-thirds majority necessary to give it priority.

There are three ways of making progress with a bill in the legislature. These are:

1. Electing new legislators favorable to the bill.
2. Converting legislators who have opposed the bill.
3. Using better strategy.

Considering the last first, the chief mistake in strategy made in the Legislature was probably getting started too late. An earlier start would, in fact, have helped the entire program; we could have used 6 months to a year of additional time in our project of trying to win over the businessmen in local communities throughout the state. (Let us hope that our brochures "Employment on Merit and Your Business" will turn out to be perennials, rather than annuals, and will bear fruit in 1955! To do that, however, they will need continued cultivation.)

With regard to electing new legislators, there was only 1 new senator (Senator Dunlap) in 1953 and he voted "no" as his predecessor had done. Half of the new senators elected in 1950 voted "yes" and half voted "no" on the motion to send the bill back to committee for further consideration rather than to indefinitely postpone its consideration (a vote "yes" is considered a friendly voted).

The 1953 vote of 39 "ayes" and 22 "nays" which passed the bill in the Senate in 1953 may be broken down as follows,*

	Holdovers	New
Remained "yes"	32	
Changed "no" to "yes"	7	
Remained "no"	23	1
Changed "yes" to "no"	3	

Of the 7 senators who changed from opponents to supporters of the bill, we know that at least 4 - Senators Grottum, Daun, Dahlquist and Miller - stated that they had changed their attitude because the punitive features of the bill had been removed. Three senators - George, Palm and Sinclair - who had been favorable in 1951, voted "no" in 1953. The other 55 did not change their attitude. 54 of the present senators have not changed their vote on FEPC in 6 years.

It may seem far fetched and useless to compare the 1951 vote in the House on the Duxbury-Forbes amended bill** with the 1953 vote on Special Order only, unless we remem-

* Senator Murray, who voted "yes" in 1951, was absent in 1953. Those present and not voting are listed as "no" votes.

**It is interesting to recall that Reps. Duxbury and Forbes, after they had succeeded in amending the bill, did not vote for it.

ber that the 1953 vote was to all intents and purposes, a show-down vote on the bill. At any rate, we did play with the figures with this result. (Rep. Appledorn was in the hospital in 1953, and we did not have a record of the 1951 votes of Reps. Otto and Tweten.)

	Holdovers	New	Total	
Remained "yes"	53	11	64)	76
Changed "no" to "yes"	7	5	12)	
Remained "no"	35	8	43	
Changed "yes" to "no"	6	3	9	
	101	27	128	

These figures do not tell the whole story, however. While it would appear that the opinions of the vast majority are set, we cannot afford to take for granted the continued support of those who have once or twice voted for the bill. Many of those who "remained 'yes'" were held there by effort. Actually, it requires a great deal of activity not to lose ground, because of the great competing pressure of the opposition lobby, which has disproportionate financial resources at its command.

Our philosophy that there is scarcely any elected legislator whom it is useless to attempt to convince bore dividends for it was occasionally the most unexpected person who underwent a change of heart and that change of heart was sometimes strategic, as in the case of the House Appropriations Committee.

It goes without saying that the election of legislators genuinely committed to legislation which we consider important, is basic. The ballot is, after all, the citizen's most powerful and most legitimate weapon. On several occasions when we were making discouragingly slow progress against heavy odds, cynical observers remarked, "Don't you know that the fate of this bill has already been decided in the ballot box?" That was only part of the truth. One angle which is discouraging is that some legislators are more concerned about the wishes of a few constituents who can finance their campaigns than about those of hundreds of voters. If the voters can be made to think for themselves, well financed campaigns or suave explanations will not sway them.

A bitter pill, if wisely prescribed to produce a stimulating reaction, is sometimes good medicine. Here are some recent statements from a Fred Neumeier editorial in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, May 17, 1953, by our victorious opponent, Mr. Otto Christenson, lobbyist for the Minnesota Employers Association:

"The Minnesota Employers Association can look back upon the 1953 session of the Minnesota Legislature as a success. Not one bill opposed by the association became law. The recommendations of the association on workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation were adopted.

"The association fought labor bosses to a standstill on their efforts to toss out state laws restricting the activities of unions. The association laid the groundwork for future legislative action in the field of labor legislation by backing the introduction of bills for a 'right-to-work' law, amended time off to vote law, restricted picketing law, and so forth.

"Their introduction was principally for educational purposes, since it was recognized early in the session that the 1953 Legislature would be defensive rather than aggressive in the field of labor law. Depending on its makeup, the 1955 Legislature may be in a position to pass some of this legislation."

"Christenson reported to his members that 'the 1953 session of the Legislature was a tough one to handle.'

"'The continued breakdown in the unity of the conservative majority groups in the

House and Senate made it necessary to carry the story of business and industry to members on an individual basis where in the past it was only necessary to contact top leaders,' he reported.

"He gave high praise to 'the true conservatives of the House and Senate majority groups.

"'They fought long and hard against the liberals and those who organized as conservatives but voted liberal to keep the spendthrifts and "reformers" from poisoning the economic and industrial climate of the state already regarded as "negative" by many,' he said."

On the whole, we think that the newspapers did a good job of reporting the campaign for the Employment on Merit bill. They deserve special commendation for having reported the individual votes, even committee votes. We hope that Minnesota citizens gave heed. We call to your attention the fact that the League has available complete voting records on all the items which were on the League Agenda.

And for those who would like a lobbyist's-eye view, we offer this blow-by-blow account of HF 518, SF 622:

Diary of an Employment on Merit Lobbyist

Feb. 3, 1953 (Rumors of activity at the capitol; supporters are organized and ready; officers of Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit; House authors of the bill.)

This morning's Minneapolis Tribune carried an article about the Employment on Merit bill. "Presented to the speaker of the House yesterday morning by Rep. P. Kenneth Peterson, Minneapolis, for introduction in the afternoon, the bill was withdrawn later in the day. Peterson said backers were aiming at introduction in both houses on the same day.

"At least one of the two senators who co-sponsored the measure last session had decided to let someone else carry the ball this time, said Sen. Gerald Mullin, Mpls. chief senate author. Mullin said he will have two co-authors by Weds., however..."

The House authors were listed, and they are strong, outstanding men, including leadership from both parties:

Conservatives: Rep. Clarence Langley, Red Wing, one of authors of '49 and '51 bills
Rep. P. Kenneth Peterson, principal House author in 1951 and chairman of the Republican Party of Minnesota in 1953
Rep. Stanley Holmquist, Grove City, Chairman of House Education Committee

Liberals: Rep. Edward Chilgren, Littlefork, leader of the Liberal farm group
Rep. Joseph Prifrel, St. Paul, leader of the Liberal labor group

One might well ask, "What more could we want?" It had been hoped, I understand, that Warren S. Moore, representative of Duluth's 57th district, might be willing to become an author and to use his rather considerable influence in behalf of the bill since his wishes had been acceded to in incorporating into it a 60-day probation period during which an employer may dismiss an employee without his action being subject to regulation or review by the commission. Mr. Moore's wishes have been considered, also in omitting the prohibition against an employer's asking questions regarding race, color, religion, or national origin of an individual before he is employed. But it looks as if his sponsorship of the bill has not materialized.

The legislature has now been in session for four weeks, so it is important that our bill should start on its long course. The violently controversial fight over filling the vacancy on the University Board of Regents has to a large degree mon-

opolized the attention of the legislators for the past few weeks, and has slowed down legislation.

The friends of Employment on Merit are organized and ready. As early as last July 8th the League of Women Voters Civil Rights Committee met with Senator Mullin and some of the human relations and business leaders of the state before planning the League Civil Rights program for 1952-53. The Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit has had two meetings one of the executive board on December 9th 1952, and one of the membership on December 10th.

At this meeting the Council elected the following officers for 1953:

Chairman: Mr. George Jensen, Vice-president Scott Atwater Manufacturing Co., Mpls.

Vice-chairmen: Mr. Frank Boyd, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, St.Paul
Mr. York Langton, Trade Extension Manager, Coast-to-Coast Stores, and President United Nations Assn.

Treasurer: Mr. Jonas Schwartz, Attorney Minneapolis NAACP

Secretary: Mrs. Russell C. Duncan, Minneapolis (member of the League of Women Voters)

They would seem to represent a good cross-section of minority group members and business people. Letters have been sent to the 60 or so organizations which supported the FEPC bill two years ago, requesting their endorsement of the 1953 bill.

Upon the recommendation of some of the authors, the name of the bill was changed from "Fair Employment Practice" to "Employment on Merit" and the name of the Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice was changed to "Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit". This was done because some legislators seem to have developed an emotional antagonism or block to the term "FEPC", and it is believed that a new terminology will encourage a more open-minded attitude.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota while not actually a member of the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit, works very closely with them. While awaiting introduction of the bill, the League has had plenty to do in interviewing business leaders; we should like to create a real mandate from the people of the state, particularly from employers, for this legislation. We believe that if we can reach them with the facts they will see that it is to the best interests of business itself.

Feb. 4, 1953. (HF 518 and SF 431 introduced; Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit discusses "Langley Amendment.")

This was the day! Identical bills (HF518 & SF431) were introduced into the house and the senate. The house authors are as reported yesterday. In the senate the authors are:

Conservatives: Sen. Gerald T. Mullin of Minneapolis
Sen. Elmer L. Andersen of St. Paul

Liberals: Sen. Thomas D. Vukelich, Gilbert

The bill is scheduled to go to the Labor, Civil Administration, and Appropriations Committees of the House, and to the Judiciary and Finance Committees of the Senate.

Several questions of strategy are being considered. Past experience has indicated that the house is more favorable to the bill than is the senate, since it was actually passed by the house in 1951 but has never been passed by the senate. The House Civil Administration committee is headed by Kenneth Peterson, one of the authors, but the chairman of the House Labor Committee, Rep. John H. Kinzer of Cold Springs, Stearns County, and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator A. O. Sletvold of Detroit Lakes, strongly opposed the bill in 1951, and the

chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Rep. Claude Allen of St. Paul, while he failed to cast a vote in 1951, is generally understood to be hostile to the bill. These committee chairmen wield a great deal of influence andpower in deciding the fate of a bill, sometimes fairly, and sometimes not so fairly. "A look at that House Labor Committee gives me the shivers", remarked one of the authors;"besides the chairman, it contains the chief axeman of the opposition."

Shortage of time would seem to leave little choice as to how to proceed. It will be necessary to push both the house and the senate bills as fast as possible, trying to keep them alike, so that one can be substituted for the other as soon as either house passes a bill.

Two of us League women talked to Warren Moore this morning. We find, that although he voted for the bill in 1951, his support this time will be conditioned upon still another exemptions being included. Mr. Moore says that he will offer an amendment exempting confidential positions, such as the position of private secretary or personal assistant to an executive. We tried to tell him that there are trustworthy people of every race, religion and national background, and that under employment on merit laws employers have always been given a wide latitude in considering such intangible qualities as integrity, personality, congeniality, and capacity for cooperation, especially in filling this type of position. Mr. Moore did not change his mind, however.

The executive board of the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit and many representatives of other organizations supporting the bill had a long meeting this evening with authors Clarence Langley and P. Kenneth Peterson. The authors were greeted with enthusiasm and were thanked for the time and effort which they have put into previous campaigns for this legislation and for their generosity in meeting with us tonight after a long day in the legislature. Kenneth Peterson said that he feels more optimistic about prospects for the bill than he has ever felt before. He can detect signs of progress, much of which, he indicated, is due to the effective educational program which the League of Women Voters has been conducting throughout the state. One hopeful sign is that half a dozen members of the house wanted to be authors. Since five is the maximum number of authors a bill can carry, he actually had to turn some of them down. Specific provisions of the bill were then discussed.

The Executive Board voted to request that the provision prohibiting pre-employment inquiries as to race, religion or national origin, which were a part of the 1951 bill, be reinstated.

A few days ago the newspapers in many parts of the state picked up a suggestion of Rep. Langley's that the state labor conciliator's office provide facilities for conciliation of cases of alleged discrimination in employment, as it does for labor disputes. The conciliator's office, may, upon failure to achieve conciliation, refer such cases to the district court in the county in which the dispute arises.

Mr. Langley told the executive board of the Minnesota Council that he had suggested the amendment, not because he thought it would improve the bill, but because he hoped it might bring added support from those who object to setting up another commission or from those who oppose for economy reasons an appropriation for even an unsalaried commission.

Supporters of the bill raised and discussed pro and con a number of questions with regard to this proposal:

1. Would such a plan actually save any money?

2. If employment on merit were made the responsibility of the labor conciliator's office, would frictions, animosities, and prejudices inherited from past labor disputes, be an obstacle to acceptance by business men and others in the community, of employment on merit?

3. Would an agency accustomed to effecting compromises between two strong, well-matched bargaining groups be equipped to undertake the complicated, delicate, and highly specialized professional job of simultaneously determining whether discrimination is present in an employer's hiring procedures, educating the employer and employees in human relations, winning the confidence and cooperation of the community, and helping discouraged or over-aggressive victims of discrimination to evaluate themselves correctly?

4. If it should become necessary to make provision for fair employment conciliation machinery in some existing department of government, would Education be more a closely allied and a more suitable department in which to place it than Labor?

5. There seemed to be pretty general agreement that some sort of citizen's commission or advisory council and a board of review with subpoena powers are basic and essential. If then, a deputy in the labor conciliator's office were to attempt to handle conciliation, would he be responsible to the state conciliator or to the advisory commision?

6. Would a labor conciliator's office almost inevitably give a certain priority to labor disputes, relegating the new program to a secondary emphasis?

The board voted to urge passage of the bill as introduced, except for the requested reinstatement of the prohibition against pre-employment inquiries already mentioned, and a better wording of the exemption for religious organizations from the requirement that they disregard religion in selection of their employees.

The council did, however, set up a committee of four lawyers who were delegated to work with Mr. Langley in case it should prove to be necessary or advisable to attempt to set up the conciliation machinery within some existing department of the state government.

Feb. 10, 1953 (Forbes, Duxbury Bill)

Representatives Gordon Forbes of Worthington and Lloyd Duxbury, Jr. of Caledonia, authors of the crippling amendments offered to the 1951 bill, today introduced into the legislative hopper such a preposterous bill that it must be seen to be evaluated. Guesses are a dime a dozen as to how this bill may be fitted into their strategy to defeat the Employment on Merit Bill. The least it can be expected to do is to create confusion and to discredit employment on merit legislation among some of the uninformed.

This is the bill:

Introduced by Forbes, Duxbury, Lorentz, O. Peterson, J.A. Anderson - H.F. 675
February 10, 1953 No CompanionS.F.
Ref. to Com. on Labor Ref. to S. Com.

A BILL

FOR AN ACT RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS IN EMPLOYMENT.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

Section 1. No person shall be denied full and equal employment on account of membership or non-membership in any fraternal, labor, political, or social organization or on account of race, color, national origin, or religion or, except as otherwise provided by law, on account of sex, age or physical disability, except in those cases where sex, age or physical disability would be a serious handicap to the proper performance of the work assigned to him. Every person who violates any provision of this act, or aids or incites another to do so, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, in addition to the penalty therefor, shall be liable in a civil action to the person aggrieved for damages not exceeding $500.

An interesting feature of the bill, as is pointed out by the Minneapolis Tribune, is the fact that it would legalize job opportunities for members of subversive groups. "Presumably this feature alone would make it unpalatable to state lawmakers", says the Tribune.

Feb. 13, 1953 (SF 622 substituted for SF 431)

Senator Mullin today substituted SF 622 for SF 431, which he had introduced nine days ago. The chief difference is that SF 622 includes the prohibition against eliciting or attempting to elicit "information that pertains to the race, color, religion, or (except when required by the United States, this state or a political subdivision or agency of the United States or this state, for the purpose of national security), national origin."

Feb. 17, 1953-9 A.M. (Senate Judiciary Hearing for Proponents.)

An effective presentation, well received and well reported in the press, was made this morning before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The crowd was so large that the double doors had to be opened to throw two committee rooms together. It was difficult to divide the brief hour allotted to proponents among the many representatives who were eager to testify. Unfortunately the committee was twenty minutes late in convening. Then, too, it is necessary for the proponents of a measure to spend part of their time in explaining the provisions of the bill itself. This was very concisely and lucidly done by Professor Robert McClure of Minnesota Law School.

George M. Jensen, speaking not only as Chairman of the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit but also as a business executive , since he is Vice president of the Scott Atwater Manufacturing Company and as a former chairman of the Mpls. FEPC Commission, stressed these points:

1. That discrimination does exist in Minnesota. Our 16,000 Indians have even a more serious problem than our Negro citizens.

2. That such discrimination is morally indefensible, economically wrong and politically dangerous. "What we do to solve our minority group problems is front page news in Europe and Asia."

3. That Senate File 622 can be the means by which such discrimination can be eradicated.

4. That business will not suffer but will be benefitted by passage of this legislation. Conciliation and education are main aspects of the bill. No employer in 6000 cases throughout the nation, has ever been fined or sent to jail. To quote the Minneapolis Star, Mr. Jensen then "whipped the panel of speakers through one-minute speeches in support of fair employment legislation."

Stuart Leck, President of James Leck Construction Co., Minneapolis, Howard J. Seesel, President, Field-Schlick, Inc. St. Paul, Ralph Sommer, Employment Manager, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, Minneapolis, and Leonard Ramberg, Secretary of the Burma Vita Co. testified as employers that this type of legislation is beneficial for employers, as well as for labor unions, minority group members seeking employment, and for the entire community. David Babcock, Personnel Director of The Dayton Co., Minneapolis said, "My experience in Rhode Island under a state law and in Minneapolis under FEPC leads me to recognize that the problems foreseen by some opponents are more fancied then true. In as tough and tight a labor market as we have today, our company believes this bill will be a real help to employers."

Karl Rolvaag, State Chairman of the DFL Party of Minnesota and Mrs. Russell T. Lund, State Chairwoman of the Republican Party of Minnesota quoted planks from their respective party platforms supporting an enforceable fair employment law.

Mrs. R. C. Duncan of Minneapolis, representing the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, began by explaining that the League never takes a stand on any issue until it has studied carefully both sides of the question. She announced that the League supports this bill and then presented Senate committee members with results of two current studies made by the League. One of these was a summary of 16 letters received from commissions and executives of canning companies in seven states which have enforceable fair employment laws. The second was a mimeographed preview of the brochure, "Employment on Merit and Your Business", 10,000 copies of which are soon to come off the press.

It is highly regrettable that the following able and important people, some of whom had come from a distance to testify, could not be called upon because the time ran out: Frank Marzitelli, St. Paul Commissioner, for the Minnesota Federation of Labor (AFL); Carl Henneman, St. Paul Newspaper Guild for the Minnesota State Industrial Union Council (CIO); York Langton, Minnesota United Nations Assn.; Charles Ackley for American Indians, Inc.; Mrs. David Aronson, president of the Minnesota Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations; Frank M. Smith for the Minnesota Conference of NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People); Mr. Mas Teramoto for the United Citizens' League (Japanese-Americans); Mrs. Termina Cohn for the National Council of Jewish Women; Rev. Russell Myers for human relations groups in the state; Edwin Christianson, for the Minnesota Farmers' Union; and Rev. Edward S. Martin of St. Paul Trinity Methodist Church for the Minnesota Council of Churches; Rev. Francis Gilligan for the Governor's Interracial Commission; and Mr. Thomas Talley for the Urban Leagues of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

That the hearing made a good impression was evident from the friendliness of some of the senators, who spoke to us in the hall afterwards. So our lobbying got off to a natural start. Six of us League "girls" remained after the hearing and began the undertaking of talking to each man on the committee individually. This will take several days. The first man we saw was Senator Lightner of St. Paul. His mind was so thoroughly made up that we had little opportunity to discuss the subject. It is his opinion that elimination of discrimination is the job of the churches and that it may take hundreds of years. In the meantime "do-gooders" have no place in the Legislature; he would tell even his own minister to keep still on a matter of legislation! Fortunately this was an extreme point of view and not representative of the committee as a whole.

Many of the men, however, seem to feel that there is nothing new that we can tell them after they have heard the matter discussed in three previous sessions. Fortunately much of the material the League has to present, <u>is</u> new, and so we feel justified in offering it. Senator Robert Dunlap of Plainview is the only new senator in the Legislature this session, so we spent a considerable amount of time with him, but did not press him for a decision.

<u>Feb. 18, 1953</u> (Senator Dunlap)

Today's Minneapolis Tribune carries an interesting story about Senator Dunlap; it is headed, "New State Senator is FEPC Key." Since he is a lawyer, it points out, he automatically becomes a member of the Senate 22-man Judiciary Committee. The late Senator Carley, whom he replaced, was also a member of the committee two years ago when it split, 10 to 10, and killed the 1951 FEPC bill with a tie vote. Senator Carley voted against the bill. Of the two senators who were absent at that time Senator Siegel had voted for it in an earlier showdown and Senator Miller is believed to be opposed to it. So, if none of the men have changed their minds, 11 of the 22 are presumed to favor its passage. Dunlap told the reporters that he has not made up his mind. He said that no discrimination problems exist in his home town, and that, as a consequence, he has had no pressure to act one way or another.

We can already see that one of our problems is the fact that many legislators are interested primarily in legislation which affects their individual communities directly, and that comparatively little attention is given to legislation which is their responsibility only because it is a state problem and they are a part of the state government.

Feb. 19, 1953 (Senate Judiciary Hearing for Opponents)

Otto F. Christenson, Vice-president of the Minnesota Employers' Association and chief foe of FEPC in Minnesota marshalled his forces for 1953 this morning. The Minneapolis Tribune account starts with a quotation, Christenson's closing plea: "Doggone it, Gentlemen, Minnesotans are getting along in harmony. Please let us continue to get along with our employees, neighbors, and friends without threatening to send us to jail." (Someone really ought to take Mr. Christenson quietly aside and tell him that in the eight years during which seven states have handled about 6000 cases of alleged discrimination under fair employment laws, no employer anywhere has yet been jailed or fined--my own comment.)

To go back to the Tribune: "Christenson, who described himself as liaison man and spokesman for management at the state capitol, said his organization numbers 1665 concerns operating in the state. Twenty Minnesota Employers' Association directors, he said, voted 19 to 1, Wednesday, against state FEPC legislation. 'And that', Christenson said, 'is approximately the consensus of any 20 businessmen you can name.'

" He asserted that Minnesota must be wary of enacting laws business doesn't like, since, already it has 'heavy corporate, personal, and income taxes and freight rates, and its workmen's compensation law is one of the most generous and costly in the United States.'

" 'Minneapolis has its FEP commission' Christenson said, 'Why do they come over here to inflict it on the rest of the state?'"

"He charged that Wilfred Leland Jr., executive director of the Minneapolis commission, had prevailed upon the St. Paul Urban League to oppose a plan to guarantee jobs to all skilled Negroes in St. Paul 'because Leland said he feared it would hurt the chances of getting a state FEPC law.'

"Leland afterward said Christenson's charge was not true. 'I told him I knew the victims of discrimination would not agree to go before a board of people they believed were discriminating against them', Leland said. 'The board should be impartial.' Thomas A. Talley, executive secretary of the St. Paul Urban League, denied Christenson's statement that there is little discrimination in St. Paul. 'There is discrimination', Talley said, 'and there are employers who admit they discriminate.'

"Christenson served as master of ceremonies for the opponents", says the Minneapolis Star, "presenting various spokesmen, including those from industry to match Tuesday's speakers."

M. J. Galvin of St. Paul, a former state senator and legislative counsel for state railroads, said that the bill would prevent the roads from employing exclusively Negroes as waiters and porters. (The Minneapolis Spokesman, one of the country's leading Negro newspapers, comments, "In the senate corridor following the hearing, a Pullman porter said that he was perfectly willing and would do all in his power to see that white men would be allowed to become Pullman porters, if Negroes would be allowed to become conductors, engineers and other jobs that are closed to him because of his race.")

T. C. Wright of Minneapolis, chairman of the board of Otter Tail Power Co., said, (according to the Minneapolis Tribune) "We would not send a Scandinavian Lutheran

to live and work in a German Catholic town. A company's representatives must be acceptable to the community."

R. K. Humphrey, of St. Paul, a personnel and industrial relations man, who said that he spoke for himself only, said, "This preference law puts persons in a preferred position, not only in an equal position. Jealousy of them would turn to hatred."

Edwin W. Elmer, Minneapolis attorney who is secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Canners' Association, called the bill "needless legislation", according to the Star. "He said the canning industry is one of the biggest hirers of Negroes, Mexicans, and Indians, but these minority groups, particularly the Mexican families, 'want to live together.'" (Does Mr. Elmer think this law contains any provisions with regard to housing?--my comment)

Other speakers were F.P. Longeway, Jr. of Minneapolis, assistant secretary of the Northwest Lumbermen's Assn., and the Rev. J.G. Steinmeyer of Pipestone, who said, according to the Tribune, "We had a beautiful rose and called it FEPC. Now we call it employment on merit. What's the matter, are we cowards?"

We find this additional information in the Minneapolis Spokesman: "Another part of Christenson's testimony that raised some eyebrows was when he praised the governor's interracial commission and urged that their appropriation be increased. His contention was that 'education' was the only way that the employment bias problem could be solved.

"After the hearing, some people who have been observing the progress of FEPC, questioned Christenson's intent and sincerity concerning the governor's interracial commission.

"This also brought up again the question of Samuel Ransom's testimony before a house committee two weeks ago when appropriations for the commission were asked.

"Ransom, a member of the commission, has been quoted by some members of the legislature, who are opposed to FEPC, as saying to the committee there is no need for FEPC in the state.

"Ransom and Clifford Rucker, executive secretary of the commission, both deny that Ransom testified against FEPC and pointed out that the commission is on record favoring an FEPC law with teeth."

The Senate Judiciary Committee did not vote, so we shall not know the outcome until their next meeting. In the meantime we shall not let any grass grow under our feet; we have about 11 lawyer-senators to convince, and another 10 or 11 to check with to be sure they still support employment on merit legislation, after a 2-year interval.

Feb. 22, 1953 (The Minnesota Poll)

Good news! In fact, remarkably good news! Two years ago the Minnesota Poll reported that 77% of Minnesota citizens favored a fair employment law for the state. We have, of course, been anticipating publication of results of another poll in 1953, but we could hardly have anticipated an increase of 7 percent in two years. The Minneapolis Tribune reports today, however, that 84% of a representative cross-section of the voting-age men and women of the state, who were interviewed, indicated that they favor an employment on merit law. This is how the question was stated: "Some states have laws that guarantee everyone an equal chance to get a job on his own merits, regardless of his color or religion. These laws are often called FEPC, or fair employment practices laws. Would you be in favor of such a law in Minnesota, or against it?"

Only 9% opposed such a law; the other 7% either qualified their opinions or had none. One of the most encouraging things about the findings of the poll is the surprisingly even distribution of advocates of employment on merit among people in different parts of the state and people in different groups. "Answers in favor of the proposal are given by 87% of the city residents, 85% of the town people, and 78% of the farmers; by 87% of the members of labor unions; by more than 80% of the Republican, Democratic-Farmer-Labor and independent voters"

Another encouraging factor is the steady increase in supporters of a fair employment law over the years; in January of 1951 only 72% said that they favored such legislation.

Feb. 23, 1953 (Prognostication)

John C. McDonald, a Minneapolis Tribune Staff writer, has been interviewing legislators for several days and comes out with an article in this morning's paper entitled, "Legislative Survey Finds Strong FEPC Bill Stands Little Chance." He reports that Senator Miller opposes the bill and that some of the others may have changed their minds since their vote two years ago. "Observers at employment on merit (FEPC) hearings last week before the state senate judiciary committee got the impression that any anti-discrimination bill that gets past the 58th Minnesota legislature will be on the 'toothless' side," he says. "A reporter, in several days of sentiment sampling, found lawmakers from both sides of the question last session who agreed they can't go along with punitive measures set forth in the bill sponsored by Sen. Gerald T. Mullin."

While we are fast learning in this legislative work not to let rumors or prognostications "get us down" or set us up" (you can sometimes hear two directly contradictory rumors within the same day or even within the same hour), yet they sometimes serve a useful purpose in giving us a clue on which to seek further information. And certainly in this instance our own interviews with senators to date do not enable us to dismiss lightly this warning of Mr. McDonald's.

Feb. 24, 1953 (Judiciary Committee meets; Rosenmeier and Grottum ask time to prepare amendments)

The Senate Judiciary Committee met again this morning; Employment on Merit was to have been voted upon, but Senators Rosenmeier and Grottum have asked for a postponement because they are preparing some amendments which they wish to submit. Sen. Mullin has consented to the postponement.

The Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit has sent to all the members of the Judiciary Committee a rebuttal of opposition testimony in the form of a 3-page letter from their president, Mr. George Jensen, and, in order to be sure that they read it, no matter how busy they are, a one-page summary accompanies it. Here is the summary:

MINNESOTA COUNCIL FOR EMPLOYMENT ON MERIT

500 Northwestern Federal Building
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

Summary of Letter to Senate Judiciary Committee
from Geo M. Jensen, February 24, 1953

Subject: Minnesota Employment on Merit Bill (SF 622)

In answer to opponents' arguments, I should like to point out:

Discrimination is Serious in Minnesota: Agencies working in the field can provide extensive and specific evidence of a serious problem throughout the state.

State Action Needed: The largest non-white racial group, the American Indians, live and work outside the major cities, Many important industries are located outside municipal jurisdiction. A single state agency is more economical and efficient than separate municipal commissions.

Law Good for Industry: Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce reports no question about Minneapolis Ordinance ever raised in connection with establishing new plants in Minneapolis. The policy promoted by the law is sound and would not discourage industrial expansion in the state.

Why Not Enact a Law? : The opponents agree that non-discrmination should be practiced. They say that most employers and unions are following it now. Then why not require this sound practice as a matter of public policy by enacting it into law?

Burden of Proof on Complainant: Not on respondent as charged by one opposing witness. In 40% of cases, commissions have acted to clear up unwarranted suspicions of discrimination.

Law Protects All Citizens: It grants special privilege to none. It provides opportunity in accordance with merit, reduces tensions and builds goodwill.

Provides for Employment of Best Qualified Worker: Examples given by opponents in which race or religion may be a "bona fide occupational qualification" are exempted from coverage. The law simply provides that the man best qualified to do the job should not be excluded from it because of his race, religion or national origin. Furthermore, experience shows that people of different groups can work together in harmony on the basis of individual merit.

Law Supported by Minnesota Citizens: Opponents claim that Minneapolis is trying to foist its local ordinance on the state. Minneapolis citizens support such a law because of their favorable experience with it. The current Minnesota Poll indicates 84% of the people of the entire state also favor this proposal. (See attached letter for Poll and representatives of supporting organizations.)

Take Action Now: In a matter as important as this, we cannot afford to let the mandate included in the platforms of both political parties go unheeded. The law is clearly needed. It is desired and urged by an overwhelming majority of the citizens of the state. We respectfully urge its immediate enactment.

February 25 & 26th, 1953 These were particularly active days for the routine lobbying of individual members of both the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Labor Committee, where we expect the bill to be heard next.

Monday, March2, 1953 12:30 (House Labor Committee Hearing.)

This was an eventful day. In order to move the bill ahead as fast as possible it was agreed that each side should take only half an hour to present its case. The authors were hopeful that it might even be possible for the committee to vote at the end of the hour.

The provisions of the bill were explained by P. Kenneth Peterson, after which he called upon Major Samuel Ransom of the Governor's Interracial Commission. Major Ransom stated that the Governor's Interracial Commission stands four-square behind the bill. He himself is personally behind it, as is Father Gilligan, the chairman. "We cannot do the FEPC work; we are not set up for it", said Major Ransom; "we take care of housing and other types of discrimination which have nothing whatsoever to do with FEPC and we have no intention of taking it over." (We are glad that he made that clear, for there has been confusion in the minds of a number of the legislators with regard to this question.)

(Father Gilligan himself today addressed a letter to Senator Mullin in which he stated that in accordance with its previous policy over a period of 6 or 7 years, the governors interracial commission voted unanimously in November to support an Employment on Merit bill with enforcement powers.)

Mr. Amos Deinard, chairman of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Commission, presented the arguments of the proponents of HF518. He is a forceful, impressive personality. He spoke in measured tones of the need for this legislation from the standpoints of justice and humanity, of sound economics, and of good foreign relations. "The bill provides skillfully designed mediation machinery", he said. "Once it is passed the sanction and the prestige of the law of the state",will be behind employment on the merit basis. He termed many of the arguments of the opposition "bug-a-boos" and "sheer imagination."

Otto Christenson repeated many of the same arguments which he had offered to the Senate Judiciary Committee. He pleaded with the legislators not to "Throw this spear, this stiletto" at Minnesota's employers. In addition to T.C. Wright, R.K. Humphrey, Edwin W. Elmer, and F. P. Longeway who spoke at the February 19th hearing, Mr. George Lowe of the Minnesota Restaurant Association, Mr. C.H. Bruns of Duluth, Executive secretary of the Employers' Council, and Mr. Claude Effnor of Minneapolis, testified against the bill. Mr. Bruns maintained that we do not need this legislation; two years ago, he said, the head of the Duluth Round Table of Christians and Jews was challenged to bring any case of discrimination to the business men, who promised to straighten it out. He has not brought any,according to Mr. Bruns. (Why should business men assume that minority group members with grievances are any more willing than is labor to accept the "justice" proffered by an all- employer unofficial committee or commission?- my comment)

Something of a sensation was created when Olin Kaupanger, professing to speak for the Federal Cartridge Corporation, made an impassioned attack against the bill. "Federal Cartridge employs thousands of Negroes in every category of jobs, not in just menial capacities,"he said, "but Federal Cartridge is opposed to this bill! ....We believe that minority groups have to come up first through education." He then described a vocational school which Mr. Horn, president of the company, is financing in the South.

The committee adjourned without taking any action. House liberals lost out by a 5 to 5 tie vote on a motion to hold special meetings to consider the Employment on Merit bill; Chairman John Kinzer told the committee that they were too busy with other committee work to hold extra sessions. He said that the committee will continue consideration of the bill at their regular meeting next Monday, March 9th.

We might have gone to bed quite discouraged tonight, if we had not happened to have a preview of the repudiation Mr. Horn is making in tomorrow morning's papers, of Mr. Kaupanger's testimony.

March 3, 1953 (Mr. Horn repudiates Kaupanger's testimony)

Here it is, in the Minneapolis Tribune: "Cartridge Firm Head Denies He Opposes FEPC" Mr. Charles L. Horn, president of Federal Cartridge Corporation, it seems, was out of town whenOlin Kaupanger testified. "If I had known that he was going to speak I would have stopped him", Mr. Horn said; "he did not represent me or the company in any sense." Mr. Horn personally takes no position on the proposed legislation. Importance of this incident stems from the fact that Mr. Horn was a member of president Franklin D. Roosevelt's fair employment practices commission during World War II.

March 8, 1953: Sunday (Minnesota Council considers amendments)

This morning's St. Paul Pioneer Press carried a Jack Mackay Associated Press Article entitled, "Compromise State FEPC Bill Drafted; Behind Scenes Negotiations Revealed." It states that, climaxing ten days, negotiations "behind the scenes", a compromise bill will appear on Tuesday. Sen. Grottum has been the "sparkplug" and has agreed to "go along" and line up support if certain modifications are made in the bill. Senator Mullin and P. Kenneth Peterson have met a number of times with members of both sides. Although Mullin seemed pleased, he was reluctant to state whether the whole plan is acceptable to him. He and Mr. Peterson and the other co-authors are anxious to learn the position of the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit, the executive board of which is meeting this afternoon to discuss the proposals. Mullin stated that the Rosenmeier-Grottum amendments go much further than any amendments offered in past sessions. The article goes on to comment that although the house had planned to act on the companion measure to SF 622 on Monday, it is likely that the supporters will delay action until after the Senate Judiciary Committee has taken action, since permitting changes to develop in one bill without corresponding changes in the other might jeopardize enactment of any bill.

(Actually, we did not see this article until the legislative session was over; had we seen it on the day when it was published it would have thrown some light on some of the events of the next three days)

A meeting of the executive board of the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit, to which representatives of human relations groups were invited, had a large attendance. The proposed Grottum-Rosenmeier amendments were discussed at length. The executive board approved6of the minor changes without qualifications.

Two changes they approved with suggested modifications. One of these was a rewording to safeguard the Minneapolis FEPC ordinance.

The Council opposed 6 of the Grottum-Rosenmeier proposed amendments:

1. That persons in "confidential" positions be exempted from coverage.
2. That the Governor, rather than the Commission, be given the final decision as to whether to hold a hearing before the review board. The proposed amendment would change the wording "the governor shall promptly appoint a review board" to "the governor may promptly appoint."
3. That the section providing that free copies of the transcript of the hearing be provided at the request of the complainant or the respondent, be omitted.
4. That the power of the review board to issue a cease and desist order be removed, and that it be given instead the duty of making a report to the governor.
5. That the provisions for court review and enforcement be eliminated. In respect to points 4 and 5 the Council passed the following resolution:

"Resolution: The Council for Employment on Merit appreciates the support of a fair employment practice program indicated by Senators Grottum and Rosenmeier. However, the Council believes that the lack of procedure for judicial review of the orders of the board would demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the program and would deny to employers and other respondents a necessary safeguard. Therefore, the Council urges the Senators to withdraw that portion of their amendments and to support the enforcement provisions orginally designed. If the possibility that the court might imprison a violator for contempt of court appears to the Senators too drastic, then the Council would recommend as a substitute amendment the following clause at the end of Section 9, Subd. 8: 'Provided that for any contempt of court the punishment shall be limited to a fine, and incarceration may not be ordered.' "

6. The Council opposed the reduction in the appropriations for the Commission from $80,000 to $30,000 for the biennium. It adopted the following motion on

this point: "The Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit opposes any cut in the budget which would make the work of the Commission ineffective and suggests that a realistic budget be prepared after study.

"It was the consensus of the meeting that the Chairman convey the appreciation of the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit to the authors of the Senate and House Bills for their efforts in getting the best Bill that they possibly can at this session."

March 9, 1953 (House Labor Committee)

It was our understanding when we went to the House Labor Committee today that only legislators would be permitted to debate on the Employment on Merit bill--members of the committee and some of the authors of bill. Rep. Langley began by saying that aside from his Christian convictions, his primary interest in the bill is that, as an American, he believes in the supreme dignity of labor. "We do not hope to legislate tolerance", he said; "we have not legislated honesty, but we do hope to prevent the ill effects of intolerance. Members of minority groups have the right to labor up to the level of their ability; they ask no more."

He was heckled by Rep. Duxbury, as was each of the other authors, in turn, as he spoke for the bill. (Questions, it must be remembered, can be used to accomplish several ends; they can serve as rebuttal, they can irritate and confuse the speaker, or they can prolong debate and delay action).

Rep. Duxbury asked Mr. Langley why these rights should be limited to plants where 8 or more people were employed.

(This happens to be a point on which we of the League are not in complete agreement with Mr. Langley) Rep. Langley replied that in these small businesses there is a closer personal relationship between employer and employees. The League reply, which we expect to mimeograph and distribute to member of the committee, since we were given no opportunity to speak, is as follows:

"If(1) the legislators of this state would pass in good faith an enforceable employment on merit law which would apply to all employers or to employers of 2 or more individuals, as does the Minneapolis Ordinance, and (2) if the state could afford to provide a commission with sufficient staff to do the necessary administrative and educational job for that number of employers, and (3) if this commission and staff could be adequately financed, we should be glad to see this exemption struck out. Limiting the application of the law to employers of 8 or more serves to open up the greatest number of jobs with the most economical use of the manpower of the commission and its staff."

We submit that there is no reason why the head of a small business should any more hesitate to work with clean, decent, well-qualified members of minority groups than should employees in larger plants.

It is, however, noteworthy that it is always the inveterate opponents of the bill who fight to remove the exemption, and it seems clear that their purpose is to make the bill unpalatable so that it will be defeated.

Rep. Holmquist spoke next; we are coming to appreciate the value of our five able authors as we hear them speak.

Kenneth Peterson distributed newspaper clippings with regard to the Minnesota Poll. "The people weren't asked about this particular bill", said Rep. Duxbury.

When Rep. Duxbury asked how the Commission could decide whether one applicant was better qualified than another, the question was referred, with the consent of the chairman, to Wilfred Leland, Jr., executive secretary of the Minneapolis

Fair Employment Commission. Mr. Leland said that the burden of proof rests with the complainant. Unless a case can be clearly demonstrated to be discrimination, the employer gets the benefit of the doubt. Commissions all recognize the right of the employer to consider subjective factors.

Mr. Mike Galvin, one of the opponents who testified at the Senate Judiciary Hearing on February 19th, somehow got the floor. He was much disturbed at the possibility of having to mix people of different races or colors with the all Negro waiters and red caps now employed by the railroads. "It will be another noble experiment like prohibition", he declared; "the Soviet press will have big headlines every time there is a violation."

Otto Christenson followed. He described graphically and emotionally the embarrassing position in which "your own school board" might find itself if it could not require a photograph or ask questions about an applicant's race or religion. This would cause "religious upsets, emotional tension, gossip, pressure" among other things, according to Mr. Christenson.

All this was too much for Rep. Albert Dominick of Pierz, Crow Wing County, vice-chairman of the committee. He made an eloquent plea for democracy.. "In my opinion," he delared, "these rights are already guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, only we don't enforce it. The main usefulness of this bill would be to enable us to implement the Constitution."

Rep. Forbes then introduced his bill, H.F. 675. He said that HF 518 is class legislation, that it would create political issues, that elimination of discrimination lies in the home, the school, etc. He praised the Governor's Interracial Commission and said that it had got great results without punitive measures. He criticized the exemptions in HF 518, said that if it was good for any it should be good for all. He brought in the topic of labor unions. Finally he said that while he doesn't actually recommend his bill he offers it as an alternative "if you feel that you want compulsory FEPC in Minnesota."

Some of us were sitting on the edges of our chairs while Otto Christenson was speaking about the schools If he could speak, why couldn't we? Why couldn't we tell about the fine well-qualified, Negro and Nisei teachers in the Minneapolis and the St. Paul schools who have worked out so successfully and have helped the Twin Cities to solve their teacher shortage problems? Whether "our team" had a high sense of fair play and obedience to the rules, whether they are still a little distrustful of women as active participants in such a hearing, or whether they just wanted to conserve time by limiting debate, they canseled us to keep still, so these points remained unanswered.

With adjournment time nearing, Rep. Emil C. Ernst, of Lester Prairie, submitted an amendment which would set up a quota system to regulate hiring practices of Minnesota employers. The Minneapolis Tribune explains it this way:"Quotas corresponding to the size of minority groups in a community would be set up for each business coming under the employment law. An employer would not be required to hire more than his quota of any minority."

A group of people which included Mrs. Elizabeth Heffelfinger, Republican Chairwomen for Minnesota gathered around Mr. Ernst in the hall afterwards. "Such an amendment would be directly contrary to the principle of employment on merit which the bill is intended to establish! ", one said. "It would be impossible to administer and would call for the expenditure of large amounts of the state's funds on misdirected research," said another. "It is contrary to the basic philosophy and the successful operation of the American individual enterprise system to set up quotas and stratifications", said another.

March 10, 1953 (Senate Judiciary Committee amends and recommends)

"The Minnesota senate's judiciary committee today approved for passage a fair employment practices act, sending it to the senate floor for the first time in the three-session history of that issue", says tonight's Minneapolis Star.

This morning's session of the committee began by Senator Grottum's presenting the amendments. "I have always been willing to go along", he said, "if employers are not subjected to fine and imprisonment..." "The amended bill leaves the force of public opinion. If the right commission is selected, much can be done." He stated also, that as a token of good faith he and Senator Rosenmeier had restored part of the cut in the appropriation, providing $7500 to be immediately available, $20,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and $25,000 for the fiscal year June 30, 1955. "The Finance Committee will have to make the final decision as to the appropriation, anyway, " he said. "We wanted to make it clear that we are not trying to sabotage the bill."

Senator Mullin mentioned one or two of the points which the Minnesota Council had requested, but did not urge their acceptance. When questinned by Senator Johanson he said, "As distasteful as it is to me, I'll go along on the hope that the act will prove effective."

Senator Johanson objected to taking action; he maintained that the amendments were "a body blow" to the bill and that he wanted time to study them; he tried to postpone action. Senator Sletvold was in sympathy with this suggestion, since, as he said, the amendments were extensive. Senator Johanson's statements were misinterpreted by some observers as indicating that he was friendly to the unamended bill) Senator Rosenmeier, however, pushed an immediate decision, and the amendments were adopted. Senator Johanson moved that the bill be sent on without recommendation, but he was voted down by a chorus of "no's". Senator Mullin's motion, that S.F. 622 as modified by the Grottum-Rosenmeier amendments be recommended to pass by the committee, was carried.

We felt depressed as we left this meeting. We had hoped that Senator Mullin might be able to win some of the points which the Minnesota Council had requested. Moreover, there were two undesirable statements in the amended bill, which we thought Senators Grottum and Rosenmeier had not noticed and did not intend. One of these left the status of the Minneapolis FEPC ordinance in question. Since the Minneapolis ordinance is definitely stronger than the amended bill, and since it is working out so successfully, Minneapolis naturally does not want it superseded or set aside by the state law.

The other statement had resulted from a hasty attempt by one of the other Senators to correct clumsy wording. Section 4, subdivision 1,(3) now reads, "This act does not apply to.....discrimination based on religion, a religious or fraternal corporation, association, or society."

The intention was, we felt certain, to state that religious or fraternal organizations might limit their employees to people of their own faith, but must not discriminate with regard to race.

We determined to speak to Senator Grottum about it. A great deal depends upon him. Mari Donohue, our state legislative chairman, had told us from experience that Senator Grottum is a man of sincerity and integrity. We knew that support of this bill had meant a real compromise to him, for when we had talked to him before he was very firmly opposed to it, and had said that he stood for the Indiana plan, which is a much weaker law than the amended bill provides. We watched him as he stood across the lobby, in conference with some of his constituents; he seemed a little forbidding and unapproachable. Then, suddenly he excused himself

to the group of men, telling them that he was overdue at a meeting of the Finance Committee, but he took the time to come over to us and to say, "Were you waiting to see me?" He could not believe that either of the two difficulties we mentioned was actually present in the amended bill, but seemed willing to study them when he should have more time. It was apparent that he had no objection to the safeguards about which we were concerned. He spoke very sympathetically saying, "I believe and I hope that the law will be enforceable without court penalties. If it shouldn't work out you will have been able to assemble definite figures and statistics as to the actual amount of discrimination which exists in the state, and you will have something more tangible with which to convince a person like me that a stronger law is needed."

The more we thought about it, the more we realized that he had touched upon a very important problem in connection with the question of discrimination. Until we have some sort of official agency to judge cases, all the evidence which we can assemble outside of the city of Minneapolis, is "alleged" discrimination to the opponents, no matter how obvious and flagrant it may be.

Merely setting up an official commission and board of review to judge cases would be one forward step.

March 13, 1953 (Division among the proponents; the League issues a rebuttal statement)

We are going to have to face the problem of keeping a united front among proponents of this bill. It is understandable that those who are close to the actual needs but not so close to the inertia, misinformation, special interest, and intrenched conservatism that we are "up against" in making progress with a large number of the legislators, should feel that this was an unnecessary, if not a cowardly, compromise. If we look back on our own unscarred enthusiastic determination of a few weeks ago, it is not difficult to understand those who recoil with the statement "It is better to have no bill at all than to accept such a watered-down or emasculated bill." The Minneapolis Spokesman of today quotes several of our most outstanding Negro leaders as taking this position.

A bulletin issued two days ago by the Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit pinpoints the issue: "The Minnesota Council for Employment on Merit took a stand this week that it will continue to work for the original bill on the floor. However, it did vote to accept the majority of Grottum and Rosenmeier amendments... ....left the way open to work further with the senators." This is being given different interpretations. There are those who believe that the Council should try to line up friends of fair employment legislation among senators who would be willing to make a floor fight to restore the court enforcement powers. Some of the rest of us believe that that would not only be impossible for our own authors and very difficult for any other proponents, but that it would alienate the men who are most likely to be able to put some kind of an employment on merit bill across at this session.--- Senators Grottum and Rosenmeier and those who have faith in them. At the March 10th meeting there seemed to be a general recognition of a spirit of compromise, and a kind of gentlemen's agreement. We believe that an attempt to reverse that action on the floor would be regarded as a breach of good faith, and would create division and confusion. We are therefore urging another meeting of the Council to reassess the situation.

Another matter which reached our attention today gave us some cause for alarm; it was reported to us by several people that some of the Liberals in the Legislature have lost interest in the bill, assuming that it is not worth supporting. At this point, it seems to us, there is a need to rally our forces, lest, when we need

them, we should find that they are disbanded, or at least, disheartened.

March 16, 1953 (House Labor Committee makes no progress; League rebuttal statements distributed.)

Today's meeting of the House Labor Committee was pretty much of a parliamentary wrangle, so far as employment on merit was concerned. Rep. Dominick moved that they vote on HF 518. Chairman Kinzer said that other bills were ahead of it. Rep. Dominick said that it had been out of order on March 9th to take up the Forbes-Duxbury bill when HF 518 was under consideration. We couldn't hear all of the altercation but it ended in Rep. Dominick's being pronounced "out of order" by the chairman.

Representative Prifrel then moved that an arbitration bill on which some work had been done be passed, and the committee went on to other business.

Toward the end of the meeting Rep. Karth made another attempt to get consideration for the employment on merit bill. He moved that a special meeting be held. Rep. Kinzer said that it would be impossible to get the committee together. Mr. Karth suggested Wednesday; Mr. Ottinger (an opponent) said that would be impossible for him. Mr. Karth suggested an evening meeting; Mr. Kinzer objected. He adjourned the committee until Monday, March 23rd.

In mentioning Rep. Karth we cannot refrain from throwing a bouquet at the White Bear Lake League who are among his constituents. With the well-informed interest and enthusiasm they have demonstrated, they have built a fine relationship and spirit of cooperation between the League and their representatives in the legislature, all of whom support the employment on merit bill.

Out in the hall several human relations representatives approached Rep. Kinzer. Before they had said anything he began, "I'm not holding up your bill; really, I'm not. It may look that way, but I just couldn't help it. We'll surely get to HF 518 next time; the Child Labor bill we're working on now shouldn't take more than 10 minutes next Monday."

Something, however, we have managed to accomplish with the House Labor Committee during the past two weeks; Rep. Karth distributed newspaper clippings reporting Mr. Horn's repudiation of Kaupanger's testimony, and the League of Women Voters of Minnesota has mimeographed and distributed four pages of rebuttal and new testimony which we have had no opportunity to present orally. We have listed and attempted to answer these questions:

Will the law cause intergroup conflicts?
Will the law cause sweeping changes of personnel?
Are employers opposed to this legislation?
Is government regulation always a menance to business?
Are employers not guilty of discrimination subjected to publicity?
Does the law protect employers against unwarranted suspicion of discrimination?
Will hiring teachers without discrimination create community problems?
Does an Employment on Merit commission ever select employees for an employer?
Would a Minnesota Employment on Merit act interfere with migrant labor contracts upon which Minnesota canning companies depend for seasonal labor?
Why exempt employers who employ fewer than 8 individuals?
Would the quota system amendment proposed by Rep. Ernst be workable or desirable?
Are proponents of this legislation people who would not be affected by it?
Who are the proponents?

We end the statement with a quotation from the 1946 1100-page report of the

Economic Principles Commission of the National Association of Manufacturers :

> "We (Americans) have been a people dedicated to the theory of equal opportunity . It has been our conviction that everyone should receive an education at public expense; that he should be free to enter the occupation of his choosing; and that no one should have the right to deny to another the freedom of selecting his own occupation."

and the challenge:

> "We call to your attention that the LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA is prepared to back up any statement which it has made, by reliable evidence. We have quoted exact references and authorities and have brought you up-to-date statements directly from employers and others in states and cities, including Minneapolis, where fair employment laws have actually been in effect."

The rebuttal calls attention to several statements of the opponents which would not meet similar standards.

March 18, 1953 (League executive board endorses amended bill)

After a careful discussion today the executive board of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota decided that it is wiser to work for the amended SF 622 than to cling to a hope that something might turn up which would enable us to get the bill of our choice at this session. The amended bill still provides:

(1) A commission with authority to carry on a program of education, conciliation, and persuasion.
(2) A board of review with authority to subpoena witnesses, to administer oaths, to cross-examine witnesses, and to apply the rules of evidence of courts of law.
(3) The influence of public opinion as an enforcement power.
(4) The governor's influence as a last resort.
(5) An appropriation.

We believe that it will be easier to build from experience with such a law than from no law at all. And in the meantime it deserves a fair trial.

March 22, 1953, Sunday (Minnesota Council votes to support amended bill)

Another Sunday afternoon was given by a large number of intensely interested proponents of fair employment legislation, and by Rep. P. Kenneth Peterson, to working out a united approach. As the Minnesota Council record states: "Despite the general feeling of genuine regret at having to abandon the fight for the original bill, consensus of those present was that the passage of the amended bill would be a tremendous step forward and will provide a real foundation on which supporters of employment on merit can build in years to come." The motion was made by William Cratic, President of the Minneapolis NAACP, seconded by Frank Boyd, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, St. Paul, and carried without a dissenting vote, although it was preceded by some earnest arguments for trying to restore enforcement powers. The spirit of cooperation and the morale of the group were admirable.

March 23, 1953 (SF 622 substituted for HF 518 and voted out by House Labor Committee without recommendation)

The star of today's Labor Committee meeting was Rep. Harold R. Anderson of North

Mankato. When this session opened he was certainly no advocate of the employment on merit bill. On the other hand, he was not one of those who had his mind closed to reasoning and information. When the Grottum-Rosenmeier amendments were proposed, he found the amended bill much more acceptable. Moreover, Mankato was so wholeheartedly in favor of the bill that their city council had endorsed it, and, we understand, the mayor telephoned Mr. Anderson to that effect, at the suggestion of one of our League women. Rep. Anderson led the fight for the amended bill by moving to substitute SF 622 for HF 518. He made an excellent speech in support of his motion. "I have been on this committee for 3 sessions," he said, "and I have come to this conclusion: the opponents of this bill don't favor discrimination; they doubt the need, and they fear something new. On the other hand, I am persuaded that education is not quite enough; we need something to speed the process. In this bill the educational process is combined with enforcement by public opinion. Some say that the proponents are merely getting their foot into the door with this bill. Actually, we are inviting the stranger in but are telling him to stack his guns at the door. If in two years' time we find that he is not a friend, the legislature can tell him to get out.

"I urge the authors and friends of this bill to seriously consider the amendments. You still have (1) a definite statement of policy by the state, (2) a commission to conduct a program of education, conciliation, and persuasion, (3) a review board which can operate with the help of the persuasion of public opinion, and (4) appeal to the governor which may have some effect."

"For the present you have no whip. You may not need it. Maybe a firm, guiding hand may do the job. If in 2 years you can point out such a need, you will have definite facts. This amendment represents a true compromise. But it is not a compromise in principle; it is a compromise in method."

Rep. Duxbury moved to amend. in order to eliminate exemptions for domestic or confidential service, exemptions for employers of fewer than 8, and exemptions for religious or fraternal organizations--also to eliminate the authority of the commission to issue complaints.

The Duxbury motion was voted down, 10 to 8, but not before another of our authors, Rep. Joseph Prifrel, had given a demonstration of his skill in pleading, with quiet, eloquent sincerity. He made it clear that any amendment other than the Anderson amendment, would be pretty sure to kill the bill, since there would not be time to pass a corresponding amendment in the senate.

The Anderson amendment, substituting SF 622 for HF 518, was then passed, with 13 favorable votes.

Mr. Anderson then moved that SF 622 be referred to the Civil Administration Committee without recommendation.

Rep. Pischel moved that the appropriation be stricken entirely, but the committee objected, saying that a motion to commit supersedes a motion to amend. A miscellaneous discussion continued for some time, even after Rep. Karth had called for the "Question" once.

Rep. Karth finally said, "Inasmuch as we have discussed this bill thoroughly for 5 or 6 hours and I doubt whether any new arguments can be advanced, I move the previous question." This precipitated a confused parliamentary skirmish, but no action. Rep. Dominick then moved to limit debate. Rep. Ernst thought that every member should be given time to explain his vote. There was further discussion. Rep. Dominick rose to a point of order and reminded the chairman that he had

moved to limit debate.

"How can you limit debate?" asked Chairman Kinzer; "Would you limit each person to 5 minutes or to 2 minutes? Before you can limit debate, you have to decide how you're going to limit it." Rep. Dominick thought that they could vote to limit debate first and then have another motion to set the time limits, but Rep. Kinzer was not willing to put any motion that Rep. Dominick suggested.

Finally, at the suggestion of Representatives Anderson and Prifrel they voted, permitting each man an opportunity to explain his vote if he wished to do so.

The motion to refer SF 622 to the Civil Administration Committee without recommendation was carried by 11 votes, which was one more than the necessary majority.

Then Chairman Kinzer made a speech. He said that the reason he had opposed the bill all along was that in a previous session he had requested the authors to include an amendment to the bill which would prohibit landlords from discriminating against veterans with children. "That is the worst discrimination of all", said Rep. Kinzer. The sponsors of the bill had refused to include this amendment. "I was awfully sorry", said Rep. Kinzer; "therefore I have opposed the employment on merit bill."

We were "awfully sorry", too, when we looked at the calendar and saw how precious were the three weeks during which our bill had been tied up in Mr. Kinzer's committee. But the Civil Administration Committee meets on Wednesday, fortunately!

Wednesday, March 25, 1953 (Thwarted again!)

Hastening over to the capitol from Minneapolis this morning, to be on hand bright and early for the Civil Administration Committee hearing, we encountered Mari Donohue, the legislative chairman of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, sitting on the bench next to the check room, and smouldering as only Mari can smoulder when duly provoked. She jumped up at sight of us and exploded,"There will be no hearing of the Employment on Merit bill this morning!" "Why not?", we gasped. "Because Kinzer has the bill in his pocket", she said between set teeth; "he hasn't sent it on to the Civil Administration Committee." "But can he do that?", I asked. "It seems he can--for three days. It's been only two since the Labor Committee referred it out." "Another whole week of delay", I mourned; "the Civil Administration Committee meets only on Wednesdays." "Unless Kenneth Peterson can call a special meeting", said Mari, "but that's difficult to do this late in the season, since the committee members have so many conflicting meetings."

We stayed on for the rest of the day, however, to continue to systematic interviewing of individual senators and representatives.

March 31, 1953 (Special meeting of House Civil Administration Committee; bill recommended to pass)

Kenneth Peterson finally got his committee together this morning to consider the Employment on Merit bill. Since this special meeting conflicted with a number of other committee meetings, the men came in and out and the composition of the committee was constantly changing. This gave us some breathless moments.

Rep. Prifrel began by moving 2 amendments to take care of the points which had worried the proponents, and which we had discussed with Senator Grottum on March 10th--the matters of safeguarding municipal ordinances, and rewording the provisions with regard to religious institutions and organizations. After some slight

changes in wording, the amendments were adopted.

Many questions were then asked by friends, as well as foes of the bill. Rep. Daley moved to make the bill apply to employers of 2 or more employees, instead of 8 or more. Quite a discussion followed. The League of Women of Minnesota submitted a statistical table which showed that even if employers of fewer than 8 employees were exempted, the law would apply to 84.8% of the jobs in the state. Rep. French of Minneapolis objected because it would apply to only 18% of the employers. Rep. Popovich pointed out that the bill would cover the larger industries and would provide about as much work as the commission could handle in the next 2 years. Rep. Sally Luther called attention to the fact that this amendment is usually proposed by opponents of the bill.

Rep. Daley moved and Rep. Carl A. Jensen of Sleepyeye seconded a motion to strike out the exemption of employers of fewer than 8. The motion was lost, 6 to 8, with the committee voting as follows:

No	Yes
Rep. H. J. Anderson	Rep. Geo. Daley
K. Kennedy	Emil C. Ernst
Sally Luther	Geo. French
P. S. Popovich	Carl A. Jensen
Jos. Prifrel	G. J. Van de Riet
Dewey Reed	Vernon Welch
Wm. Shovell	
D. D. Wozniak	

The bill was then voted out of the committee with a recommendation to pass. It was a voice vote; there was no roll call.

April 1, 1953 (Senate votes special order after Senate Finance Committee action)

It was something new for us to spend time in the gallery. First, however, we had distributed clippings of the Minnesota Poll to all the senators. Senator Mullin had given notice that this morning he would ask for a special order. We had been informed that it is a kind of courtesy rule in the senate to grant such a request. Senator Mullin did not take up time with any lengthy statement. He simply asked, that in the name of fairness, the bill be given an opportunity to be heard. He asked, also, for a roll call vote, so that it would be official. We needed a two thirds majority or 45 votes. It is impossible to describe how we felt, after all the uncertainty, when 55 green lights flashed on, and not a red one! (See Voting Record)

Progress of the bill through the Senate Finance Committee was so painless that we didn't know about it until after it happened. Senator Mullin and Senator E. L. Andersen are both on that committee, so they put it through (at an evening meeting, I believe). We are sorry that the appropriation was cut to $7,500 to be immediately available, $15,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and $18,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

April 3, 1953 (Rep. Forbes of Worthington)

Rep. Forbes has withdrawn his bill, we learned. Today we had an opportunity to talk to him about it. We asked him whether his withdrawal of HF 875 means that he will consider supporting the Grottum-Rosenmeier amended bill. He said that he hadn't made up his mind, but might consider it.

April 6, 1953 (Senate passes SF 622, 39 to 22)

For once we had the fun of sitting on the senate floor, if you can call such agonizing suspense "fun". The senate debate on the bill lasted for 3 hours and was far more emotional than had been anticipated, now that the "teeth" have been removed from the bill. Half a dozen of us League women had come over early to talk to those last 9 senators whom we hadn't reached before.

Senator Mullin presented the two amendments which Rep. Prifrel had added in the House Civil Administration Committee (with regard to city ordinances and religious organizations), thus making the house and the senate bills once more identical. In presenting the bill he said, "Minority groups, although they are called upon to perform all the duties of citizenship, are denied its privileges."

Senator G. Baughman of Waseca, who started with the familiar "some of my best friends....." and continued by talking about the "right to accept anyone and reject anyone", offered 2 crippling amendments which would have eliminated the commission and the review board. These amendments were voted down by votes of 46 to 10, and 44 to 10.

Senators Sletvold, Johanson, Baughman, Child, Imm, Palm, Pedersen, Engbritson, E. P. Anderson, and Mattson spoke against the bill; Senators Mullin, Grottum, Rosenmeier, E. L. Andersen, and Gillen spoke for it. (Another senator told us afterwards that some proponents didn't think they would help the bill any by stringing out debate any longer).

Senator Sletvold of Detroit Lakes, perennial foe of FEPC, led the opposition. We had come to respect him as a fair committee chairman, so we were a little disillusioned to hear him maintain that the bill "would give preference to certain groups and take away from others," thus creating jealousies. He talked, too, about interfering with the constitutional rights of employers, and finally stated that the work could be done by the Governor's Interracial Commission.

Senator Child, wondered who was "behind" the bill, and managed to bring in "world government."

Senator A. R. Johanson of Wheaton attacked the amended bill, calling it "sugar-coated", He claimed to be suspicious of the motives of the authors in permitting it to be amended, and insinuated that "persuasion" might become a third degree, and that rackets and bribery might develop to avoid compliance with the law.

But the most amazing statement of all was made by Sen. Hans C. Pedersen, an banker from Ruthton. He described his tragic childhood as an immigrant boy whose little sister died of starvation and was buried in a crude coffin which he himself had made. He told of discrimination which he had suffered, of working for 15 cents a day picking cotton, and even got onto the subject of a lynching which he had witnessed. He then concluded by stating that he and his brothers and sisters were better citizens for having been discriminated against, and finished by saying, "I want every citizen to grow up the hard way--the way I did."

Senator Elmer L. Andersen of St. Paul, co-author of the bill, pointed out that one of the nation's weakest points in winning friends throughout the world is the treatment accorded minorities in the United States, and Senator Gordon Rosenmeier made a stirring speech in which he said, "Democracy is more than a free press and a right to vote. Those are manifestations of democracy. Democracy is an ideal. To me this vote is an expression of the strength of our faith in democracy. Has this senate the courage to preserve and carry on the spirit of democarcy?" He

also chided those who formerly complained that penalties were too severe but now try to cast suspicion on those who have been willing to remove the penalties.

Senator Arthur Gillen brought in new factual material by quoting from an article in the Minnesota Law Review, just off the press (March 1953); it reported successful administration of fair employment laws in other states and cities. He assailed lawyers who had condemned the bill on "hearsay evidence", instead of informing themselves.

Senator Palm offered another amendment, without success. Senators Carey, Keller, Lauerman, Mattson, and Sullivan did not vote.

We know, now, of course, that the opponents will concentrate all their forces to stop the bill in the house.

This morning, while we were watching the debate in the senate, the House Appropriations Committee discussed the bill. (Once again, we had no notice that it was coming up). Figures were not available with regard to an executive director's salary and other items, so action had to be postponed. This is most regrettable, since for several days the League has been urging that these figures be prepared and held in readiness.

April 8, 1953 (Vigil)

The bill is fighting for its life. We attend every meeting of the Appropriations Committee, night and morning, hoping that the bill will be considered. We talk with some of the men, and have alerted the Leagues in their own communities to communicate with others. The Minnesota Council has sent out a bulletin to its members, notifying them that this is the time to write to representatives on the committee. We think we know where practically every man stands. Only a few are uncertain; the rest are almost evenly divided. The chairman holds it within his power to delay the bill or to give it a chance. We know that he has received close to 100 letters urging action. This afternoon he told us he thought it would come up tonight; tonight in adjourning the meeting, he stated definitely that it will be taken up tomorrow morning, and urged every man to be present.

April 9, 1953 (Bill voted out of House Appropriations Committee, 14 to 13)

At 7:30 this morning I telephoned Kenneth Peterson; not being a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was not present last night, and yet, we felt that we needed him this morning. He thought it would be wise to call the other authors, Representatives Holmquist and Chilgren, so my telephone calls roused them out of bed in their St. Paul hotel. They were gracious about it. When, however, at 9 o'clock we all hurried to the committee room, we found that a delegation from some out-state community had the floor on a local bill; Rep. Allen said that he had forgotten that they were scheduled ahead of us. Our authors have other committments for this evening, but everyone promised to return.

This evening one of the representatives, seeing us outside the committee room door, suggested that they would feel freer in their discussion if we League women were not present. He hinted that perhaps some of the men were waiting for a time to take up the bill when there was not such a large audience present. We decided to accede to his wishes, and spent about an hour and a half sitting in a cold stone niche outside the committee room door, watching members and others go and come. We could still be useful, for Rep. Leonard Johnson, one of our friends on the committee and Rep. Chilgren, one of our authors, were upstairs in

the house itself, which was in session, and we hoped to notify them when the bill was about to come to a vote. We knew that Mr. George Jensen, President of the Minnesota Council, was testifying before the committee. (They cross-questioned him for over an hour). Finally we stepped inside, and when we saw Otto Christenson, lobbyist for the Minnesota Employers' Association, sitting up in front with his feet on a chair, we came right in and sat down. They were still questioning Mr. Jensen and he was impressively successful in answering their questions.

To quote the Minneapolis Star, "Opponents led by Representatives Gordon Forbes, Worthington; Lloyd Duxbury, Caledonia; and Eric Friberg, Roseau; tried grimly to beat the bill with non-fiscal arguments that caused Rep. Claude Allen, committee chairman, to warn that the committee's primary job was to weigh the $33,000 appropriation carried in the bill." Rep. Forbes' crippling amendment was voted down, 11 to 13.

Rep. Popovich, who had spoken against the Forbes amendment, moved that the bill be recommended to pass. The first vote was a tie, 11 to 11, which would have kept the bill in committee. "Gentlemen, I don't think this should be decided this way", Chairman Allen said, and had them polled again, insisting that they vote. When Reps. Appledorn, Beanblossom, and Croswell voted "aye", and Reps. Dahle and Forbes voted "no", the final result was a 14 to 13 victory for the bill.

This was far too close for comfort. Rep. Leonard Johnson, who voted for the bill, could not come out of the house the first 2 times we called him; he said that bills of his own were under consideration there. Finally Rep. Holmquist brought him down in time for the vote. Another affirmative vote can definitely be traced to the work of a League group.

That is a story in itself. It shows that you should "never underestimate the power of women". Mrs. Robt. Burger, a member of St. Paul League Unit 28, happens to be also legislative chairman of Harrison P.T.A. On February 17th she and other P.T.A. members talked to Rep. Beanblossom at a P.T.A. meeting to which he had been invited. He told them that he understood that the minority group members themselves did not want this bill passed. Mrs. Burger contacted officers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in St. Paul, and of other minority group organizations, and they informed Mr. Beanblossom of the almost unanimous support for this law among the minorities. Mrs. Struck of St. Paul League Unit 25 cooperated with Mrs. Burger, and the women continued to work through League units, P.T.A's, and church groups, members of which wrote letters to Mr. Beanblossom. On the evening of April 8th Mrs. Burger and Mrs. Herbert Morton came to the House Appropriations meeting and talked to Mr. Beanblossom again. Finally he said that since the League, the P.T.A. groups and so many organizations to which many of his constituents belonged, were so evidently in favor of it, he would vote for the bill. And tonight he kept his word.

We consider this, and the work done by St. Paul Unit 18 in alerting not only their own members, but many other citizens in the community, to write letters to their legislator, Rep. Claude Allen concerning the urgency of getting the bill through the Appropriations Committee, examples of lobbying at its best.

Legislative Report of 1953- 36

The committee vote was as follows:

Representative	1st vote	Final vote	Representative	1st vote	Final vote
Appledorn	pass	yes	Kording	yes	
Beanblossom	pass	yes	Kinzer	no	
Clark	no		La Brosse	yes	
Croswell	pass	yes	Langen	yes	
Dahle	pass	no	Langley	yes	
Day	yes		Lorentz	no	
Duxbury	no		Ottinger	no	
Erdahl	no		Popovich	yes	
Forbes	pass	no	Reed	yes	
Friberg	no		Swanstrom	yes	
Howard	absent		Tweten	no	
Iverson	no		Van de Riet	no	
Leonard Johnson	yes		Volstad	yes	
Kaplan	no		Voxland	yes	

One of the committee members said to us afterwards, "I am as happy about this as you are, even if I couldn't vote for it. Certain powerful constituents of mine are opposed to it."

The bill is Number 126 on the general orders list. Now the heat will really be on, as we attempt to win a place on the Special Orders calendar. As one of the legislators said to us, "This wasn't according to the plans of the opposition, you know; the bill wasn't expected to come out of the Appropriations Committee."

April 15, 1953 (House vote on special order lost, 84 to 41)

For several days we have been going through the same kind of watchful waiting in the house gallery that we went through with the House Appropriations Committee. As early as Monday we thought the vote might come up. There is not much we here at the capitol can do now but wait; most of the time the house is "on call", which means that we cannot ask them to come out to talk to us. As the pressure toward the end of the session builds up, tensions increase, anyway, and the men have less time and patience to talk to us. We hope that League members out in the state have been holding up their end of the lobbying job.

Today Rep. Langley moved for a special order. Rep. Dominick, who had recently been featured by the newspapers as a baseball star of bygone years (he is now 69), made this appeal: "The committees have played eight innings of this ball game. The ninth inning must be played here. If there is no special order, the ninth inning will be rained out." He told opponents to grant the special order and then "use your relief pitchers, pinch hitters and even the bat boy in an effort to beat it" if they wished.

Rep. Kinzer objected to the special order, saying that business men in the country felt no need of the bill.

The board was tormentingly slow in lighting up. Representatives had to be rounded up from other parts of the building. Rep. Roy Dunn, to whom many look for leadership, was late in arriving, but voted "yes" when he did come in. Representatives Sorensen and Appledorn were sick in bed, Rep. Appledorn being seriously ill. Reps. Allen, Biernat, Bouton, and Gibbons, although they had been present earlier in the day, could not be found. And so, the motion failed for the lack of 4 more votes.

We saw Kenneth Peterson shortly after this vote. With an admirable fighting spirit, he was already planning for the next attempt, but it will not be easy to round up the additional votes required.

April 18, 1953 (Final defeat came late on a Saturday afternoon)

We have been attending every session (they are now being held morning, afternoon, and night), expecting almost momentarily for the bill to be put to its second vote in the house. This afternoon at about 3:30 Rep. Langley moved the special order, saying that the bill was one of the major issues before the 1953 legislature. "The hopes, the interest, and the labor of a great many people are in this bill. Don't let it be crowded out on a vote just to bring it up for debate."

Rep. P. Kenneth Peterson, according to the St. Paul Pioneer Press "attacked the work of a St. Paul Lobbyist against the bill and urged members to press the 'yes' voting button 'to show that we do not approve of the methods used to defeat this bill'".

Rep. Joseph Prifrel declared, "the vote you cast today means so much to so many people" and Rep. Keith Kennedy of Staples called it a "human interest package bill".

Reps. Kinzer and Iverson spoke against it.

Says the St. Paul Pioneer Press: "The roll call was delayed about 10 minutes because Rep. Arthur Gibbons of St. Paul didn't vote. The House refused to excuse him and, when he did note, it was in favor of having the bill placed on special orders."

A decline from 84 votes 3 days ago doesn't begin to tell the story. 22 men voted differently this time, although 3 of them changed merely from not voting to voting "no", which made no difference in the outcome. But while 8 votes were gained, 11 were lost. The truth is that during these last few days there has been a terrific tussle behind the scenes. Legislators received letters and telegrams from both proponents and opponents; many new faces suddenly appeared in the capitol lobbies. This was the time when we wished that we might have had more time for our program of education for the out-state businessmen; it should have been a 2 year, rather than a 1 year program.

Keen as our own disappointment was, we could not leave the capitol until we had penned each of our authors in the house a note of appreciation, thanking him for the clean, courageous fight which he had put up for the bill, and stating that we did not feel that his effort had been in vain.

April 27, 1953 (Newspaper comments)

More than a week has gone by since that last vote on the Employment on Merit bill. When I telephoned P. Kenneth Peterson the next day, he was already talking about 1955. We admire his spirit.

The legislature adjourned on the 22nd.

The same issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press (April 19) which carried the story of the decease of the Employment on Merit bill quoted Wm. E. Carlson of St. Paul, legislative representative of the Democratic-Farmer Labor party, whom we had seen many times in the capitol, as saying, "The Republican Party should quit fooling the people; they have not intention of passing such a bill." "He pointed out

that Roy Dunn, former Republican National committeeman, was one of those who voted against it Saturday."

A few days later, we understand, Kenneth Peterson accused the Democrat-Farmer Labor Party (or the Liberals) of having failed to support the bill.

It is a little sad to see these two young men, both of whom, we are convinced, put their hearts into the fight for the bill in their different capacities, thus turning their fire upon each other.

What have been the reactions of the minority groups? As yet we have seen only the statements in the Negro press of the Twin Cities.

The Minneapolis Spokesman has this to say: "This newspaper cannot agree with DFL legislative chief William (Bill) Carlson's charge that Republican leadership killed FEPC chances. It is true that Roy Dunn, still a power in the reactionary section of the GOP in the state helped kill FEPC, but the elected Republican leaders of the state, Gov. C. Elmer Anderson, the State Central Chairman, Kenneth Peterson, National Committeeman, George Etzell, and National Committeewoman, Elizabeth Heffelfinger, have worked for the state FEPC law unceasingly. The Young Republicans of Hennepin County campaigned for the bill.

The Twin City Observer reacted in this way: "A stubborn and short-sighted minority in the House prevented simple justice from being carried out. Had the bill been defeated by a majority vote, the defeat would have come in fair battle. But this was assassination."

Two more editorial comments are of interest: On April 21st, the Minneapolis Tribune summarizes the story of the bill's progress and concludes, "Those who favor it are not easily discouraged....They are confident that some day a Minnesota legislature will dare to stand up for fair employment practices....This year the senate dared, the house didn't. Perhaps 1955 will tell a different story. We hope so."

And the Minneapolis Star of April 27, 1953 has a brief editorial: "College kids have some good ideas. Meeting in Duluth yesterday, the Minnesota Federation of College Republican Clubs censured the state legislature for failing to enact FEPC, reapportionment, a call for a constitutional convention, party designation for legislators, and arrest powers for liquor control agents."

It seems that we shall have to once more take comfort in some of my favorite quotations from a speech made about five years ago by Gunnar Myrdal, internationally famous Swedish political economist who was brought to this country in 1938 by the Carnegie Corporation to head an extensive research study of the American Negro. What he says applies to the problems and the hopes of all our minority groups:

"The deeper I went into my research about the failures of American democracy.... the more sincerely did I come to love and admire your country and the more earnestly hopeful did I become of its great and glorious future. How do I explain to myself this apparent contradiction, this paradox? .....I think the answer is what has sometimes been called that 'moral overstrain' of the American reaction, this fact that the Negro problem in America really is a problem within the entire nation which is constantly held on its agenda. America believes in and aspires to something so much higher than its plane of actual living. The ideals are constantly pressing for their more perfect realization.....America could never think of giving the caste system the public sanction of the law. Even the southern segregation laws are based upon the fiction of equality. When the Negroes are fighting for their rights they have, therefore, a most powerful tool in their hands; the glorious American iedals of democracy, liberty, and equality, to which the nation is pledged, not only by its political Constitution, but also by the sincere devotion of its citizens."

IV VETERANS' PREFERENCE IN CIVIL SERVICE

A comprehensive bill to modify veterans' preference was prepared prior to the 1953 Legislative session by Orville C. Peterson, Attorney for the League of Minnesota Municipalities, at the instigation of Senator Philip Duff, Kasson, Minnesota.

The bill consolidated the provisions of the General Preference Law (Minnesota Statutes 1949, Sections 197.45, 46, 47, and 48) and the veterans preference provisions in the State Civil Service Law (Minnesota Statutes 1949, 43.30). For a summary of this bill, I quote the statement prepared by Senator Duff for presentation to the Senate Civil Administration Committee.

"This bill embodies the majority recommendations of the 1949 to 1951 interim committee on veterans preference headed by the late representative Ralph Illsley. In addition it makes two important steps beyond the recommendations of this interim committee so that it contains exactly the changes recommended by the Little Hoover Commission.

"This bill, based on the bill prepared by the Illsley interim committee, was drawn in consultation with members of the State Civil Service Department, the Minneapolis and St. Paul Civil Service Offices, the League of Minnesota Municipalities and other groups interested in effective civil service.

"There are a number of small changes having to do with the technical operation of civil service procedures, but the major changes proposed by this bill are as follows:

"1. A uniform veterans preference system throughout the state, whether in state government, or in a local sub-division.

"2. Requirement that any veteran must pass the civil service examination in order to be eligible for employment.

"3. Elimination of absolute preference for any veteran.

"4. Provision for five points preference for any veteran and 10 points for any disabled veteran.

"5. Requirement that an individual veteran may use his preference only once in securing a state position, whether original or promotion, and only once in any single local sub-division of government.

"6. Extension of preference to widows of men who would have become veterans had they survived.

"7. Requirement that the ten points for disabled veterans be extended only to veterans who are rated at least 10% disabled instead of the zero percent disabled which now qualifies for the extra points. 10% is the minimum rating for which the Veterans Administration grants compensation.

"8. Extension of preference to veterans of the Korean war."

This bill was introduced in the House on January 26, 1953 by H. R. Anderson, Hartle, Day, V. C. Johnson, and Luther. It was referred to the Civil Administration Committee. The next day a move was made, but defeated, to refer the bill to the Military Affairs Committee. (The number of the bill was H.F. 268)

On January 28, 1953 the same bill was introduced in the Senate as S.F. 259 by

Sletvold, Johanson and Duff. It was also referred to the Civil Administration Committee.

At 9:00 on February 9, 1953 the Senate Civil Administration Committee heard the proponents of the bill. Testifying for the Bill were:

1. G. Howard Spaeth, Commissioner of Taxation
2. Mike Hoffman, Commissioner of Highways
3. Francis W. Nichols, Director, Division of Social Welfare
4. Herbert Lyon, Head of the St. Paul Civil Service Commission
5. Mr. Flewell, Secy & Chief Examiner, Duluth Civil Service
6. A young alderman from Minneapolis, Lindsay Arthur
7. Mrs. A. H. Down, League of Women Voters
8. John Peterson, State Federation of Labor
9. Robert D. Stover, Director, Minnesota State Civil Service Dept.
10. Orville Peterson, League of Minn. Municipalities explained the bill, Senator Duff presented the bill and the speakers. As I recall, Senator Sletvold came in after the meeting was well under way, and said nothing.

At 2:00 P.M. on February 11 the opponents were heard. Senator Baughman, Chairman, limited the meeting to an hour and a half, saying that that was what the proponents had had. (The proponents took only about 45 minutes.) All but one of the opponents represented the American Legion, the VFW and the DAV. They were:

1. Joseph Dudley, Legislative Chairman of the Legion, who introduced the other Legion spokesmen. Dudley said that during the Korean war is no time to change preference laws.
   Because Milton G. Boock, H. S. Principal of Lake City, was unable to attend the hearing, a letter from him was read to the committee. (He is the Commander of the Minnesota Department of the American Legion)
2. Harry Wilson, representing the Legion, and also an employee of the State Auditor, said he is opposed to the disclosure of veterans' status before examination. (The bill would make known the identity of veterans before examination so that their relevant experience could be credited.)
   He also said that now is no time to change preference because Korean vets should have something to say about legislation.
3. Mr. McCoy, Rehabilitation Officer in Mpls. Legion said it is not true that incompetent veterans are being appointed and retained in public service. If incompetent veterans are retained, it is because of poor administration and civil service regulations.
4. Severin Mortenson, Commissioner of Public Utilities, St. Paul. A city official has said, he said, that St. Paul can't get reputable employees because of veterans' preference. Mortenson says salaries are too low to get any good employees. Yet, he said, the Public Utilities Comm. has good veteran employees--better even than non-veterans.
5. Les Guggensberg, a policeman, and representative of the Fire and Police Post of the American Legion, said:
   a. Everything aimed at taking away from the veteran.
   b. Do away with that offensive "rule of three".
   c. Abuses of civil service should be attacked rather than veterans' preference.
   d. Opposes examiners' knowing who are veterans.
   e. Department heads should give detailed reasons for rejection of veterans for appointment. (This is now required, however.)
6. Jim Lund, Legislative Representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Presented figures obtained from the Civil Service Dept. in defense of his point that there are not enough disabled veterans appointed to state jobs

to create any problem.

7. Victor Wyberg, Civil Service Chairman for VFW.
8. John Erickson, Rehabilitation Chairman for VFW.
   Opposed point system in original Civil Service Act.
   "This is no time to change veterans' preference, etc..."
9. Mrs. Helen Sime, former employee of the state Division of Social Welfare, member of the VFW Auxiliary and of the Legion Auxiliary. Went through her history of 17 years with Social Welfare without ever being promoted.
10. Mr. Monohan, Head of the DAV in Minnesota. Along with criticisms of the bill, he mentioned that membership in the DAV is not extended to veterans without compensable disabilities.
11. Frank Howard, Junior Vice-Commander, Disabled American Veterans. Served with interim committee on veterans preference. According to him, everything wrong is with civil service, not with the veterans. Mentioned:
    a. Waivers
    b. Tailor-made exams
    c. V.P. Committee recommended establishment of an appeal board. Now little appeal except to the C.S. Director.
    d. Present law fine except for administration. Comm. recommended appointment of the Director by Governor with Senate confirmation.
    e. Exams too general
    f. No transcripts made of oral exams.
12. Sam Goldman, Mpls. Relief Dept. representative of Jewish War Veterans. For the first time, he said, all of the veterans' organizations are united against veterans' perference changes--at least against this bill.
13. Walter Hauser, Mpls. attorney and former member of the Minneapolis Civil Service Commission. Orated about how military service is prima facie evidence of experience in the public service.
14. Mr. Wyman Fourre, Ramsey County Veterans Service Officer. Got in only a few words at last minute.

At the conclusion of the testimony, the committee decided to have another meeting on the bill. Senator Wright asked a chance to speak at that meeting, which was scheduled for 2:00 P.M. , Feb. 18.

At the meeting of Feb. 18, Senator Wright proposed that the bill be amended to:

1. Do nothing with the general preference law.
2. Eliminate absolute preference in promotional exams. He said this is the only change in veterans' preference with which he would go along.

Senator Joseph Daun objected to disabled veterans' preference being allowed for veterans with disability ratings of less than 10%. Senator Larson moved that the bill be sent out of committee without recommendation. After some discussion by Wright and Daun, particularly, he requested that a roll call be taken on his motion. Another senator moved that a sub-committee be appointed to study the matter further. Later Senator Siegel moved that the bill be laid on the table. After further discussion during which the consensus was reached that the bill under consideration needed too much revision to bother with, the latter two motions were retracted. During this discussion, too, many of the committee members said that they would not go on record as opposing veterans. The vote was taken, and the bill unanimouslykilled. There seemed to be agreement that a new bill be prepared to incorporate Senator Wright's proposal.

As a result, S.F. 915 was introduced on Feb. 25, 1953 by Senator Duff. It provided only that 10-point veterans' names be placed on eligible promotional lists in order of augmented score rather than be placed at the heads of the lists--in other

words, eliminating absolute preference in promotional exams; and that disabled vets be required to have a rating of 10% from the Veterans' Administration.

At 2:00 P.M. on March 4, 1953 the Senate Civil Administration Committee called a meeting to hear both the proponents and the opponents of this bill. Each side was to have 15 minutes. Senator Duff explained the bill, and the inclusion of the 10% disability requirement. Senator Daun said that that had been mostly his idea, and if that clause would hamper passage of the bill, he would move that it be stricken. Senator Wright said, "I second the motion"; a vote was taken, and the amendment passed. Speaking for the bill were Mr. Hoffman, Commissioner of Highways, and Alfred Angster, Chief of Child Welfare Services, Division of Social Welfare, who said that he represented the opinion of the World War II Veterans in the Division that there should be no preference allowed except in entrance to the state service. The opposition had been conspicuous by its absence. When called upon, Joe Dudley, American Legion Representative, said they weren't there because they had been informed that the bill was not to be considered at that meeting. Consequently, he asked for another time for the veterans' organizations to be heard. After some deliberation, and an objection from Senator Duff, the committee decided to continue the discussion until the following Monday morning, March 9th.

At that meeting Joe Dudley quoted Alfred Angster's statement that he has been promoted in spite of veterans' preference and the fact that he has not used his preference since he entered state service. (Not taken into consideration was the fact that Social Welfare has a preponderance of women employees, which greatly reduces the veterans' preference problem in that department.)

Jim Lund of the VFW quoted figures again of the number of disabled veterans appointed from promotional eligible lists--something like 38 out of 255 promotional appointments made.

Mr. Wyman Fourre, Ramsey County Veteran's Service Officer, said he thought that a passing point of 70 should be required of veterans as well as non-veterans and that preference should be given on promotion but not on entrance to state service. (The issue was becoming more and more confused!)

The fifteen minutes were then gone. Senator Baughman said that a member of the Citizens' Committee of the Little Hoover Commission had asked for a chance to speak. Lloyd Wilkes was granted a couple of minutes in which he said that the Commission had studied this problem in detail, (Lloyd Wilkes is Minnesota Taxpayers Assn. Representative,) and asked that some of the members of the subcommittee who actually worked on it have an opportunity to speak before the committee.

It didn't take long for the committee to decide that this was much too controversial to do anything about. Both Daun and Wright made speeches directed to the veterans to the effect that nothing will be done about veterans' preference until the veterans organizations themselves decide what they want and come to the legislature with their own proposals.

Senator Larson, again, moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed. The motion was passed unanimously. This bill received no hearings in the House.

TESTIMONY ON VETERANS PREFERENCE REVISION
GIVEN BY MRS. ARTHUR DOWN ON S.F. 259 BEFORE THE
SENATE CIVIL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 9

After identification as Civil Service Chairman of the State League,"I hold this position because of my long association with the State Civil Service Department, starting with the first examination in 1939, and ending in 1949. During most of this time I worked with examinations and lived with veterans' preference. I have seen the hardships wrought on account of veterans' preference, not only on capable non-veterans, but also on non-disabled veterans, and most important, on the whole calibre of state personnel.

"The members of the League of Women Voters are interested in this bill, because they want efficiency and economy in government. Effective administration depends to a large extent upon competent personnel. For this reason the League worked hard for the passage of the State Civil Service Act in 1939. The principle of the merit system requires the selection of public employees solely on the basis of merit and fitness. The Civil Service law provides good machinery for the selection and appointment of employees on the basis of merit. There is one exception. That exception is the preference in employment extended to war veterans. Veterans' preference is contrary to the merit principle because it requires that preference be extended to members of a special class on the basis of membership in that class.

"The League of Women Voters agrees with other groups that the service veterans have rendered to our country should be recognized by the incorporation of preference for veterans as an integral part of our civil service system, but the system must not be so rigid that it benefits neither the veterans nor the government. The amount of preference varies greatly from one public jurisdiction to another. The fact that other states are now changing veterans' preference provisions to lessen the amount of preference indicates that the subject is becoming more and more of an issue. The State of Minnesota is one which now grants a maximum amount of preference to its veterans.

"We believe that passage of this bill would promote greater efficiency and thereby economy in our state and local governments, because it would encourage competent veterans and non-veterans alike to seek public employment, and, with fewer obstacles to promotion, would encourage them to continue in public employment."

LEGISLATIVE REPORT on two bills affecting Civil Service which the LWV opposed.

I. S.F. 166--Introduced Jan. 23, 1953 by Keller and Rogers; referred to Civil Administration.
H.F. 293--Introducted Jan.28, 1953 by Swanstrom, Prifrel and K. Kennedy--also referred to Civil Administration.

The Senate bill was reported out of committee on Feb. 19, 1953, to pass, and given its second reading that day. However, it never came up for third reading and passage.

These two bills (which were identical) provided the addition of a new sentence in the section of the Civil Service Law stating the composition of the Civil Service Board. The proposed addition read, "Inasmuch as the duties of the board vitally affect the interests of state employees, one member of such board shall be an employee in the classified service with permanent status who is a member of an economic association representative of employees in such service."

The LWV of Minnesota in previous legislative sessions had opposed bills which proposed to put a representative of labor on the Civil Service Board. This year was the first time a state employee and member of the employees' union had been proposed. The League, along with the few others interested in this legislation, opposed the bill because it felt that such legislation would serve only as an opening wedge to the representation of many special interests on the C.S. board.

In its hearing before the House Civil Administration committee the fact that the C.S.B. is a policy-making and quasi-judicial body was brought out. It must be remembered that it is not a conciliation or mediation board. It is appointed by the Governor to represent the public as a whole, as is recommended in model civil service laws. Experience with civil service and types of organization has demonstrated that the best boards have always been those composed of persons with no direct affiliation with the system, who have long been interested in civic affairs and who are especially interested in the promotion and preservation of the merit system principle.

Although the Senate Civil Administration Committee recommended the bill to pass, the sub-committee of the House Committee recommended that it be indefinitely postponed at the meeting of the House Civil Administration Comm. on April 8, 1953. At the meeting of the full committee a week later, on April 15, the bill was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 6 to 4. This indefinite postponement gave the minority an opportunity to present a minority report to the full House, which Mr. Prifrel did immediately after the House convened that afternoon. The motion for consideration of the minority report was defeated by a vote of 58 to 52.

II. S.F. 882--Introduced Feb. 24, 1953 by Vukelich, Schultz and Rogers; referred to Civil Administration
H.F. 956--Introduced Feb. 24, 1953 by Silvola, Rutter andCina; referred to Civil Administration

This bill proposed to change the appointment procedure of the Civil Service Director by making the job appointive by the Governor with the consent and advice of the Senate, and taking into consideration "merit and fitness". It proposed also to change the title from Director to Commissioner, a point which the authors seemed to think important. Most important of the provisions of the bill in my estimation was the proposal to set the salary at $7,700.

This bill whipped through the Senate almost without anyone's knowing about it until it suddenly came up on Special Orders on April 13. The Senate passed it with a vote of 40 to 16. The 16 who voted against it were:

Andersen, E.L.	Dickinson	Ledin	Lofvegren	Wefald
Anderson, E.P.	Duff	Lemm	Root	Wrabek
Dahlquist	Gillen	Lightner	Wahlstrand	Zwach
Daun				

Senator Daun led the opposition to the bill. Interestingly enough, I went to the Capitol that day to try to see some of the Senators before they went onto the floor, to make an attempt to influence their votes. The only ones I managed to speak to were Duff, Dahlquist and Mayhood. Here is where the "interestingly enough" belongs: Duff had told me that he was all set to vote in favor of the bill; Dahlquist probably would have voted the same way anyway; and Mayhood told me afterward that he had withheld his vote because of what I had said about the bill.

The first time the House bill was brought up in committee was on April 8. Mr. Silvola and Mr. Rutter presented the bill with the reasons for passage being that "why should the C.S. Director be appointed any differently than any other department head", and "the C.S. Director should be as responsible to the Governor as any other department head", and "he isn't responsible to anyone now", etc. After some discussion, Mr. Silvola said that there was no ulterior motive involved on the part of the authors.

To oppose the bill that morning Mr. Ziesmer and Mrs. Beard were there from the Civil Service Board and Mrs. Down from the League of Women Voters. Mrs. Beard spoke first and made a very fine speech, giving the reasons for the present form of appointment. Consequently, I asked her to write what she had said, which follows:

"I. Government includes:
1. Individuals who are responsible for determining policies, and
2. Individuals responsible for carrying out or administering policies.

II. It is generally recognized as a principle of good government that:
1. Policy officials should be appointed by the Governor or chief executive (since he is to a large extent held responsible for policies in all departments of his administration); and
2. Those who carry out the policies should insofar as possible be selected on the basis of merit and fitness and should carry over from one administration to another.

III. One of the strong features in the Minnesota Civil Service Law is the careful differentiation which is made between policy functions and administrative functions in the Department.

The Civil Service Board is appointed by the Governor and is responsible for all policy matters. The Director is appointed by the Board after open-competitive, nation-wide examinations and, after appointment, is placed under Civil Service and is responsible for its administration.

This does two things:
1. It insures a highly qualified administrator for the Department, and
2. It removes the Director as far as possible from the temtations of yielding to the manifold pressures that are constantly put upon him (by political groups or individuals, employee groups, department heads, etc.) to do things in their favor that may not be proper for good personnel administration.

If he were not under civil service and appointed by the Governor, he would have no security and would be largely at the mercy of the Governor and the politicians. Under such a "set up" a civil service system could become just a cloak for a spoils system."

The most important point is that the present appointment form of the C.S. Director was devised for the precise purpose of removing the position as far as possible from the political scene.

Mr. Welch and Mr. French, both from Minneapolis, led the discussion against the bill. Mr. French said that the LWV should be interested in this bill, and asked the Chairman, P. Kenneth Peterson, if the League had been notified.

The answer was "No". Mrs. Down finally did have a chance to say that the League did know about it, and pointed out that the Little Hoover Commission had recommended that the Director be appointed by the Governor, but with the retention of the examination procedure for selection of three top candidates. She also mentioned the salary proposal, which no one else had, as being the greatest threat to the C.S. system, because it would rule out the application of any qualified persons. (The job is on a par with the major department heads of the state, and presently is paid $11,300 per annum. All department heads' salaries are stipulated in one law, which provides an automatic adjustment for cost-of-living changes.) Members of the committee said they had taken for granted that the $7,700 quoted would be basic only and that this job would still come under the department heads' salary law. Mr. Peterson, Chairman, pointed out that there was nothing in this bill which would do that. During the hearing, Mr. Hartle called the chairman to tell him he was opposed to the bill.

Anyway, the bill was laid over that day. That was Wednesday. The following Monday the Senate passed it.

So. at the next meeting of the House Civil Administration Committee on April 15, it was brought up again. Mr. Claude Allen came up to speak against the bill. He spoke first, of course, because he had many other things to do. As soon as he was out of the door, Mr. Prifrel announced that what Mr. Allen had said hadn't changed his mind a bit. The discussion follwed the same pattern as it did at the preceeding meeting. The motion was made to postpone the bill indefinitely, and won by a vote of 6 to 4.

We were still standing in the corridor outside the committee room when Mr. Peterson came by and announced that it was the House bill the committee had acted upon, that the Senate bill was still alive. For that reason the committee was to meet again on the bill immediately after the nonn recess of the House. (The authors of the bill had not been present when the vote was taken, because, Mr. Peterson said, he had told them it would be the last on the agenda. He had had to move it up because Mr. Allen requested an opportunity to speak on it.)

After a two-hour wait for the recess. the committee assembled again, in greater numbers and with their sandwiches in hand. At this meeting there was no one present from the Civil Service Department. The authors stated their position again, Mr. Silvola reinterating that there was no ulterior motive. Finally, Mr. Prifrel, whom I don't think was one of the authors, said to this effect, "All right, so this bill is devised to remove the present Civil Service Director". That seemed to clear the air for a discussion of the real issue involved. Rep. Shovell brought up a case in which he thought the C.S. Board had been in the wrong. Rep. Duxbury set him straight on the issue involved there, which was one of how cases should go to the courts, and was not an issue on this bill at all. At the very last of the discussion, Rep. Forbes rose to speak, and did so with words of wisdom, saying that removing the Director was one thing for which machinery is provided by the present law, and that to endanger the system in this fashion is not the manner in which it should be done.

Mr. Shovell had moved that the bill be recommended to pass. The vote was taken by roll call, and the motion lost by a vote of 10 to 5 this time.

Mr. Prifrel threatened to bring a minority report in on the indefinite postponement of the Houee bill, but he never did.

V. PARTY DESIGNATION FOR LEGISLATORS

H.F. 329 Authors: Oberg, P.K. Peterson, Holmquist, Day, Knutson
S.F. 367 Authors: Sageng, Vukelich, Lightner

House Action

This bill, calling for election of State Legislators with Party Designation met with only token opposition in the House. It came out of the Elections Committee on Feb. 27 recommended to pass and reached the floor of the House on Thursday, March 12. The debate on that afternoon was extremely spirited and when the bill was laid over until the following day for a vote, the general feeling was that strong opposition would grow even stronger overnight. It was somewhat mystifying then on Friday, March 13 to watch 88 House members, some of them outspoken opponents, vote for passage of the bill, and it carried 88 to 36.

On March 17, Rep. Friberg, District 67, who had voted on the prevailing side, moved to have the House reconsider its action to pass Party Designation. He stated that he had voted for the bill originally, so that he would be in a position to make the move for reconsideration. His motion failed, 32 yes to 65 nays, and the previous action of the House stood.

Senate Action

At the first hearing in the Senate Elections Committee on March 24, eighteen proponents of the bill were heard. There were as follows: Mrs. Russell Lund, State Chairwoman, Republican Party, Rep. P.K. Peterson, State Chairman, Republican Party, William E. Carlson, from the DFL Party. Mrs. Hamilton Lufkin, League of Women Voters. Also speaking in favor of the bill were Republican county chairman or chairwomen (in some cases both) from all counties represented on the Senate Elections Committee. They were heard for 2 minutes apiece.

The opponents who were also heard held forth at great length prophesying economic collapse and political anarchy if the bill were to pass. Opposing the bill were: Otto Christenson, Vice-President, Minnesota Employers Association, Rep. Carl M. Iverson, Grant County, and Rep. Eric Friberg, Roseau County. A spirit of optimism had settled over the committee room and the supporters were not dismayed. Senator Baughman, however, cleared the air when he rose to read four telegrams from his constituents; two of them from local Leagues urging his support for Party Designation; one from a political organization urging support of Party Designation for Legislators; and one from another political group urging support of Party Designation at all levels of government. It was apparent, said the Senator, that since the League of Women Voters' telegrams had not specified limits to Party Designation that they, too, would support it on all levels, and he, therefore, would bow to majority opinion in his district and propose an amendment to cover all county and local offices.

Fortunately the hour was late and the Senators were hungry so a hasty motion to adjourn took precedence and the bill was laid over for another week.

At the second hearing there was little argument and less dissension and it was agreed to pass out the unamended bill without recommendation. Immediately after the 8 to 5 vote to pass out Party Designation, Senator Grottum rose to urge passage of the so-called DFL Divorcement Bill. This bill would allow candidates for office to file as Democrats or Democratic-Farmer-Laborites and would serve to split the DFL party. While an inquiry into the possible merits or demerits of the proposed legislation is not in order at this time, the effect it had on Party Designation was sudden death, since many of the liberals who had previously supported P.D.

could not continue to do so with the divorcement bill threatening their party solidarity.

On April 19, a move was made from the Senate floor, by Senator Ole Sageng, chief author of the Party Designation measure, to place the bill on Special Order. It was so far down the line on the General Orders list, that it had no chance of being heard before the close of the session, unless a 2/3 majority voted to give it this priority.

The debate was long and most interesting, with one Senator shouting his opposition "to the League of Women Voters, as well as to the platforms of both the Republican and DFL parties". Speaking for the Special Order were Senators Lightner, Sageng, Gillen, Palm and E.L. Andersen. Opposition came from two sources. The staunch conservatives, who had always opposed the bill, and from some liberals who had formerly supported the measure, but felt that because the DFL Divorcement bill was pending, their support must be withdrawn. Many of them believed that such a bill would split the DFL party and leave the door wide-open to "Stooge" filings. They were open and frank about the withdrawal of their support. Senator Vukelich, an author of the Party Designation bill, voiced opposition to it for the above reasons. Senators Schultz, Rosenmeier, Lauerman, Mullin and Ledin also spoke in opposition to the Special Order. The final vote was 37 yeas and 25 nays--5 votes short of victory. So the bill remained buried in General Orders.

According to corridor gossip, had it reached the floor, it would have been crippled by amendments which would have served to kill it anyway.

VI EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Station: LWV-TV
Program: Educational Television; How It Came Not to Minnesota
Dates: Spring, 1952, continuous until possible cut-off, June 2, 1953
Time: Too short.

Notes: This script attemts to represent day-by-day progress. In the interests of authenticity, it may not seem to be always consistent. No satisfactory conclusion has yet been achieved. Readers and critics are invited to suggest possible such conclusion. The number of participants varies from day to day. For purposes of this script, VIDEO refers to "what we saw", AUDIO to "what we heard".

VIDEO	AUDIO
April 14, 1952 Federal Communications Commission (FCC) announced allocation of 2,035 TV channels; 242 to be reserved for educational use until June 2, 1953.	Allocation came as a result of magnificent efforts on the part of the Joint Committee on Educational Television (JCET), set up under the guidance of the National Assn. of Education Broadcasters (NAEB) and including the leading educational groups in the country. 76 of the nations most prominent educational, political and public figures appeared before the FCC and 838 colleges, schools and public agencies made formal statements.
November 7, 1952 State-wide Educational TV Planning Conference called by Dean Schweickhard, state commissioner of education. The Minnesota Citizens Committee for Educational Television (MCCE-TV) was formed and S.C.Gale named temporary chairman. A three-point program was adopted for study: establishment of a state-wide network; formation of a policy board; application for a license in the name of the University of Minnesota.	Over 100 persons, representing civic, educational, labor, church and other state-wide groups attended, including four official representatives of LWV. University of Minnesota staff members presented an outline for a tentative plan for a state-wide network of ten stations with key stations in the Twin Cities and Duluth, locations of channels 2 and 8, allocated to education by the FCC.
November 21, 1952 Letter sent from State Board to local Leagues, explaining Educational TV activity to date and requesting opinion to guide the Board's action.	Response indicated general majority approval, with questions centered on financing and the licensee.
November 24, 1952 Initial meeting of MCCE-TV. LWV invited to send a representative.	Three basic problems came out of this meeting: 1. Should efforts be directed toward development of a state-wide network or be limited at this time to the securing of channels 2 and 8? 2. Should the licensee be a) the university, b) a state-wide non-profit corporation, c) a twin cities corporation operating one channel? 3. Should financing be totally public (legislative appropriation), partly public and partly private, wholly private?

December 22, 1952 MCCE-TV met and elected permanent officers.	Walter Finke was named chairman. Agreement was reached that the university be licensee.
January 6, 1953 The legislature convened.	
Mrs. K. K. McMillan was named a member of the 26-man executive committee of the MCCE-TV.	
January 28, 1953 MCCE-TV met and discussed cost estimates and direction to be taken by committee.	E.A. Hungerford, special consultant for the JCET, appeared and confirmed the university's cost estimates. It was decided that the initial approach be made on the basis of a first-step philosophy.
February 26, 1953 Bills were introduced: S.F. 951, Almen, Butler, E.L. Andersen; H.F. 1093, Holmquist, H.J. Anderson, Schulz, Grittner, V. Johnson.	Identiaal bills provided for the building of three stations, in the Twin Cities, Duluth and an undesignated rural area and called for an appropriation of $2,150,000 for the biennium to cover onstruction and operatinn. The university was to be the licensee and the composition of the Minnesota Educational Television Commission was designated.
MCCE-TV met and reviewed the bill	It was pointed out that total construction cost for ten stations would be $3,269,834.
March 16, 1953 An open hearing of the joint House and Senate Committees on Education was held.	An auspicious array of organizational leaders from all over the state testified in favor of Educational TV, but no adequate presentation of the proposed plan was made. Senator Almen asked for support in writing from the citizenry of the state.
March 23, 1953 Letter from Mrs. K.K. McMillan, addressed to Walter Finke, sent to all members of the MCCE-TV.	Mrs. McMillan's letter pointed out three areas in which the MCCE-TV had been something less than effective and suggested action in these areas; 1. Legislators were not really cognizant of potential programming, but could be briefed on it by Burton Paulu, manager of KUOM. 2. The financial problem was not being faced; the MCCE-TV should present concrete proposals. 3. The citizenry was not being acquainted with Educational TV and consequently no pressure was being put on the legislators by their constituents; the speakers bureau should be more active.
March 27, 1953 Legislative bulletin requested LWV members to write Senate and House Education Comm. members.	

April 7, 1953 Senate Education Committee considered S.F. 951. Passed out of committee without recommendation and referred to Finance Committee.	Presentation of the bill was made by Rufus Putnam, Minneapolis Superintendent of Schools. Supporting testimony given by other members of the MCCE-TV. Still no informed presentation was made of the technical requirements or of the potential programming. There was general approval of the idea but the method of financing could not be solved. LWV representatives were present at the hearing.
April 9, 1953 House Education Committee considered H.F. 1093. Recommended to pass and referred to Appropriations Committee.	Presentation of the bill was made by Walter Finke. Supporting testimony given by other members of the MCCE-TV. Possible means of financing were discussed and a motion to divert money from the state income tax fund dedicated to education was defeated. LWV representatives were present at the hearing.
MCCE-TV met for the last time before the Legislature was to adjourn. No action was taken.	Mr. Finke asked for further instructions. The LWV representative begged that the MCCE-TV make concrete suggestions for financing, but found herself in a minority of two (with another League member). The MCCE-TV expressed confidence that Educational TV would receive legislative financial support and the bill would pass.
April 10, 1953 Call for action sent out by LWV Legislative Chairman.	
April 14, 1953 House Appropriations Committee considered H.F. 1093. No action was taken.	No representative appeared for the MCCE-TV. Three members of the staff of KUOM, who were asked to appear to supply supplementary technical information, were put in the embarrassing position of having to make the entire presentation, for which they were not prepared. Stanley Hubbard, manager of KSTP-TV and member of the MCCE TV spoke in sarcastic and personal opposition to the entire plan.
April 7-17, 1953 LWV representatives worked at the Legislature on TV.	Recognizing that the only chance for Educational TV for Minnesota by legislative action lay in reducing the amount requested, the LWV presented several alternative plans. One provided for two stations; one for one station; one provided for a basic appropriation to be supplemented by already guaranteed outside sources.

April 16, 1953 Senate Finance Committee passed S.F. 951, as amended, out of committee with an appropriation of $100,000.

April 21, 1953 Senate failed to act on S.F. 951, as amended.

Senator Almen made two attempts to have S.F.951 brought before the Senate on special consent. He lost to a small opposition, led by Senator Child, who said he did not care for the groups supporting Educational TV, making particular reference to the danger of this medium being used by internationalists. Stanley Hubbard was reprimanded during the debate for lobbying on the floor of the Senate against Educational TV.

May 7, 1953 MCCE-TV met in Executive Committee.

It was decided to continue to function as a committee, to request that the FCC hold channels 2 and 8 for education and to attempt to find funds for Educational TV.

VII EDUCATION (Platform Item)

Regular visits were made to:
House Education committee meetings - Thursdays at 10:00 A.M.
Senate Education committee meetings - Thursdays at 1:15 P.M.
Special Hearings
House and Senate sessions when bills came to the floor

Reorganization of School Districts H.F. 1916 - Holmquist
S.F. 1721 - Almen

This bill was referred to a subcommittee at the first Education Committee meeting. When it came before the regular Committee, a hearing was held in the Auditorium of the State Office Bldg. Many hundreds of people were brought in by a well organized opposition, "Friends of the Rural Schools", on this and many other occasions to lobby against the Bill.

As this Act must be fought out every two years, it is evident that there is danger of its failure at every Session of the Legislature. The League, in the interest of efficiency in government, should do some work state-wide between Sessions to build public opinion for the Reorganization Act and give the Legislators the necessary backing to encourage them to pass it as a permanent law.

Passed in House - April 18
Passed in Senate - April 20
Repassed in Senate as amended by House - April 21

School Aid Bill - H.F. 1873 - Holmquist
S.F. 1631 - Almen
Senate file was substituted for House file

Many weeks of discussion and study were given this most important and complicated of the Education Bills. The original Bill raised basic aid from $70 to $100 per pupil aid. The thinking back of this figure was that increased maintenance costs

have raised the cost per pupil as figures show. Average cost per pupil in State:

1950-51 - $178
1951-52 - $194
1952-53 - $200
1953-54 - $210

and that "balance" in the income tax fund should be used now for elementary and secondary education where it is needed. Legislators who are in favor of using the "balance" in Income Tax Fund for other purposes were against this. Also, some committee members felt that after two years they would have to cut back the Aid or look for other revenues.

The figures on the enormous increase in enrollments in the next few years, plus the estimated reduction in Income Tax Revenues were responsible for the reduction in the increase for basic aid. Both Houses Education Committees agreed on $80 basic aid, but the House increased Equalization Aids, too, and the Senate did not.

The Conference Committee members who worked out the agreement were:

House - Holmquist, Langen, Ernst, Iverson, Hinds.
Senate - Zwack, Engbritson, Wahlstrand, Gillen and Daun.

The Compromise Bill included:

Basic Aid	$80	from $70
Isolated Pupil Aid	$72	
Equalization Aid	$83.95	from $80
Mentally Retarded	$300	from $240

The aid to Junior Colleges on the basis of secondary pupils was voted on as an amendment and failed to pass. The feeling is that elementary and secondary education need all the State can do at this time.

VIII TOURS

"Come and See"

The report on the "Come and See" tours can almost be called "The Christmas Story". Planned one December afternoon, just before the holiday rush, manned by a group of "angels" from the St. Paul League, and received as a "tinsel-decked gift" by the local League, they are truly our success story!

As you know, each League was given a specific time to come to the Capitol. A tour leader was provided, and meetings with the local League's own legislative representative planned. 39 out of our 49 local Leagues responded, and we brought in well over 1000 League members on tour, nearly one-quarter of our membership!

There were 31 tours planned. Not a single one was cancelled. Our members came by car, chartered bus, and train. Some became so interested, they came back in two's and three's. Other Leagues arranged tours in addition to days assigned them, in order to bring in more of their members.

Aside from "have a day off", what did we learn? How great was our influence?

What is the tour "potential"? How were we received?

I would say that an over-whelming majority of the legislators were pleased at having visitors from the League. Some were skeptical about being visited, a couple were worried (due to their voting records on League items), a few did not care to be visited at all. The influence of people "coming to see", cannot be over-emphasized. Some votes and attitudes were changed by the visits which were made. Some more, might have been, had the visiting Leagues been more emphatic about what they wanted. As one legislator said, when informed of a pending visit, "I suppose they are going to rake me over the coals". He was really quite disappointed when his constituents failed to do so.

We started our touring on January 20th, three weeks after the session began. Even then, some of the Leagues who came on these "early" days, were disappointed at the lack of activity. Perhaps this should be stacked up against the mad scramble as the session ends. Maybe this will clarify the mysterious death and burial of so many important bills in General Orders, at the close of the session.

Because geography decrees it, the lobbyists for the League must necessarily come from the Twin Cities. Often they are troubled by convincing the legislators that they represent the WHOLE state League. The tours have proven to be the most important and effective method of demonstrating the force of League opinion. As the Leagues return session after session, it is important to remember that the legislators want and expect their questions, their views, their compliments and complaints. It is a phase of our action program which can be expanded to help the members become more and more aware of state government, its functionings, its strength and its foibles. It is another way in which to promote "citizen responsibility" through learning and doing.

IX CONCLUSION

Fortunately for Democracies, moral indignation will always have a great influence with public officials. This has been vividly illustrated in the last few months.

The League of Women Voters, dedicated to the purpose of promoting greater citizen participation in government and being a non-partisan organization, considers its means of attaining its purpose to be three-fold: 1. spreading public information; 2. building public opinion and 3. promoting or opposing specific legislation in the interests of all citizens. Our work in the legislature during sessions is, therefore, not just contained in the act of lobbying for those bills in which the League is most interested. It involves close observation of what actually happens during the session.

The League has had this year an especially large and creditable group of representatives at the Capitol. Well-informed, with no desire to attract attention to themselves, they have done a very keen job of observing. They know very well and admire profoundly those legislators who have worked hard, voting by conviction, keeping themselves free from the pressure put upon them by special groups which are working for the interest of a small but powerful section of the people. They know which ones played no tricks, made no bargains, took their responsibilities as representatives of the people seriously. They know which ones, in quoting their constituents as wanting or not wanting certain things, were honest in their statements; which ones attended committee meetings at which they must commit themselves one way or another.

What these observers learned has been put into this record which goes out to Leagues throughout the state. Furthermore, the League knows what it must do in informing the entire citizenry of the state on the particular measures which were defeated not by honest conviction, but by pressures or animosities; it knows what it has to do in building public opinion to the strength which produces moral indignation. This is the way citizens in a democracy must work to get good government and to keep it. We are more than ever dedicated to leadership in this work.

VOTING RECORD

on Bills which the League of Women Voters of Minnesota supported in 1953 Session of REPRESENTATIVES

The chart lists the Representative, his District, his Caucus (C for Conservative, L for Liberal) and the asterisk means there is no League in his district.

1. is vote on HF 49 - bill to submit a new Constitution to Voters. (H.JR.Mar.5,p.18)
*2. is vote on HF 238 - bill providing that Legislature write Constitution(Mar.9,p.16)
3. is vote on HF 100 - bill providing for a Constitutional Convention(H.Jr.Mr.11,p18)
4. is vote on HF 329 - bill to provide Party Designation in Legislature(Mr.13,p.27)
5. is vote on 1st Special Order for SF 622 - Employment on Merit(Apr.15,p.45)
6. is vote on 2nd Special Order for SF 622 - Employment on Merit(Apr.18,p.32)

*The League stand is "no" on HF 238, "yes" on all other votes.

NAME of REPR.	DIST RICT	CAU CUS	VT 1.	VT 2*	VT 3.	VT 4.	VT 5.	VT 6.	NAME of REPR.	DIST RICT	CAU CUS	VT 1.	VT 2*	VT 3.	VT 4.	VT 5.	VT 6.
Allen	42	C	Y	-	N	Y	-	N	Ernst	22	C	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Anderson,A.A.	55*	C	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Fitzsimons	67*	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Anderson,D.F.	47	C	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Forbes	11	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Anderson,G.A.	48*	C	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Franz	10	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anderson,H.J.	33	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Frederickson	10	C	Y	Y	Y	N	N	a
Anderson,H.R.	15*	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	French	33	C	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Anderson,J.A.	50	C	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Friberg	67*	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Anderson,M.	1*	C	-	N	N	Y	N	N	Furst	3	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Anderson,O.	24*	L	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Gallagher	29	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Appeldorn,J.	12*	L	Y	Y	N	N	a	a	Gibbons	37	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y
Aune,Ole	50	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Goodin	35	L	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
Basford,H.	63	L	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Grittner	39	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Beanblossom	37	C	Y	a	N	Y	Y	Y	Haeg	36	C	Y	-	-	a	Y	Y
Bergerud	36	C	a	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Hagland	31	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Biernat	28	L	Y	N	Y	Y	-	Y	Halsted	53	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blomquist	64*	C	-	Y	N	N	N	N	Hartle	16	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bouton	49*	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Herzog	5	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Campton	57	C	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Hinds	63	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Chilgren	62	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Hofstad	24	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Cina	61*	L	Y	a	Y	Y	Y	Y	Holm	12*	C	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Clark	47	L	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Holmquist	26	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Croswell	8	C	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N	Holtan	5	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cummings	11	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Howard	43	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dahle	16	C	Y	Y	N	a	N	N	Iverson	48*	L	Y	Y	N	a	N	N
Daley	2*	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Johnson,A.I.	25	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Day	65*	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Jensen,Carl	14	C	Y	a	N	Y	N	N
Dirlam	14	C	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Johnson,L.A.	31	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dunn	50	C	Y	-	-	Y	Y	N	Jensen,Roy	25	C	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Dominick	53	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	a	Johnson,V.C.	30	C	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Duxbury	1*	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Kaplan	54*	C	Y	-	N	Y	N	N
Eddy	27	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Karas	56*	L	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Enestvedt	23	C	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Karth	41	L	Y	N	a	Y	Y	Y
Erdahl	7	C	Y	-	N	Y	N	Y	Kennedy,K.	51*	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ericson	52	C	Y	-	Y	N	N	Y	Kennedy,R.B.	14	C	-	N	N	N	N	N

"a" indicates absence; "-" indicates not voting

VOTING RECORD of REPRESENTATIVES -- 1953

NAME of REPR.	DIST RICT	CAU CUS	VT 1.	VT 2.	VT 3.	VT 4.	VT 5.	VT 6.
Kinzer	46*	C	Y	-	N	-	N	N
Knutson	65*	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kording	32	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kosloske	45	L	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Langen	67*	C	Y	-	N	N	Y	Y
La Brosse	59	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Langley	19	C	a	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
Legvold	9*	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Letnes	66*	L	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Lloyd	12*	C	-	Y	N	N	N	Y
Lorentz	51*	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Luther	30	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Madden	4	C	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
McGill	2*	L	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
McKee	62	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Moore	57	C	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-
Moriarty	21*	C	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Mosier	35	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mueller	15*	C	Y	Y	N	-	N	N
Murk	29	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nelson,K.O.	49*	C	Y	-	N	Y	Y	N
Nelson,Will	13	C	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Nordin	44	C	-	-	N	N	N	N
Oberg	56*	C	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
O'Dea	43	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Odegard	55*	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
O'Malley	58	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ottinger	21*	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Otto	40	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Parks	42	C	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Peterson,O.	13	C	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Peterson,P.K.	34	C	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pischel	17	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Podgorski	38	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Popovich	40	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Prifrel	38	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reed	45	L	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Rinke	48*	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Rutter	60	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Schulz	8	C	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
Schwanke	53	C	Y	Y	N	N	N	a
Shipka	52	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shovell	41	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Silvola	61*	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Skeate	29	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sorenson	48*	L	Y	Y	N	N	a	Y
Sundet	18	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Swanstrom	59	C	Y	Y	a	Y	Y	Y
Swenson	27	C	Y	-	Y	N	N	N
Talle	6*	C	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N
Thompson	1*	C	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Tiemann	46*	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tomczyk	28	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tweten	66*	C	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
Van De Riet	9*	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Volstad	32	C	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Voxland	19	C	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Wanvick	58	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Welch	34	C	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y
Widstrand	60	L	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Windmiller	50	C	Y	Y	N	Y	N	-
Wozniak	39	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Yetka	54*	L	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

"a"stands for absent; "-"stands for no vote

VOTING RECORD

On the Bills which the League of Women Voters of Minnesota supported in 1953

of

SENATORS

The chart lists the Senator, his District, his Caucus (C for Conservative, L for Liberal) and the asterisk means there is no League in his district.

1. is vote for Special Order for SF 622 - Employment on Merit (S.Jr.Apr.1,p. 22).
2. is vote for SF 622 - Employment on Merit (S.Jr.Apr.6,p.35).
3. is vote on Special Order for Party Designation,HF 329 (S.Jr.Apr.14,p.25).
4. is vote on HF 49 - Bill to submit new constitution to voters, amended to 60% of those voting on question, and allowing legislators to be delegates. (S.Jr.Apr.16,p.97).

The League stand is "yes" on all these votes.

NAME of SENATOR	DISTRICT	CAUCUS	VT 1.	VT 2.	VT 3.	VT 4.
Almen	13	C	Y	Y	Y	a
Andersen,E.L.	42	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anderson,A.	11	C	Y	N	Y	a
Anderson,E.P.	51*	C	Y	N	N	-
Anderson,M.H.	32	L	a	Y	N	-
Baughman	16	C	-	N	Y	Y
Bonniwell	22	L	Y	Y	Y	-
Burdick	4	C	Y	Y	Y	-
Butler	57	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Carey	7	C	Y	-	N	Y
Carr	59	L	Y	Y	a	-
Child	24*	C	Y	N	N	-
Covert	18	C	-	N	Y	Y
Dahlquist	65*	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Daun	15*	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Dickinson	62	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Duemke	29	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Duff	5	L	Y	Y	Y	-
Dunlap	3	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Engbritson	6*	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Erickson	9*	C	a	N	Y	Y
Feidt	34	C	-	Y	N	Y
George	19	C	-	N	Y	Y
Gillen	20	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grottum	10	C	Y	Y	N	-
Imm	8	C	Y	N	Y	-
Johanson	48*	C	Y	N	Y	-
Johnson,C.	56*	L	Y	Y	N	Y
Johnson,J.	1*	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Julkowski	28	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Keller	2*	C	Y	-	N	a
Larson	64*	C	Y	Y	Y	-
Lauerman	23	C	-	-	N	Y
Ledin	44	C	Y	N	N	a
Lemm	46*	L	Y	Y	N	-
Lightner	40	C	-	N	Y	a
Lofvegren	47	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Masek	39	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Mattson	54*	C	Y	-	Y	a
Mayhood	31	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Miller	36	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mitchell	55*	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Mullin	35	C	Y	Y	N	-
Murray	66*	L	Y	a	Y	Y
Novak	38	L	Y	Y	Y	Y
O'Brien	52	C	Y	Y	a	-
Palm	26	L	Y	N	Y	Y
Pedersen	12*	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Peterson	60	L	Y	Y	N	Y
Rogers	58	C	-	Y	N	Y
Root	33	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rosenmeier	53	C	Y	Y	N	Y
Sageng	50	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salmore	43	L	Y	Y	Y	Y
Schultz	37	L	Y	Y	N	Y
Siegel	41	L	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sinclair	67*	C	Y	N	a	Y
Sletvold	63	C	-	N	Y	Y
Sullivan	45	C	Y	-	N	-
Vukelich	61*	L	Y	Y	N	-
Wagener	21*	C	Y	N	Y	Y
Wahlstrand	25	C	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wefald	49*	C	Y	Y	Y	-
Welch	27	C	-	Y	N	Y
Wrabek	17	L	Y	N	-	Y
Wright	30	C	-	Y	Y	-
Zwach	14	C	Y	Y	a	Y

"a" indicates absence "-" indicates not voting

Civil Rights Hurriedly
party worker
July '52

SUGGESTIONS OF MEETING

I. There should be conferences with employers who live outside the Twin Cities.

II. A few more affirmative votes may mean passage of FEPC. Work should be concentrated in areas where legislators might be converted to support.

III. Party designation would help passage.

IV. This is a majority endeavor.

V. The rural, as well as the urban, groups and communities and legislators must be made to feel that they have a part in this movement before passage can be assured.

VI. Positions of the legislators must be known and distributed to the public.

VII. We must know our state and know the problems of the WHOLE state. Problems must be related to the communities. We must discover which minority problem concerns a certain community.

VIII. Policy decisions must be made as soon as possible and by all concerned groups. A change in fundamental policy must be avoided at the last minute. Decisions should cover these (1) Enforcement or voluntary? (2) Number of employees to be covered by bill? (3) Inclusion of Moore or other amendments? (4) Number of establishments to be covered?

IX. Contact should be made with employment agencies to get their support before they are influenced in another direction.

X. Use should be made of men and women who support the bill and whose names have influence in the state.

XI. Effort should be made to get local church organizations to pass resolutions in favor of this legislation.

XII. The bill must be circularized as soon as possible in order to obtain support from all people.

XIII. Consideration should be given to enforcement of the President's executive order 10308 which says there cannot be discrimination in employment where there are government contracts.

NOTES TAKEN AT CIVIL RIGHTS MEETING, JULY 8, 1952

Present: Russ Myers, Roy Burt, Bill Leland, Amos Deinard, Langton, Mattson, Donohue, McClure, Hon. G. Mullin, Mrs. Chas. Rauch, Hubert Schon, Helen Mudgett, Kent Fitzgerald, Pioni (AFL), Glottstein, Monroe Schlatis, Sheldon Grainger, Mrs. Stewart Hatch, Mrs. H. H. Livingston, Mrs. Lewis, Johnson, Mr. Frank Fager, Mrs. Walter Angrist, Mr. Senneck (Mpls. Moline), Mrs. J. Gruner, Luella Newstrom.

Schlatis — suggested possibility of discussing the present executive order 10308 to enforce compliance with government contracts

Gruner — told about 2 hour conference with executives of Minnesota Mining Co. League is conducting interviews as pilot experiment in St. Paul for guidance in helping Leagues outside Twin Cities.

Mudgett — Will there be employer conferences out in state?

Deinard — Asked Mr. Mullin where we have failed in passing state law for FEP.

Mullin — League didn't fail. The same could be said about other organizations. The fault, if any, lies with the legislature. Pledges and commitments fell through. Bill was changed to meet objections. Meeting held with bill's opponents. Bill was bi-partisan. It comes down to individual responsibility in the legislature. Pressures were brought. Canners Ass'n. letter changed 3 votes in committee. In fairness to employers, he said a great deal of misinformation had been disseminated. They thought the bill was a very extreme measure. Christianson's letter responsible for this. C. did not attach bill to letter so that employers could see for themselves. Perhaps this was mere carelessness. Many people endorse the bill but do not follow through with support.

Two (three) types of legislators
a. Some men felt that voluntary method should be presented (such as Grottum of Jackson). There are others like him who will not change. Believe approach should be through commission to report to governor and legislature.
b. Men who say they are for a bill with enforcement provisions but when the chips are down they do not support it.
c. Men who are not interested in the subject at all.

Fears that his sponsorship of this bill might be better taken over by someone new but it is hard to get some one. Understands that Gov. Anderson will endorse a bill.

Co-author felt, last session, that bill couldn't pass unless it was voluntary. This change of feeling left the committee vote 11-10 against bill. Would have been the other way if there had not been this change of opinion.

Deinard — As you recall the vote, could you suggest where we might pick up a few affirmative votes?

Mullin — Couldn't answer for House. But as for Senate

Congressional District	
I	Keller, Winona (maybe)
	Grottum, Jackson (Maybe)
II	Bauman, Waseca (maybe)
III	Ledin (no) - others go along

IV	Lightner (No) others for bill
V	Wright (once for it - hard to convince)
VI	Sullivan (hard to interest in anything but finance)
	(Mrs. Mattson said he could be prevailed upon not to vote)
VII	Aleman, Wahlstrand (maybe)
VIII	Dahlquist (not really interested - interested In conservation, most powerful man in N. W. good man to have along. (Deinard suggested that Chas. Hornmight have influence here)
IX	Butler is employer - couldn't recall his position (League said he promised to vote for it) He is an honorable man, will keep his pledge

Livingston Why is Sinclair against it.

Mullin Couldn't say. Pro-University. Doesn't give reasons just give stands.

Some discussion here about whether O. C. or Board of Minn. Employers Ass'n. determines Ass'n. position.

Peoni DFL Hennepin County took stand for FEPC

Langton Wekness seemed to him to be-too superficial. Waited too long. No party designation. Hopeful that more liberals will get into legislature this year. Otto C. is sincere and thinks he's right. Doesn't represent all employers. Gen'l. Mills, Pillsbury, belong to Ass'n. but testified against. Coast to Coast Stores do not belong to Ass'n. (Langton employed by C-C) Christianson used story that only 8 of 48 states have FEPC - 40 do not. Suggested that O. C., all employers and all legislators be tackled. Only need a few extras. Put it over quick.

Livingston Legislators feel this is Twin City affair.

Mullin Be sure to send out League questionnaires.

Deinard Mullin mentions Mr. Grottum. What techniques could be used to win his and other votes? Could we persuade him in advance?

Mullin Good idea.

Mudgett Feels strongly that you have to find out more about the state and what the whole problems are. If you are serious [illegible] there has got to be a great deal of time spent on knowing what the people want. They don't care about negro employment but they do care about the migrant and indian problems.

Donohue Told about plan for League area conferences where League members would become informed on subject.

Mudgett Do statisical work first. Have to have figures. What to know about district? Know how minds work. What the people worry about? Decide how many establishments you want this bill to cover. 5 or 20? It will make all the different in the world. Doesn't think you will get a bill passed if the number is set at 5. Have to settle for more. Enforcement? Something like Wisconsin bill? Have to decide both matters.

Mullin[illegible] Would have been willing to salvage some from last bill but I had committed myself to this bill. Legislators said they would have supported a voluntary bill last session.

McClure Took the number 8 out of a hat for last bill. Didn't care what the number was.

Mudgett But the people out in the state don't know that you don't care what the number was. If you figure out how many establishments it would cover that would help immeasureably.

Schon Christianson attacked the bill with lack of principle in terms of what it would do to everyone. Spoke to many civic clubs.
Get some kind of hearing before these groups within the next six months to clarify the provisions of the bill.

Another thing - In small towns like Waseca, Brainerd, Hibbing, people who support the issue are afraid to say so in their community. Their stand, they feel, would be misinterpreted. Make individuals feel that this is respectable(to be on this side) Do this in these areas which Mullin mentioned.

Policy - This group will probably meet 3 or 4 times and come up with a concrete plan. Then at the very last minute other groups, which should have been here all along, come in and force a change in policy. Views should be brought forward early so that for once we can be united.

Peoni Spoke in regard to the political viewpoint. Inform the public of the issues, and how the men stand on them. Contact Pat Good who will line up a liberal group in the legislature. Cooperate with other groups.

Mattson 1. Don't meet with Christianson. Has paid job. Meeting with him would be a waste of time.

2. Has heard that C. is planning to influence employment agencies next.

3. This is a majority not minority problem. Ball must be carried by majority groups. Influence rural. Not enough women are used on the floor. Names would have had great influence (Mrs. F. K. Weyerhauser of conservative St. Paul is ready to take a stand on this issue). Use women as sponsors.

4. Essential that all groups in this field work together and support the bill. Groups cannot keep silent.

Senneck Good idea to contact organizations through presidents. His company has not stated position. Opinion varies in his management.

Gruner Minnesota Mining meeting very interesting. Good exchange of ideas. Said both had learned. League didn't know many things MMM was doing. Very encouraging.

Langton If it wasn't for O. C. we might have passed bill. Work on individual companies.

Deinard Suggested League have conference with executive board of Minn. Employers Ass'n. Thinks O. C. guesses what Board thinks

Gruner Feels that conferences would be more successful if they are held with individual companies.

Leland Believes that Minn. Employers Ass'n. decisions are based on C's information.

Leland — Minn. FEPc inactive so far cause Geo. Jensen must resign and they haven't found successor. Want progressive minded business man.

Langton — Evident that we have just begun. Have to meet again.

Mattson — Get to the employment agencies (before Christianson does).

Gruner — Some employers have volunteered to help League with conferences, If League will do the scheduling.

Glottstein — Need more specifc analysis of FEPC in state of Minnesota. Adapt to the audience. What bill will we support.

Related experience in Buffalo. Legislator (Bonniwell?) said Buffalo was with him, he was willing to support bill but Cokato, where there is canning industry, put on pressure.

Spoke of Executive Order 10308 - said we should use threat of exposure on employers who are violating this order.

Dangerous attitude to dissociate FEPC from Civil Rights.

Groups should be brought together soon.

Fitgerald — Made announcement that Dillon Meyer of Indian Bureau would be in town Sat. evening to explain Indian Bureau side of question of whether Indians have the right to employ their own legal counsel.

Mudgett — Announced that University will hold 1st institute on Indian Affairs, Feb. 20-21.

Burt — Minn. Civil and Human Rights Ass'n. is 2 years old. Organized because there is racial discrimination through out state. Said rural-urban conflict is real reason why FEPC does not pass. Need local groups to support bill. Majority concern. His organization has not resource but can help. Rural groups must feel they have had a part in drawing up the bill.

Deinard — Is it possible to have religious groups pass resolutions in favor of bill.

Burt9 — Most state meetings have been held. But there are still local meetings. Get local church groups to take a stand. This would probably be more effective that a statewide stand.

Gruner — Cooperation evidenced at meeting very good. Will meet again if another groups calls meeting. League must get started on its work.

Leland — Suggested that League schedule meeting.

Glottstein — League is limited. Could Minn. Council for FEP get started.

Leland — Agreed that Council would call next meeting. First order of business is to draw up the bill.

??? — Discussion of the Moore amendment and the possibilities of including this in next draft. McClure said he was willing to concede it and Schon also seemed willing.

Newstrom — Bill should be in the hands of the people as soon as possible even though there may be changes. League members were particularly anxious to see copies of the bill before they were willing to give their support.

Deinard — Then the bill must be circulated as soon as possible. Make some changes. Change the number from 8. Compromise here. Must be a magic number Find out what it is.

Gruner — Perhaps that's what Leagues could do. They could suggest a number that might be used.

Deinard — Concede Moore amendment.

A G E N D A
for
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE CONFERENCE

6:00 p.m. SHARP, Tuesday, July 8, 1952

Minneapolis YMCA; Dinner $1.75

INVITED: About 30 business men, legislators, human relations experts, representatives of Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice and Minnesota Civil and Human Rights Association, and members of League state Civil Rights Committee.

Item II on the League of Women Voters' state Program for 1952-1953, adopted at the Rochester Convention, reads: "The League of Women Voters of Minnesota, in the interests of responsible, efficient and democratic government in our state, will work for the enactment of a fair employment practices law and other legislation to correct discrimination."

Tentative preliminary program is based on these objectives:

1. To educate the people of the state so as to create a genuine popular mandate for fair employment legislation.
2. To convince legislators before the session convenes, while they are still among their constituents and comparatively unharassed by competing pressures.

TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED AT THIS MEETING

I. In addition to continuing the program of study, public meetings, panel discussions, contacting legislators, etc.

   A. Would a state-wide program of conferences with individual key employers be feasible and helpful, to accomplish the following purposes:

      1. To assure a realistic and practical approach.
      2. To obtain information with regard to specific local employment problems, employers' attitudes, etc.
      3. To eliminate and forestall as much opposition as possible and to try to build up interest and support among business men.

   B. Can you suggest certain employers in the state whom it is important to contact?

   C. What suggestions have you as to how to approach employers? What pitfalls should we avoid?

II. How can efforts of the following groups be systematically and effectively coordinated?

   A. Sponsors
   B. Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice
   C. Minnesota Civil and Human Rights Association
   D. Human relations agencies and other organizations and individuals

III. What factual materials on FEPC should be prepared for distribution by the League?

A. Can some of this material be used by other groups as well?

B. Under consideration are:

1. A fairly comprehensive summary of arguments in favor of FEPC, with answers to the most commonly advanced opposing arguments, to be used by civil rights chairmen, lobbyists, etc. - Bill Young?

2. A short pamphlet specifically directed toward employers and business men. Minn F E P C to this?

3. A short leaflet or broadside for general distribution also Gruner July 30 — If they say -- tell them - Vote en masse

C. Bill Leland and Hubert Schon are preparing a first draft of some of this material, to serve as the basis for discussion.

D. League materials are usually mimeographed. If some of these materials, could be used by other groups, as well as the League, what possibilities are there for financing printing?

If you cannot attend the meeting, please write in or telephone your suggestions to

Mrs. John W. Gruner, Civil Rights Chairman
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
527 Seventh Street S. E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

(GLadstone 3489)

A BILL

FOR AN ACT RELATING TO DISCRIMINATORY EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR PRACTICES BASED ON RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN AND ESTABLISHING METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PURPOSE OF ELIMINATING DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES AND PROVIDING AN APPROPRIATION TO CARRY OUT THE PURPOSES OF THIS ACT.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

Section 1. As a guide to the interpretation and application of this act, the public policy of this state is to foster the employment of all individuals in this state in accordance with their fullest capacities, regardless of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and to safeguard their rights to obtain and hold employment without discrimination. Such discrimination threatens the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of this state and menaces the institutions and foundations of democracy. It is also the public policy of this state to protect employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies from wholly unfounded charges of discrimination. This act is an exercise of the police power of this state in the interest of the public welfare.

Section 2. This act may be cited as the Minnesota Fair Employment Practices Act.

Section 3.

Subd. 1. For the purposes of this act, unless the context otherwise requires, the terms defined in this section have the meanings ascribed to them.

Subd. 2. "Board" means the review board appointed under section 8, subdivision 4.

Subd. 3. "Commission" means the state commission for equality in employment created by section 6.

Subd. 4. "Employment agency" means a person who regularly undertakes, with or without compensation, to procure employees or opportunities for employment.

Subd. 5. "Labor Organization" means any organization that exists wholly or partly for one or more of the following purposes:

(a) collective bargaining;

(b) dealing with employers concerning grievances, terms, or conditions of employment; or

(c) mutual aid or protection of employees.

Subd. 6. "National origin" means the place where an individual or any of his ancestors was born or has resided.

Subd. 7. "Person" includes partnership, association, corporation, legal representative, trustee, trustee in bankruptcy, receiver, and the state and its departments, agencies, and political subdivisions.

Subd. 8. "Respondent" means a person against whom a complaint has been filed or issued under section 8.

Subd. 9. "Unfair employment practice" means any act described in section 5.

Section 4. This act does not apply to:

(1) the employment of any individual

(a) by his parent, grandparent, spouse, child, or grandchild, or

(b) in the domestic service of any person;

(2) a person who regularly employes fewer than eight individuals, excluding individuals described in clause (1); or

(3) a religious or fraternal corporation, association, or society.

Section 5. Except when based on a bona fide occupational qualification, it is an unfair employment practice:

(1) when a labor organization, because of race, color, religion, or national origin;

(a) denies full and equal membership rights to an applicant for membership or member,

(b) expels a member from membership,

(c) discriminates against an applicant for membership or member with respect to his hire, apprenticeship, tenure, compensation, terms, upgrading, conditions, facilities, or privileges of employment, or

(d) neglects to classify properly or refer for employment or otherwise discriminates against a member;

(2) when an employer, because of race, color, religion, or national origin,

(a) refuses to hire an applicant for employment, or

(b) discharges an employee, or

(c) discriminates against an employee with respect to his hire, tenure, compensation, terms, upgrading, conditions, facilities, or privileges of employment;

(3) when an employment agency, because of race, color, religion, or national origin,

(a) fails or refuses to accept, register, classify properly, or refer for employment or otherwise discriminates against an individual, or

(b) complies with a request from an employer for referral of applicants for employment if the request indicates directly or indirectly that the employer does not comply with this act;

(4) when an employer, labor organization, or employment agency discharges, expels, or otherwise discriminates against a person because that person has opposed any practice forbidden under this act or has filed a complaint, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act;

(5) when a person intentionally aids, abets, incites, compels, or coerces another person to engage in any of the practices forbidden by this act;

(6) when a person intentionally attempts to aid, abet, incite, compel or coerce another person to engage in any of the practices forbidden by this act;

(7) when an employer, employment agency, investigating agency, or labor organization, before an individual is employed by an employer or admitted to membership in a labor organization,

(a) elicits or attempts to elicit information that pertains to the race, color, religion, or, except when required by the United States, this state or a political subdivision or agency of the United States or this state, for the purpose of national security, national origin of that individual, or

(b) causes to be printed or published a note of advertisement that relates to employment or membership and discloses a preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin, or,

(c) follows a policy of denying or limiting the employment or membership opportunities of individuals because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Section 6.

Subd. 1.

(1) There is created a State Commission for Equality in Employment of nine members. At least one member shall be a lawyer licensed to practice law in this state.

(2) Subject to clauses (3) and (4) the term of office of each member of the commission is five years.

(3) The terms of the members first appointed are: one appointed for one year, two for two years, two for three years, two for four years, and two for five years.

(4) A member is eligible for reappointment.

Subd. 2. The governor shall:

(1) appoint, with the advice and consent of the senate, the members of the commission.

(2) select and designate a member of the commission as its chairman; and

(3) fill a vacancy occurring otherwise than by expiration of term by appointing an individual to serve for the unexpired term of the member whom he is to succeed.

Subd. 3. The governor may remove a member of the commission for inefficiency, neglect of duty, misconduct, or malfeasance in office after the member has been given written notice of the charges against him and has had an opportunity to be heard.

Subd. 4.

(1) A vacancy in the commission does not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all powers of the commission.

(2) Each member of the commission shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling expense incurred on official business for the commission. Reimbursement shall be made in the manner provided by law for state employees.

Section 7.

Subd. 1. The commission shall:

(1) establish and maintain a principal office in St. Paul and any other necessary offices within the state;

(2) meet and function at any place within the state;

(3) appoint an executive director to serve at the will of the commission as an unclassified employee under Minnesota Statutes, Section 43.09, Subdivision 2, fix his compensation and prescribe his duties;

(4) to the extent permitted by Federal law and regulation utilize the records of the Division of Employment and Security of the state when necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act;

(5) adopt suitable rules and regulations for effectuating the purposes of this act;

(6) issue, receive, and investigate complaints alleging discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin;

(7) attempt to eliminate unfair employment practices by means of education, conference, conciliation, and persuasion;

(8) conduct research and study discriminatory employment and labor practices based on race, color, religion, or national origin;

(9) publish the results of research and study of discriminatory employment and labor practices based on race, color, religion, or national origin when in the judgment of the commission it will tend to eliminate such discrimination;

(10) develop and recommend programs of formal and informal education designed to promote goodwill and eliminate discriminatory employment and labor practices based on race, color, religion, or national origin;

(11) make a written report of the activities of the commission to the governor each year and to the legislature at each session.

Subd. 2. To the extent determined by the commission and subject to its direction and control, the executive director may exercise the powers and perform the duties of the commission.

Section 8.

Subd. 1.

(1) Subject to clause (4), a person authorized by clause (2) may, by himself or his agent or attorney, file with the commission a verified complaint in writing stating the name and address of the person alleged to have committed an unfair employment practice and setting out the details of the practice complained of and any other information required by the commission.

(2) A complaint may be filed by:

(a) an aggrieved individual;

(b) an employer whose employees, or some of them, refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in complying with the provisions of the act.

(3) Subject to clause (4), whenever the commission has reason to believe that a person is engaging in an unfair employment practice, the commission may issue a complaint.

(4) A complaint of an unfair employment practice must be filed within six months after the occurrence of the practice.

Subd. 2.

(1) When a complaint has been filed or issued, the commission shall promptly inquire into the truth of the allegations of the complaint.

(2) If after the inquiry required by clause (1), the commission determines that there is probable cause for believing that an unfair employment practice exists, the commission shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unfair employment practice through education, conference, conciliation, and persuasion,

but if the commission determines that there is no probable cause for believing that an unfair employment practice exists, the commission shall dismiss the complaint.

(3) Whenever practicable the commission, in complying with clause (2), shall endeavor to eliminate the unfair employment practice at the place where (a) the practice occurred or (b) the respondent resides or has his principal place of business.

Subd. 3.

(1) The commission may publish an account of a case in which the complaint has been dismissed or the terms of settlement of a case that has been voluntarily adjusted but the identity of a complainant or respondent shall not be disclosed without his consent.

(2) Except as provided in clause (1) the commission shall not disclose any information concerning its efforts in a particular case to eliminate an unfair employment practice through education, conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

Subd. 4.

(1) On failing to eliminate the unfair employment practice in the manner prescribed by subdivision 2, clause (2), the commission shall notify the governor in writing of that fact and request him to appoint a review board to conduct a hearing in the case.

(2) Upon receipt of the notice and request prescribed by clause (1), the governor shall promptly appoint a review board consisting of three members, one of whom shall be a lawyer licensed to practice law in this state. The governor shall not appoint a member of the commission as a member of a review board.

(3) A vacancy on the board does not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all powers of the board.

(4) Each member of the board shall receive $20 per day in lieu of subsistence while the board is in session and reimbursement for necessary traveling expenses incurred on official business for the board.

Subd. 5. The board shall:

(1) conduct the hearing at a place designated by it within the county where

(a) the unfair employment practice occurred, or

(b) the respondent resides or has his principal place of business.

(2) subpoena witnesses pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 596, administer oaths, and take the testimony of any individual under oath relating to the case being heard by the board;

(3) adopt rules of practice to govern the hearing before the board;

(4) employ necessary stenographers and clerks, who need not be classified employees under Minnesota Statutes, section 43.09, subdivision 4, fix their compensation, and prescribe their duties.

Subd. 6.

(1) The review board promptly after its appointment shall notify the commission of the time and place of the hearing to be conducted by the board.

(2) Within ten days after receipt of the notice specified in clause (1), the commission shall issue and serve by registered mail upon the respondent a copy of the complaint and a written notice requiring the respondent to answer the

allegations of the complaint at the hearing. The notice shall state the time and place of the hearing.

(3) Within 15 days after receipt of the copy of the complaint and the notice specified in clause (2), the respondent shall serve upon the commission by registered mail a verified answer to the complaint.

(4) The commission shall submit evidence and present before the board the case in support of the complaint. The complainant shall appear in person at the hearing and is subject to cross-examination by the respondent. The respondent may appear at the hearing, submit evidence, and present his case.

(5) The board shall apply the rules of evidence that prevail in courts of law. The board shall not receive in evidence any evidence pertaining to the efforts of the commission to eliminate the unfair employment practice through education, conference, conciliation, or persuasion. Each witness at the hearing shall testify under oath. All testimony and other evidence submitted at the hearing shall be transcribed. The board at the request of the complainant or respondent shall provide a copy of the transcript of the hearing without charge.

Subd. 7.

(1) If upon all of the evidence taken at the hearing the board finds the respondent has engaged in an unfair employment practice, the board shall make findings and shall issue an order directing the respondent to cease and desist from the unfair employment practice found to exist and to take such action as in the judgment of the board will effectuate the purposes of this act and shall serve the order on

(a) the respondent personally, and

(b) the commission and the complainant by registered mail.

(2) If upon all of the evidence taken at the hearing the board finds that the respondent has not engaged in an unfair employment practice alleged in the complaint, the board shall make findings of fact and conclusions of law and shall issue and serve an order dismissing the complaint on

(a) the complainant personally, and

(b) the commission and the respondent by registered mail.

Section 9.

Subd. 1. Subject to subdivisions 2 and 3, the commission or the respondent may institute in the manner prescribed by subdivision 4 a proceeding in the district court for judicial review and enforcement of an order of the board.

Subd. 2. Except for a proceeding by the commission to enforce an order of the board, a proceeding in the district court must be instituted within 30 days after service of an order of the board as prescribed by section 8, subdivision 7.

Subd. 3. A proceeding under this section must be instituted in the district court for the judicial district in which

(1) an unfair employment practice covered by the order of the board occurred, or

(2) the respondent resides or has his principal place of business.

Subd. 4. A proceeding under this section is instituted by:

(1) filing with the clerk of the district court

(a) a petition stating the relief requested and the grounds relied on for that relief.

(b) a transcript of the hearing held before the board, and

(c) a copy of the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and order of the board, and

(2) serving a notice of motion returnable at a special term of the court on

(a) the complainant,

(b) the respondent, and

(c) the commission.

Subd. 5. When a proceeding under this section has been properly instituted, the district court has exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and shall hear and determine the proceeding as expeditiously as practicable.

Subd. 6. The commission, complainant, respondent, and any person aggrieved by an order of the board may appear in the proceeding and be heard in argument by the district court.

Subd. 7. In a proceeding under this section, the district court:

(1) shall, subject to clauses (2) and (3), limit its review to determination of whether

(a) the findings of the board are supported by sufficient evidence considering as a whole the transcript of the hearing held before the board,

(b) the findings of the board support the order of the board;

(2) shall consider only an objection that was argued before the board unless the failure or neglect to urge the objection is excused because of extraordinary circumstances;

(3) may, in its discretion:

(a) remand the proceeding to the board for further hearings, or

(b) take additional evidence on any issue, or

(c) order a trial de novo to the court.

Subd. 8. Subject to subdivision 7, the district court may:

(1) grant temporary relief by restraining order or otherwise;

(2) order the respondent to comply with the order of the board;

(3) grant relief appropriate to the findings of the board or the court, or

(4) set aside the order of the board and dismiss the proceedings against the respondent.

Section 10. The commission, or respondent, may appeal to the supreme court as provided by Minnesota Statutes, Section 605.09, clauses (2) and (7) from an order of the district court issued pursuant to section 9, subdivision 8 of this act.

Section 11. There is appropriated out of the general revenue fund in the state treasury to the commission for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act: $10,000 to be immediately available, $30,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and $40,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

(Note: This bill introduced January 17, 1951.

Senate file 69. Authors: Gerald T. Mullin, Minneapolis; Gordon Rosenmeier, Little Falls; Thomas D. Vukelich, Gilbert.

House file 74. Authors: P. Kenneth Peterson, Minneapolis; Clarence G. Langley, Red Wing; E. J. Chilgren, Littlefork; Aubrey W. Dirlam, Redwood Falls, A. F. Oberg, Lindstrom.)

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA
84 SOUTH TENTH STREET, ROOM 406
MINNEAPOLIS 3, MINNESOTA
Atlantic 0941

March 11, 1952

To: Local League President
From: Mrs. Donohue, Legislative Chairman
Attention: Local Legislative Chairman

Attached is the proposed plan for Legislative Action which was approved by the State Legislative Steering Committee at a meeting on January 31st.

The Steering Committee is composed of:

Mrs. K. K. McMillan, President	Mrs. Harold Richardson
Miss Barbara Stuhler	Mrs. Talbot Jones
Mrs. Harold Wilson	Mrs. Robt. Anderson
Mrs. David Kruidenier	Mrs. Jas. R. McNamara
Mrs. Hiram Livingston	Mrs. Hamilton Lufkin
Mrs. Harold Field	Mrs. John Donohue

The General Legislative Committee is composed of:

All the Legislative Chairmen in the State

We are attempting to localize our State Legislative Program, our aim being to insure more interest and individual response to Calls for Action, by the local Leagues. We believe this can be accomplished by having one person in each local League responsible for Legislative activity on the State Program level. She should work in cooperation with Resource Chairmen, Voters Service Chairmen, and Public Relations Chairmen., as well as with the corresponding State Chairmen, to put the League program across.

This agenda, we believe, sets up the duties of a Local Legislative Chairman. Those chairmen in the Twin City and Suburban areas will find that their duties will vary slightly from the other chairmen living farther away from St. Paul. Because they are in close commuting distance they will be called on to aid in conducting the "come-see" tours and with the actual lobbying at the Capitol.

You will probably want to discuss this agenda with your Board. We will want your comments, corrections, and additions. Also, we will want to know how much action you believe your League can accomplish along the lines of this agenda.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION IN MINNESOTA

1. Train League Lobbyists — (Twin City and surrounding area people) Most important criteria is that Lobbyists be well informed on subject matter and so we will greatly rely on our Twin City Resource Chairmen to train them.

2. Inspire Letter Writing — on League items during the session in answer to Calls to Action. There is the possibility of devoting a Unit Meeting in the fall to letter writing. We intend to put out a kit, "Lobby by Letter", next fall. It will contain the what, why, where, and how of letter writing. Also a statement of the League's stand on state items and how to use this material in a letter to your legislator. A sheet, "If they say ----------, tell them ----------" on the Agenda Items will probably be prepared to help in face to face, as well as in letter lobbying.

3. Urge and set up "Sight Seeing Tours" during the session for Out-State Leaguers. This is most important, particularly if it is combined with a talk with the legislator on League matters.

4. Work with your Voters Service Chairman, who will arrange local Pre-Election Meetings for candidates running for the State Legislature. Help them understand League items and get their position on these items before they are elected.

5. Keep Files on Legislators. One card kept by local League, one card sent to State Office will be very helpful in lobbying wisely and effectively. If this information is not available to you now, it will be at election time. Files might contain the following information about the legislator:

His district
- Is labor strong?
- Is farm group strong?
- What business is predominant?
- What nationality predominates?

His organization affiliations
- American Legion?
- Luncheon clubs?
- What is he interested in?

Other information
- Political Leaders in his district?
- What groups supported him in campaign?
- What favors would he want to confer?
- What reprisals?
- Who are his friends? opposition?
- Family connections?
- Special interest?
- Political party?
- Caucus?

6. Keep Files on League Members. These should be kept according to Legislative District to make it easier for individual calls for action to be answered. Also might contain some of the same information recorded on Legislators File Card, to make it easier to fit the Lobbyist to the Legislator. (This separation into districts is of course for large Leagues.)

7. Keep Files of Other Organizations' Legislative Programs, also the individuals to contact, both in the local community, and at the State Capitol, in these organizations, so that we can work more effectively in cooperation with these other organizations. These would be useful to have in both the local League's and the State League's possession.

8. Legislative Budget — Do we need one?

PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

MAY Local League Legislative Chairman communicate with State Office by May 1st on their evaluation of the enclosed plan for Legislative Action. Suggestions for change or addition will be valued.

MAY 21-22 At the State Convention, a meeting will be set for Legislative Chairmen, details will be forthcoming. (A Pep Fest)

SEPTEMBER Area Conferences on Legislative Action will be held.

OCTOBER Before election, a communication will be sent to local Leagues reviewing the agenda items to come before the State Legislature. At this time the Voters Service Chairman, with the help of the Legislative Chairman, will reach the local candidates for the Legislature with League material on our agenda items, to get the candidates position before the election, and working with the Public Relations Chairman will publicize these facts.

NOVEMBER General Election, Nov. 4th.

DECEMBER After election have a meeting with the Representatives and Senators before they leave for the Capitol. Possibly give them a letter or booklet, stating our program, signed by the local President, rather than be state officer. In some towns, this might be done at a luncheon. The Voters Service, State Resource, and Legislative Chairmen might work together on this project.

DECEMBER Have a meeting of Twin City and suburban League's Legislative and Resource Chairmen, with corresponding State Chairmen, in order to form actual lobbying committees and make plans for action. Possibly a booklet "How it is Done", a handbook on lobbying to be put out by the League, could be distributed at this time.

JANUARY 1953 In the first week of the session we will have our Legislative Workshop, plus a "come and see" tour. (Skit on Constitutional Convention, Mrs. Minnesota and Daughter, might be given to entertain our Legislator Guests). "Come and See Tours" will continue through the session.

a. have legislators talk on program items coming up for action
b. visit House and Senate while in session
c. have League members talk to their legislators
d. get copies of legislative publications, such as Journal, Agenda, Bill, etc. for League visitors

JANUARY to APRIL 1953 Until the middle of April 1953, All League members Lobby for the League

a. in person
b. by letter
c. by letters to the paper
d. by influencing others to lobby

August 22, 1952

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota, a non-partisan organization of 4300 members in 48 communities throughout the state, adopted at its state convention last May in Rochester the following item:

"In the interests of responsible, efficient, and democratic government in our state, we will work for the enactment of a fair employment practices law and other legislation to correct discrimination".

The League has made a study of civil rights in Minnesota for three years and believes that a fair employment law should be passed in this state:

because every worker should have the opportunity to make use of his skills, regardless of his race, religion, or national origin.

because employment on merit puts democracy into practise

because employment on merit benefits everyone — worker, management, the consumer

because experience in Minneapolis and other cities and states show that a fair employment practice commission, with enforcement powers, is an effective and proper instrument for solving this problem.

The League hopes that the Republican Party will again include a statement on its Platform in favor of this action, and that the combined strength of the many organizations favoring a fair employment law will be great enough to achieve this important step toward a more democratic state.

August 22, 1952

Minnesota Republican State Central Committee
Hearings on State Platform for 1952
Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota, a non-partisan organization of 4300 members in 48 communities throughout the state, adopted at its state convention last May in Rochester the following item:

"In the interests of responsible, efficient, and democratic government in our state, we will work for an efficient civil service system".

Because the League is aware of the service veterans rendered to our country, we believe that this service should be recognized through the incorporation of preference for veterans as an integral part of our civil service system. It is our belief however that the present law needs modification. Because veteran's preference may be used for both entrance and promotional examinations (in some branches of state government a veteran who can not pass the examination gets absolute preference over a non-veteran who may get 100%) many capable non-veterans hesitate to take jobs with the state. This causes our government to be run less efficiently and economically than is necessary.

Because the principle of the merit system requires the selection of public employees solely on the basis of merit and fitness while veterans' preference requires that preference be extended to members of a special class on the basis of membership in that class, veterans' preference is contrary to the merit system. Therefore, since the League of Women Voters has always worked for the merit system in Minnesota, we are hoping that the Republican Party will include a statement to support revision of the veterans' preference in civil service, and that the combined strength of the organizations favoring revision will be great enough to achieve this needed step toward a more efficient state government.

August 22, 1952

Minnesota Republican State Central Committee
Hearings on State Platform for 1952
Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota, a non-partisan organization of 4300 members in 48 communities throughout the state, adopted at its state convention last May in Rochester the following item:

"In the interests of responsible, efficient, and democratic government in our state, we will work for party designation for legislators".

The League studied this subject after they had a chance to review the work of the 1951 Legislative session. Although all the items on the League program were also items on the platforms of both the political parties, none of the bills that the League worked for were passed. It seemed to us that part of the trouble, at least, was that the legislators were not committed to the platform of their party, since they were elected without party designation. We believe that party designation would strengthen the two party system, would simplify the voters' choice, would make legislators responsible to their party's platform, and would tend to counteract in a healthy way the influence of the special interest pressure groups which seek to influence legislation.

We are hoping that the Republican Party will again include a statement on its Platform in favor of this action, and that the combined strength of the organizations favoring party designation will be great enough to achieve this important step toward a more responsible government.

August 22, 1952

Minnesota Republican State Central Committee
Hearings on State Platform for 1952
Nicollet Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota, a non-partisan organization of 4300 members in 48 communities throughout the state, adopted at its state convention last May in Rochester, the following item:

"In the interests of responsible, efficient, and democratic government in our state, we will work for a constitutional convention".

Five years of study have convinced the members of the League that many provisions of our state constitution are obsolete, confusing, and unenforceable, completely at odds with efficient and responsible government. For example:

It has been amended 75 times
It is 3 times longer than the federal constitution
It contains out of date provisions such as election of Senators by the Legislature
It greatly limits home rule
It limits the legislative session to 90 days
It does not require judges to be trained in law
It does not provide adequately for reapportionment

We are hoping that a law will be passed in the 1953 session of the Legislature which will provide for the calling of a constitutional convention. The League hopes that the Republican Party will again include a statement on its Platform in favor of this action, and that the combined strength of the many organizations favoring a constitutional convention will be great enough to achieve this first step toward a more responsible, efficient and democratic government.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA
84 SOUTH TENTH STREET, ROOM 406
MINNEAPOLIS 3, MINNESOTA
Atlantic 0941

September 29, 1952

Dear Civil Rights Chairmen,

We hasten to reassure you as you open this bulky envelope; it is not intended that one person alone should assimilate all the enclosed material. If you will read, firsl of all, "Suggested Use of Fair Employment Materials", you will see that we have divided it into moderate, and we hope, platable doses for 5 or 6 program participants.

I wish it were possible for me to adequately express to you my deep sense of gratitude for the opportunity to work with you on this civil rights program with its special emphasis on fair employment legislation. I feel strongly that we can make no more important contribution at the present time to the permanent betterment of the human race than to help to establish in our state a pattern of justice in employment, eliminating racial and religious discrimination.

Some of us have had the privilege of seeing in Minneapolis during the past five years, deserving, competent men and women with the same education, aspirations, and sensitivity as the rest of us, able for the first time to find the type of employment for which they are qualified and which they enjoy. It is a great satisfaction to see these people making good; it provides us with the courage and the enthusiasm to forge ahead, for we know that fair employment is not only right; it is feasible.

Since, however, my experience has been limited to Minneapolis, I shall have to lean heavily on you for the wider picture of any special problems which may arise in other parts of the state. We should keep closely in touch with each other.

The materials enclosed in this packet should cover the basic information now available with respect to fair employment legislation proposed for the 1953 legislative session. Since such a painstaking job was done in drafting the 1951 fair employment bill, it is generally assumed by the friends of fair employment that the 1953 bill will be much the same. We therefore enclose a digest of the 1951 bill, and shall keep you advised of any changes.

You may remember that we discussed at the state convention last spring the necessity for creating a genuine mandate from the people of the state for this legislation. We recognized the importance of achieving this as early as possible, while our legislators are still at home among their constituents. and unharried by the competing pressures of the legislative session. It is our feeling that lobbying done before January may be much more effective than lobbying done after the legislature convenes, since we hope to develope a kind of "chain reaction" of League, business men, Community, and legislators. This makes it desirable that you schedule your Civil Rights program as early as possible.

We have been advised to avoid use of the letters, "FEPC", since many people have developed an adverse emotional reaction based upon lack of information or misinformation. Some of the Republican legislators are calling it an "Equality of Opportunity Act", relying on the widespread acceptance of that principle by the American people, to give this legislation a fair hearing. We use both that terminology and "fair employment legislation".

We are assembling for you a small supplementary "library" of such interesting pamphlet materials as "An American Challenge", the brochure of the American Nurses' Association, which recounts the record of the ANA in integrating Negro nurses in all but four states in the United states.

The amount of use which you make of these supplementary materials will be dependent on the time which your group feels that it can put into the program, but because of the added interest which these pamphlets provide, we want you to have them in your hands. Since it has cost us some effort to "beg, borrow, and steal" them, and to pay postage on them, we hope that you will make them a part of your League library and will pass them on to your successor.

The "Free Enterprise" leaflets will take a little more time to put into final form, since we are submitting them to business leaders for criticism before they are printed, but we may be able to send you a preliminary proof sheet, which will give you an idea of the material which they will cover. A little later on we hope to be able to supply them to you in whatever quantity you can use.

We hope you are planning to cooperate closely with your Legislative Chairman, your Voters' Service Chairman, and your Publicity Chairman. We hope that, working together, you may be able to follow through on some of the following suggestions:

1. We believe we could provide you with a panel of human relations and fair employment experts for a public meeting in your community.
2. You should seek as early as possible to enlist the cooperation of the ministers of your community; this might be done through the local Ministerial Association. Ask your local ministers to deliver sermons against discrimination.
3. Seek the cooperation of the press; as editors for editorials, and write letters for the Letters to the Editor column.
4. Seek cooperation from other organizations in your community.
5. We hope that you have checked the answers of legislative candidates to the question as to whether or not they will support fair employment legislation, and will follow through with those who need convincing, as soon as you have built up sufficent strength in your own orgenization and community.

We shall be watching for any proposed legislation affecting Indians, Migrant workers, or other minority groups, and shall inform you as early as possible if any program appears to be developing on which we might wish to take action.

This job is not going to be easy, but it is going to be intensly interesting and worthwhile. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Very sincerely,

/s/ Opal G. Gruner

Mrs. John W. Gruner
Civil Rights Chairman

P.S. Watch for the next Articulate Voter. Interesting new material to supplement your Civil Rights study.

List of Materials Included in This Kit

1. "Suggested Use of Fair Employment Materials"

2. "Why the Minnesota League of Women Voters Wants a Fair Employment Law for Minnesota"

3. "How Valid Are the Arguments Against Fair Employment Legislation?"

Section I
"How Would a Fair Employment Law Affect Employers?"

Section II
"How Would a Fair Employment Law Affect the Community?"

Section III
""Do We Need a Law?"

Section IV
"Are there Better Ways of Achieving Employment on Merit?"

Section V
"Who Drafted, Who Supports, and Who Opposes this Bill?"

Section VI
"Is a Fair Employment Bill Workable? and Is It Constitutional?"

4. "Suggestions with regard to Conferences with Business Men"

5. "Origin and Development of the Proposed State Bill for Equality in Employment Opportunities."

6. Digest of the 1951 proposed Fair Employment Practice Bill

7. Reprint from Fortune for July 1952; "Negro Employment, a Progress Report," by John A. Davis.

8. "Our Human Resources"; 1952 report of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Commission

Digest of

Employment on Merit Bill

State of Minnesota

Senate File No. 431
House File No. 518

•

By EDWARD F. WAITE
Retired District Judge
Hennepin County

•

MINNESOTA COUNCIL FOR EMPLOYMENT ON MERIT

500 Northwestern Federal Building
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota
LIncoln 6781

•

Senate Authors:
GERALD T. MULLIN, Minneapolis
THOMAS D. VUKELICH, Gilbert
ELMER L. ANDERSON, St. Paul

House Authors:
CLARENCE LANGLEY, Red Wing
P. KENNETH PETERSON, Minneapolis
STANLEY HOLMQUIST, Grove City
EDWARD CHILGREN, Littlefork
JOSEPH PRIFREL, St. Paul

Introduced: February 4, 1953

Purpose: The purpose of the proposed Act is to eliminate practices of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color or national origin. Such discrimination is declared to be an "unfair employment practice." The bill also aims to afford to all concerned protection against unfounded charges of discrimination.

It is broadly modeled upon legislation which has been in effect in New York and New Jersey for seven years, and in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Washington and Oregon for from three to six years.

Scope: It applies uniformly throughout the state to employers, labor unions and employment agencies, but does not cover:

(1) Employers of fewer than eight persons;

(2) Persons employed in domestic service;

(3) Religious or fraternal organizations, with respect to religion.

It specifically does not cover discharge of an employee during a probational period of sixty days or less, established by a collective bargaining agreement or a custom applicable to all employees.

It declares each of the following acts to be an "unfair employment practice":

(1) For a labor organization, because of race, religion, color or national origin of any person, to exclude or expel him from membership, or discriminate against him in any of the incidents of membership;

(2) For an employer, because of like reasons, to refuse to employ him, to discharge him, or to discriminate against him in respect to any of the incidents of employment;

(3) For an employment agency to make a like discrimination in listing or referring for employment;

(4) For an employer, labor organization or employment agency to discriminate against any person because of conduct reasonably designed to effectuate the purposes of the Act;

(5) For any person to aid or incite another to violate any provisions of the Act, or

(6) Attempt to do so.

(7) For an employer, employment agency, investigating agency or labor organization to disclose in any advertisement relating to employment or membership an unlawful discriminatory preference.

ADMINISTRATION and PROCEDURE

(a) The Commission: There is created a "Commission for Employment on Merit," consisting of nine persons to be appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate. They are to serve without compensation, having an office in St. Paul and traveling about the state as may be necessary. The Commission is charged with the administration of the Act, its general duties being to investigate and, by advice and persuasion, correct alleged unfair employment practices, and help to create an informed public opinion in the field to which the Act relates. It appoints an Executive Director and prescribes his duties.

Any person claiming to be aggrieved by a violation of the Act may, within six months thereafter, file a complaint with the Commission. If, on investigation, the Commission determines there is probable cause to believe an unfair employment practice has occurred, it undertakes to correct it "through education, conference, conciliation and persuasion." This failing, it requests the Governor to appoint a Review Board to conduct a hearing. (If the Commission believes that an unfair practice has occurred it may itself commence a proceeding without complaint by an aggrieved person.)

(b) Review Board: The Governor then appoints a Review Board of three persons to hold a hearing on the disputed issue in the county where the alleged practice occurred, or where the person charged with the same, styled the respondent, has his principal place of business. Each member of the Board receives $20.00 per day while actually employed on the case, with necessary expenses of travel.

At the hearing, the Board is required to apply the rules of evidence as observed in courts of law, except that it shall not receive any evidence pertaining to the efforts of the Commission to settle the dispute through the conciliation effort prescribed by the Act. If the charge is found unproven, the complaint is dismissed. If found proven, the Board makes findings of fact and issues an order that the respondent cease the unlawful practice found to have existed and take

such action as in the judgment of the Board will effectuate the purposes of the Act. Upon notice of such order the respondent, or upon non-compliance, the Commission, may institute a proceeding in the District Court of the appropriate district for a judicial review of the case. The District Court then has exclusive jurisdiction of the controversy subject to appeal to the Supreme Court in due course.

(c) The District Court: In court the primary issues are whether the findings of the Board are supported by the evidence as appearing in the transcript of proceedings at the hearing, and whether the findings support the order. The court may:

(a) Remand the proceeding for further hearing by the Board;

(b) Take additional evidence;

(c) Order a trial DE NOVO to the Court;

(d) Grant temporary relief by an appropriate order;

(e) Order the respondent to comply with the order of the Board;

(f) Set aside the order and dismiss the proceeding;

(g) Grant other relief appropriate to the findings of the Board or the Court.

The Act does not specifically provide penalties for violation; but under the general law non-compliance by the respondent with an order of the Court requiring action or non-action on his part would be contempt of court and punishable accordingly.

The Act calls for an appropriation of $10,000 to be immediately available, $30,000 for the fiscal year 1953-54, and $40,000 for 1954-55.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth Street, Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

September, 1952

Additional Copies - 2¢

SUGGESTED USE OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT MATERIALS

(for Civil Rights Chairmen)

In using the material on fair employment we suggest that you keep in mind our ultimate goal, which is action -- securing the passage of the fair employment law, or Equality of Opportunity Act, as some legislators suggest calling it in 1953. We believe that you can move toward this goal and at the same time inject a freshness and interest into your program by using the following plan:

Make your Civil Rights Program a rehearsal of a conference with one or two imaginary business men of your community. Select members of your group to impersonate these business leaders and assume that they will be either skeptical or hostile to fair employment legislation. Three or four other League memebers should impersonate the League committee which is calling on them to interest them in fair employment.

Rules of the Game - Participants will study kit materials in preparation for the program, but the discussion itself will be unplanned and unrehearsed. It will duplicate, as nearly as possible, conditions of an actual League conference with an employer. The League "delegation" should have a chairman and each member of the delegation should be prepared on certain assigned aspects of the question. HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT? which you will find in your kit, is divided into seperate sections for this purpose. Each participant should have read WHY THE MINNESOTA LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS WANTS A FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW and SUGGESTIONS WITH REGARD TO CONFERENCES WITH BUSINESS MEN.

A "conference" would begin with a brief positive statement from the chairman of the delegation. The "business men" may then ask any questions they choose, or raise any objection which occurs to them, whether it is included in our outline or not. Members of the "delegation" will do their best to answer the questions convincingly, each one speaking to the questions which seem to lie in her special field.

You might devote the last 10 minutes to questions from the audience. Pass out the FREE ENTERPRISE pamphlets and the Fortune leaflets and send out the entire membership to emulate the "delegation" they have seen in action. Tell them to go out and win the community.

Your experienced "delegation", having been through a rehearsal, should now feel competent to "take on" the most prominent, the most formidable business men and legislators in your community. They should schedule a series of conferences, varying the makeup of the delegation from time to time by including one or two new members, and soliciting help and suggestions from the entire membership.

If you should care to plan a more ambitious program for members of the community outside of the League, as well, we should be glad to help you secure speakers experienced in the human relations field, to strenghten or reinforce your panel. You could then invite real business men to ask questions. We don't recommend that you invite them to debate as opponents. Even if they are known to oppose FEPC assume that there are at least many points of agreement. Ask them to join in a discussion. Seek the truth objectively together; don't crystallize the opposition. When people line up on different sides of a question for purposes of argument it becomes a matter of pride not to concede even when one is convinced, and minds are closed to facts and logic. Try to win and persuade. On such questions as fair employment, where deep-seated and complicated emotions are sometimes involved, this is done much more effectively with two or three than with a large group because each person's prejudices are individual

such questions as fair employment, where deep-seated and complicated emotions as sometimes involved, this is done much more effectively with two or three than with a large group because each person's prejudices are individual and different and need to be dealt with separately. That is why we recommend the conferences. It does not help to confuse people with additional prejudices and misconceptions of others.

Business men who favor fair employment legislation and others whom you may win should be enlisted to open the minds of their colleagues on the question. The chief reason that many people oppose fair employment legislation is that they have been misinformed with regard to it. We want our Minnesota League members to not only distribute 10,000 FREE ENTERPRISE leaflets to business men and legislators in this state; we want you to see that they are read. One public relations expert who works with some of our most prominent business men says that because they are so busy the only way to do that is to read it to them!

You might give the business man one copy and, holding another in your hand while you are talking to him, you could read a bit here and there to arouse his interest and curiosity. We are doing our best to make the leaflets readable and attractive, and shall submit them to a representative group of business leaders for comment and suggestion before putting them into final form.

Use your ingenuity and imagination!

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth Street, Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

September, 1952

Additional Copies - 20¢

HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION?

Let's make an honest appraisal of the statements most frequently offered by the opposition. How many of them are based on lack of information or misinformation?

We list herewith some of the statements which have been made against fair employment legislation. Many of them were made by one man. We then give you the answers of fair employment and human relations experts.*

Section I

HOW WOULD A FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW AFFECT EMPLOYERS?

1. Opponents of Fair Employment Legislation have said that fair employment legislation means more government control, and that we have too much government control already.

> "Every piece of legislation that gives a power to the state to control acts of individuals, taking away their personal freedom in any way, is a step near Totalitarianism."
>
> "When the state can regulate the hiring, upgrading, and discharging of individuals by firms and individuals, we cease to have free enterprise."

Every law restricts the freedom of some people in order to prevent injury to others. Therefore, the above argument could just as well be advanced against any existing laws. It may be that some laws should be repealed and that others should not be passed. However each proposal must be considered on its own merits and not on the basis of such general statements as those above.

The proposed law grants to every citizen freedom from discrimination because of his race, religion or national origin. The only freedom which is limited by the law is the freedom to hire a less competent worker and to reject a more competent applicant because of prejudice against him. Therefore, the freedom denied to the employer is the freedom to injure others as well as himself; whereas the freedom granted by overcoming discrimination is the freedom to develop one's best skills and to advance in accordance with one's ability and industry. This law answers Totalitarianism. This law strengthens democracy and free enterprise.

2. Opponents have said that the enforcement powers provided in the law are dangerous and objectionable. The employer would be put to the expense of hiring legal counsel to defend himself from even groundless complaints, they claim.

> "The proposed legislation provides for a series of regulations, inconveniences, and penalties for our employers, seeks to set up a rule of personal conduct between people themselves which would be enforced by a police club held in the hands of the State."
>
> "Unfavorable publicity will damage even an innocent employer's reputation, subjecting him to boycotts and picketing by minority group sympathizers in the community."
>
> "If an employer does not comply with the law he can be sent to jail and kept there until he does."

The employer who conforms to the law and does not practice discrimination would not be interfered with in any way as long as no complaint was brought against him. There would be no blanks or reports for him to fill out, no red tape, no investigations. None of his time would be consumed.

---

* Many answers will be found to be identical with answers in A Reply to Otto F. Christenson's Comments on the Proposed Fair Employment Practice Legislation for Minnesota, issued in January 1950 by the Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice. Some of the same authors worked on both statements.

Every safeguard is provided in the law against the abuse of enforcement powers. Provision is made for the adjustment of every complaint by education and conciliation. Public hearings and court procedure is provided for only in case conciliation should fail.

Of the more than five thousand cases handled by the seven state and two municipal commissions which have been in operation for three years or more, only seven cases have gone to public hearings and only four have gone to court. All others have been settled by the conciliation process. Of the four court cases only two were concerned with exercise of enforcement powers by the commissions; the other two were instituted to test certain aspects of the authority of the commissions. In general the commissions rulings have been upheld by the courts.

The Commission to be established by the law has no power to issue orders or to impose penalties. It is a conciliation body only. There is no reason for an employer to hire legal counsel during the conciliation process. It is not a legal proceeding but is simply an informal conference, held in the employer's office, for the purpose of ironing out whatever problems may be involved. The law specifically provides that the Commission shall not make public the name of the complainant or the respondent, or any other information concerning its efforts in a particular case to eliminate an unfair employment practice through conciliation. The history of established commissions shows that every case has been handled without publicity as a matter of established policy.

If the Commission's conciliation should fail, the law provides for the appointment by the Governor of a separate Board of Review consisting of three members, one of whom shall be a lawyer licensed to practice in this state. The Board of Review would hear all the facts in the case and would either dismiss the complaint or would order any action necessary to remedy the discriminatory practice found. If either the Commission or the respondent is not satisfied with the ruling of the Board, either party may appeal the decision to the District Court. Only the court has ultimate enforcement power. Refusal to comply with an order of the court would make the violator guilty of contempt of court.

The existence of an impartial agency to investigate and adjust complaints and charges of discrimination acts as a safety valve and reduces the probability that the members of an aggrieved group will stir up trouble in the community. There is no case on record of boycotting or picketing being use in connection with any complaint handled by a fair employment commission.

3. It has been claimed that employers might be forced to hire incompetents whom they do not want and who might ruin their business.

The whole purpose of the law is to persuade employers to carry out the principle of employment on merit. No commission would ask an employer to hire a less competent person if a more competent applicant were available. In fact, the law provides exactly the reverse, that is, that an employer must not refuse to hire the most competent applicant for any given position solely becuase of prejudice against him on the basis of his race, religion or national origin.

Commissions do not question the hiring standards established by the employer, so long as they are not designed to exclude applicants from consideration on the above grounds. Commissions recognize that not only training and experience, but also personality, appearance, the ability to get along with fellow workers and many other subjective factors enter into the choice of a desirable employee. The law rejects the unsound theory that these desirable qualities are possessed only by the members of some particular racial, religious or nationality group. It recognizes

that these qualities are distributed among individuals in every group. There is not a single case on record of any employer's business having been injured by following the policies recommended by a fair employment practice commission.

4. An employer's business may be injured by hiring minority group workers because customers will be driven away.

The experience of employers who have hired the members of different racial, religious and nationality groups in public contact positions shows that this fear is unfounded. Over the past five years, the Dayton Company in Minneapolis has employed Negro workers in sales and other positions throughout the store. On the basis of their favorable experience, Donald Dayton says, "We have been operating with people from many minority groups for some time. The difficulties of integration into our organization which we feared might arise, just never did. Both the public and our own employees seemed to receive the plan with hearty approval."

Such favorable experience is in line with that of other states which have been operationg under fair employment laws, and may be explained by a number of factors. When people are seeking to buy goods or to obtain business services, they are more concerned about the quality of the goods and services, than about superficial characteristics of the people who may provide them. People often make prejudiced remarks through thoughtless adherence to old habits; they are much less likely to follow up such remarks by discriminatory action when they are offered service by a member of the group against which their remarks may have been directed. Studies have shown that people are inclined to accept the fait accompli. Prejudiced people are less likely than others to initiate any movement which goes against the mores of the group. They tend to be conformists. Most of our fellow citizens, on the other hand, are decent reasonable people who believe in equal opportunity and fair play, and who obey the law.

5. Employees may not be willing to work with members of minority groups whom an employer is forced to hire; this would cause the employer serious difficulties and ruin his business.

The arguments given in answer to question 4 apply with equal force here. We might add that there are very few instances under existing fair employment practice laws in which an employer has been "forced" to hire any particular applicant. In almost all cases, the work of the Commission has caused the employer to study the problem and to examine the experience of other employers in dealing with it. He has thus become convinced that the difficulties which he fears will not arise. He has then proceeded to employ the members of formerly excluded groups, not because of force exerted by the Commission, but because they were the best qualified applicants available for particular jobs.

Joseph J. Morrow, Personnel Manager of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Connecticut, in discussing the Connecticut Act said recently: "If I were asked to select a single fact which impressed me more than anything else in carrying out our program of integrating the Negro worker, I would choose just this: The difficulties one expects to encounter in initiating such a program materialize to the extent of about five percent of what was anticipated. The 'Bogey Man' of race prejudice can hardly fail to disappear when it is really brought into the daylight and put to the test of normal day-by-day contacts."

Minority group members who qualify for a given job are likely to have education and background similar or equivalent to that of their fellow employees. To many who have thought of minority group peoples in terms of stereotypes only, this is an educational and a broadening experience.

6. It is charged that this bill "will encourage complaints no matter how unjustified."

On the contrary, commissions dismiss groundless complaints on their own initiative without formal proceedings and before there is any contact with the employer. Even the opponents of fair employment legislation remark that the number of individual complaints of discrimination has not been excessive.

The commissions protect employers against unfounded charges of discrimination. In about 25% of the cases in Minneapolis and approximately the same percentage in New York State, the result of investigation has enabled the commission to assure the complainant that no discrimination has been practiced. Both complaintants and parties charged agree that it has been of great value to them to have an impartial agency investigate complaints and clear the air of suspicion and misunderstandings. The commissions have operated to ease tensions and to build improved relations between the members of different racial, religious and nationality groups. When there is no law and no commission the minority group member who believes himself to be discriminated against has no recourse, and is likely not only to become embittered, but to pass that bitterness on to his fellows.

7. The opponents sometimes claim that the law would create other serious problems for employers. Five different arguments may be grouped under this heading.

(a) The railroads could no longer employ only colored people for dining car and Pullman service; this would put them to much expense and inconvenience.

It is true that it is just as discriminatory to exclude qualified white workers from consideration for any job, as it is to exclude qualified workers from other groups. There is no reason why prohibiting such discrimination by law should cause the Pullman Company or any other employer any expense or inconvenience. It would simply give them a broader labor market from which to select the best qualified workers.

(b.) "If Southern mothers and wives and daughters are to be examined by Negro doctors.....our Southern customers will simply go to some other state and hospital where no FEPC law exists. Our Minnesota hospitals have become a great institution for the good of all mankind besides bringing millions of dollars into this state. Should their success and progress be endangered by a law of this kind?"

Since no hospital would be required to employ any but the most skilled, competent, and ethical doctors which it could find, no patient would be in any way endangered. And since no patient would be required to consult any particular doctor he would be free to indulge his personal preferences, even though they involved racial or religious prejudice. At the same time patients from all over the world, of varying skin colors and religions, who likewise patronize famous hospitals, would be favorably impressed by the honesty of American democracy.

In New York City, where the law against discrimination in employment has been in effect over the longest period of time, the major hospitals successfully employ Negro physicians, as well as the members of other racial and religious groups. Numerous examples can be given in the South, as well as in other parts of the country, in which white patients have selected Negro physicians because of their professional skill.

Integration is daily becoming less difficult, even in the South. The American Nurses' Association publication, An American Challenge, states: "The American Nurses' Association....has always sought to extend its membership to all professional registered nurses, regardless of race, color, or background....It is

ANA's policy...to eliminate discrimination in job opportunity, salary or other working conditions...To integrate minority groups within the framework of membership...To establish the integrity of every member of the ANA as a person, as a citizen, and as a member of the hreat and honorable profession of nursing."

The first professional Negro nurse was graduated in New England in 1879 and the American Nurses' Association accepted registered Negro nurses into membership as early as 1898, or one year after it was founded.

Since fifteen states and one district excluded qualified nurses on a racial basis from membership in their alumnae associations, which were then the ANA basis of membership, a National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses was formed in 1908, and ANA cooperated closely with it and assisted in financing it.

After World War II, however, one Southern state after another removed its restrictions against Negro nurses, so that they are now accepted in all but four of the 48 states. Partly as a result of the competent service of 512 commissioned Negro nurses in the United State Army and over 2000 Negro nurses enrolled in the United States Cadet Corps during World War II, the American people began to recognize that nursing and the need for nursing are universal, and that professional competence should be the criterion.

Typical of the progress being made in inegration in the South today is the fact that a Negro nurse has been twice elected to the board of directors of the Florida State Nurses' Association and in North Carolina recently Negro and white nurses attended a state Nurses' Association meeting together in one of the best North Carolina hotels with no difficulty.

(c) The bill would prevent employers engaged in defense work from screening out poor security risks and subversives.

This is a completely mistaken idea. The law contains a specific provision authorizing the employer to comply with all the security requirements which may be established by state and federal government agencies.

(d)"Some jobs require discrimination". "It is good business practice to employ a Norwegian salesman in a Norwegian community and to discriminate against all others". How far would a Negro salesman representing a Minnesota company get in Alabama?

The jobs which "require" discrimination, such as those in religious institutions, are exempted from covdrage by the law. A requirement that a salesman must know the Norwegian language if he is to sell in a Norwegian community would not be a violation of the law. The argument that a salesman must be of the same racial, religious or nationality group as his customers is simply not true. The skill of the salesman far outweighs the influence of his race, religion or national origin in determing the success of his work.

(e) The bill would prevent employers from exercising their judgment in considering such qualifications as personality traits, temperament, suitability, compatibility, apperance, etc., in building up their personnel.

This is completely false. The law and the commissions recognize the importance of all the foregoing factors in selecting the most desirable employee for any particular job.

8. This legislation would prevent business expansion within or into the state and would drive business out of the state. Cometitor states do not have such a bill. Taxes and freight rates in Minnesota are already unfavorabe to business;we are a long way from raw materials and from large markets, and our workmen's compensation laws and resulting insurance rates are a burden to industry.

A fair employment practice law is an aid and not a burden to industry, so there is no reason why it should prevent business expansion or drive business out of the state. It opens up a larger labor market. The fact is that states and cities operating under FEPC laws have not lost business to other states. On January 5, 1949, four year after the establishment of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, Governor Dewey states; "Business activity and employment remain at unprecedented levels for times of peace. The number of business establishments has increased by 5% in the last year. Last year the personal income of our people aggregated some 27 billion dollars -- an all time high." The executive officers of the Minneapolis Chanber of Commerce have stated that no case has come to their attention in which the existence of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Ordinance has ever been discussed by a business firm in connection with a decision to either abandon or to establish a business enterprise in Minneapolis.

9. Certain minority groups will not work together; there might be bloodshed if employers were not permitted to segregate Mexican Nationals, Puerto Ricans, Jamaicans, Bahamans,etc.

Of course, it is true that intergroup misunderstandings may result when people from different groups, and perhaps having different languages and cultures, are prevented by segregation from becoming acquainted with each other as individuals. An effective state fair employment practice commission would greatly help well-intentioned employers to solve any conflicts which might develop between workers who might speak different languages and have different cultual backgrounds.

The argument that people of different groups cannot work together in harmony and good will is simply the product of ignorance and prejudice. Experience is the answer. Whereever FEPC laws have been passed, critics have found the ground pulled out from under their feet. The frequently predicted friction among employees of different racial and religious backgrounds has simply failed to develop. Firms that have given fair employment practice a fair trial have found their fears unjustified.

10. Employers are justified in asking, "Granted that fair employment laws have been well administered in most of the states which have passed them, as well as in Minneapolis, how do we know that with a new Minnesota fair employment administration we would not fall victims to a prying, meddlesome or tyrannical bureaucracy?"

Fortunately a national precedent has been set and a pattern for fair employment administration established. Administrators have taken pride in their constructive and conciliatory educational approach and their remarkable national record of 99.86% success in handling cases by negotiation without resort to public hearing or court action. Surely Minnesota business leaders who would be included on the commission the Governor would appoint could be expected to assure the selection as administrators a qualified staff of judgment and integrity.

* * * * * * * * *

These questions were asked us at the Rochester Convention by our own members:

1. "Must an employer employ drunken Indians?"
2. "Indians are our only problem. They won't work."
3. "What recourse do employers have if employment of Indians, or Negroes or other minority groups causes stable help to leave their employment. Then can the employer fire them?"

Our answers to these questions are:

1. No. No employer would be required to employ drunken Indians, or drunken Norwegians, or drunken Irish, or any other drunken applicant. He would, however, be required to give a sober industrious qualified Indian the same consideration as any such applicant whose skin was white.
2. Any Indian who literally won't work (we assume you mean after he is hired) can be fired for incompetence the same as any other employee, and a fair employment commission would stand back of the employer who fired him. Wether or not he was an Indian should have nothing to do with the case.
3. Experience shows that employees don't quit their jobs if they know that an employer means business in obeying the law. They may threaten to do so, but when it comes to a "show down" they think better of it. No, the employer could not fire a competent minority group worker because someone else was prejudiced against him. Yet after several years experience in New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, the Chairmen of these 3 commissions testified that no employer in any of the 3 states had complained of this kind of difficulty.

* * * * * * * * *

Has your community a special problem also? If so we should like to help you with it.

HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION?

Section II

HOW WOULD A FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW AFFECT THE COMMUNITY?

1. Opponents of Fair Employment Legislation have said that the law is itself discriminatory; it is class legislation. It discriminated against the employer. It discriminates against the majority, giving members of minority groups special privileges. Employers will feel compelled to discriminate in favor of persons belonging to minority groups.

This legislation confers no special benefit or grants, no special privilege to the members of any group. It simply puts all workers on the same basis -- that of being considered for employment in accordance with their skills. The commissions have held that any quota system is discriminatory and may work an injustice to members of either the majority or the minority groups.

The fair employment practice laws do not require an employer to hire any workers from minority racial, religious, or nationality groups. They simply prohibit excluding workers from consideration because of the irrelevant factors of race, religion, national origin or ancestry. In effect, they say that these factors have nothing to do with ability to do the job and that the employer should pay no attention to them, one way or the other.

The law applies to employers, employment agencies and labor unions. It benefits employers and certainly does not discriminate against them. In this connection, York Langton, Sales Extension Manager of Coast-to-Coast Stores, says, "The law backs up the businessmen, labor leaders, and employment agency managers wo want to practice the sound policy of non-discrimination."

2. It would increase our tax burdens.

We believe that the law would reduce tax burdens rather than increase them. The very moderate cost of administering the proposed law would be more than offset by two positive factors. On the one hand, there would be a reduction in the costs of police protection and health and welfare services now required to combat the poverty, delinquency and crime which are among the unfortunate by-products of discrimination. On the other hand, the increased incomes which would result from the full use of every worker's higher skills would result in increased tax revened to the state.

It would be much more economical and efficient to administer a state-wide fair employment law than a city ordinace in one or more cities. It would also be cheaper and more efficient to administer a State fair employment law than a voluntary education program supported by employers. The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce spent $31,500 in 15 months for an unsuccessful voluntary education program before it agreed to a compulsory FEPC ordinance. Yet the amount which was requested for a year's budget for the proposed Minnesota state law is only $40,000.

3. This type of legislation might develop heretofore nonexistent antagonism to members of minority groups and create more problems that it would solve. Forced association will complicate and accentuate problems which are best worked out by development of a relationship of friendly cooperation. Employers and employees, who, if left to themselves would be willing to effect integration by gradual degrees, will be resentful and resistant if forced to do so by law.

There has been no evidence that this legislation creates prejudices that did not already exist. Bringing our hidden prejudices into the light is the best way to get rid of them.

In actual practice, the commissions have not found strong general feelings of prejudice that would cause people to be unwilling to work beside the members of other groups. They have found instead ignorance, apathy, and misunderstanding. The legislation has proved to be a very appropriate and effective instrument with which to attack these problems. The effect of bringing people of different groups together in ordinary work situations has served to eliminate prejudice rather than to create antagonism.

There is no disparity between "development of a relationship of friendly cooperation" and fair employment legislation. Friendly cooperation has been the basic principle on which fair employment commissions throughout the country have been operating. Experience has shown that employees are inclined to accept and obey fair employment laws, rather than to resist them. A wise and public-spirited employer would do well to accept the help of experienced and qualified fair employment administrators in solving any problems which might arise in connection with integration. His attitude toward the law is likely to be reflected by his employees.

4. If we pass a fair employment bill in Minnesota we shall be faced with large-scale immigration of Negroes from states which do not have such laws; they will bring with them serious problems of ignorance, disease, delinquency, housing, law enforcement, unemployment, and dependency. They will compete with our present citizens for jobs. "The Minnesota business man knows that already our labor supply exceeds our labor market."

A migratory movement of both Negro and white workers out of the South and toward the North and West has been under way since the first world war. It waned during the depression and then continued in increasing volume during the second world war and since that time. There is no evidence that the presence of fair employment practice laws has anything to do with the amount of migration into particular cities or states. The people, both white and Negro, are making these moves because of the greater opportunities and the more favorable living conditions in the North and West than they experience in the South. A migration from rural to urban areas all over the country is another important trend.

Analysis of 1950 census figures shows that the largest increase in non-white populations over the 10 year period between 1940 and 1950 did not take place in the Northeastern section of the country, which has the largest percentage of FEPC states and also the states which have had fair employment laws the longest time, but in the Western states, where there is the largest increase in the white population also, and where only one state had adopted a fair employment law before 1949. Three quarters of the states in this Western block do not have fair employment laws yet. California, where the non-white population has increased more than 100%, is not an FEPC state. We should bear in mind, also, that even a large percentage increase in non-white population does not represent such a startling change when we realize that only Missouri, Illinois, and Michigan (all non-FEPC states)among the North Central states have a concentration of a little over 7% non-white population, and that a 74% increase in Oregon brings the non-white population of that state to a little less than 2% while the South still retains 68% of the Negro population in the country.

Since, however, there is a definite and continuing trend for Southern populations to migrate, fair employment laws or no fair employment laws, we should be wise to set up the kind of favorable conditions which will encourage them to develop their highest skills and become productive and self-reliant citizens. This constitutes and additional reason for the adoption of the state law against discrimination in employment.

HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION?

Section III

DO WE NEED A LAW?

1. The opponents sometimes say that Minnesota does not need fair employment legislation.

(a) "People in Minnesota do not discriminate".

It is noteworthy that the same person who made this statement also wrote "Every intelligent person knows that a problem does exist." (He was pleading for a voluntary plan). The fact is that the practice of discrimination in the state is widespread and serious. It will not correct itself, but it can be readily corrected by forthright action. An effective instrument for taking such action will be created by the adoption of the proposed bill.

(b) In November, 1949, the Twin Cities were given a national award because they had been "outstanding in their treatment and conduct of racial problems".

The award given by the National Conference of Christians and Jews does not prove that there is no need for a fair employment practice law in Minnesota. The award was made, not because the Twin Cities had solved all their problems, but because they were judged to have made the greatest progress in intergroup relations during 1948.

In that year all the agencies working in the field of human relations and civil rights carried on successful programs of education and action. In 1948, the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission received its first appropriation from the City Council. In cooperation with the Joint Committee for Employment Opportunity, the Urban League, the Minnesota Jewish Council, the Mayor's Council on Human Relations, and other agencies, it made substantial progress toward increasing employment opportunities for minority workers.

The opponents of the bill made no contribution whatever, through educational work or otherwise, to the progress upon which the award was based. Those who contributed most to that progress advocate the enactment of a state fair employment practice law.

2. "No acute problem now exists in Minnesota

(a) We have only about 22,000 colored people in our whole state."

Even this relatively small number represents an important source of manpower. Futhermore, the problem of discrimination is not limited to non-white applicants; the members of different racial and religious groups face serious barriers in some areas and in some types of employment. Finally, the question of discrimination is not simply a matter of statistics but is an ethical problem. The welfare of 22,000 of our fellow citizens should be of concern to all the people in the state. We must take vigorous action against disrimination if we are to prove our faith in democracy and our support of the principles of human dignity and individual freedom upon which our nation was founded.

(b.) "There is practically no unemployment of minority group workers — no higher percentage than of any other group."

Studies of this question by such agencies as the United States Employment Service, the Governor's Interracial Commission, the Minneapolis Self-Survey, the Urban Leagues of Minneapolis and St.Paul, and the N.A.A.C.P., have shown the reverse to be true. Consideration of this question is not complete and realistic unless it takes into account the fact that minority group workers tend to be the last hired and the first fired, as soon as a recession sets in.

However, the principal problem attacked by the law is not the problem of unemployment but the problem of under-employment. The problem of unemployment of minority group members, or of any other workers, is not serious in today's prosperous labor market. Nevertheless, there is a great loss of potential productive power when college graduates, skilled machinists, or able sales men and women are restricted to laboring jobs. Still more serious is the failure of the members of minority groups to obtain the training which would best utilize their potential skills.

(c) More Negroes are employed in St.Paul than in Minneapolis, although Minneapolis has an FEPC ordinance and St.Paul does not.

Statements that more Negroes are employed in St.Paul than in Minneapolis or that they hold more responsible jobs in St.Paul are without foundation. No comprehensive studies have been made which would warrant comparative statements. Progress has been made in both cities. Many people think that they observe somewhat more favorable patterns in Minneapolis. The two cities interact on each other. Many organizations with branches in both cities cooperate closely, and a number of stores have branches in both cities. There is competion and rivalry between them. Likewise they benefit by each other's experience. Furthermore, there have been clear indications that the prospect of the State Legislature's enacting a fair employment law in the near future has stimulated progress in St.Paul.

3. St.Paul employers attempted to set up a voluntary plan; the St.Paul Urban League turned it down.

The refusal of the St.Paul Urban League to endorse certain features of the so-called voluntary FEPC proposed by a group of St.Paul employers was based on the conviction that the plan offered no substantial benefits and was designed primarily to prevent the enactment of a state fair employment practice law.

The position of the St.Paul Urban League points up one imprtant fact which advocates of voluntary plans fail to take into consideration. Minority group members who believe themselves to be discriminated against do not have faith or confidence that they can obtain even-handed justice from grievance machinery which employers would set up voluntarily. There is nothing surprising about this: we would not expect labor unions to accept arbitration boards or bargaining machinery set up voluntarily by management, and controlled completely by employers.

There is a place for an employers' voluntary program, but it should be supplementary to legislation, and should not try to substitute for it. Employers who advocate a voluntary program unsupported by law are either using this device to pigeonhole and postpone action, or they have failed to make as careful and evaluation of the probable cost in effort and money of such a program as they would make of any other proposed business project. Experience has demonstrated that the voluntary plan alone is ineffective, expensive, and full of headaches. (See Section IV)

4. Where FEPC commissions have existed there have been few complaints, and many of these have been found to be unjustified.

The number of cases dealt with is no measure of the value of this legislation or of the effectiveness of the commission's work. It is not violation but compliance with the law that is the measure of its value. Experience has shown that the adjustment of a single case in one establishment has often improved the employment patterns in many kindred instituions. There is no question that this legislation has led to major changes in employment policy. Such changes have been made by a great number of employers, unions, and employment agencies which have never been involved in any complaints of discrimination.

5. We are not ready to take such a sweeping step.

There is nothing experimental or revolutionary about the enactment of a law against discrimination in employment. Four states and 1 city have had fair employment laws since 1945, 7 states and 3 cities have had them since 1947, and a total of 11 states and 25 municipalities are now operating under fair employment legislation. We have found in the literature no complaints from employers where these laws are in force; the only criticism has come from a few people who have felt that the commissions have been too lenient, and that they have leaned over backwards to avoid using enforcement. We must realize the critical urgency of action against discrimination if we are to win the fight for freedom and democracy throughout the world. In this connection, Abbott Washburn, former Public Serviced Director of General Mills, more recently Executive Vice-Chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, and now in charge of General Eisenhower's Denver campaign headquarters, says: "The best answer to Communist slander is making democracy work better here at home. One of the best ways to do this is to pass sound social legislation of fair employment type, legislation designed to strengthen our democratic freedoms. Such action strengthens our own country. It heartens the free world."

HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Section IV

ARE THERE BETTER WAYS OF ACHIEVING EMPLOYMENT ON MERIT?

1. The opponents sometimes state that it can be done better by education than by legislation: "you can't legislate morals and human understanding." "Let us work it out in a Christian manner." The objectives of the legislation can be better achieved by setting up educational agencies without enforcement powers. "The problem is being met in Minnesota by education and understanding...dozens of firms are added each year to the hundreds already employing colored people."

The fair employment practice acts do not attempt to legislate morals; they merely prohibit illegal acts of discrimination. There is no conflict between the proposed legislation and a program of education. This legislation provides for the use of every effective educational device.

The kind of education that changes attitudes of prejudice is that which comes about when, on a normal, everday basis, workers come to know the members of other racial, religious, and nationality groups who are like themselves in terms of education, training, and skill. It is this kind of education that is accomplished by fair employment practice legislation and this is the process through which good human relations will be established among all of the peoples of America and the world.

In this connection, Lloyd Hale, President of the G.H. Tennant Company of Minneapolis, and Chairman of the Minneapolis Industrial Manpower Committee, said, "While I believe civil rights problems are solved only through education, good legislation is helpful in speeding up the educational process." Likewise, Harry A. Bullis, Chairman of the Board of General Mills, Inc., recently wrote: " I believe the greatest value of the FEP ordinance has been educational. It has caused management to review employment policies and to endeavor to get rid of old prejudices."

We may cite here again (See Section II, 2) the very extensive and ambitious attempt of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce to achieve fair employment by a voluntary educational program. After a year of experience and study, they abandoned the voluntary plan and supported the adoption of a compulsory fair employment practice law. The following excerpt from an editorial from The Cleveland Press, dated January 31, 1950, covers this point: "VOLUNTARY FEPC DIDN'T WORK: NOW CITY GETS THE REAL THING. Cleveland can be proud of its new fair employment practices ordinance --- proud that it is again a pioneer in the field of intelligent race relations and proud that the decision was taken deliberately and thoughtfully.

"In the process, this community learned a lot which should be helpful, Most important, we learned that a voluntary FEPC, no matter how diligently and sincerely run, is almost valueless.

"Cleveland was fortunate indeed that its Chamber of Commerce set up and operated a thorough, conscientious and spirited voluntary FEPC, Its program was so good, in fact, that Philadelphia, which has compulsory FEPC, borrowed many of the educational and promotional ideas generated by Cleveland's excellent committee.

"But the voluntary plan simply wasn't enough. There was no noticeable change in the employment of minority groups. There was plenty of goodwill, but practically no jobs.

"Yesterday, the Chamber's committee in effect admitted failure. With a minor change, they agreed to a compulsory FEPC, which Council promptly passed, 25 to 7.

"The important thing is that Cleveland has legislated with courage against racial and religious discrimination in employing its citizens."

2. Some opponents of a state fair employment law have claimed that this is a problem which should be handled by each local community individually; it chiefly concerns the three large cities.

It is undoubtedly more efficient and will involve less total cost to the citizens of the state to deal with the problem of discrimination in employment through a single agency with state-wide coverage than through setting up seperate agencies in each local community. It is not true that the problem is limited to the three largest cities or that it can be handled adequately by the city governments of Minneapolis, St.Paul and Duluth. For one thing, an important portion of industrial employment in the Minneapolis, St.Paul and Duluth metropolitan areas lies outside the city limits of these communities and outside the jurisdiction of their municipal government authorities. Furthermore, the largest racial minority in the state is the American Indian group. Only a very small proportion of the Indian people in the state reside in the principal cities. In this connection, the ethical aspects of the problem should again be emphasized and the citizens of Minnesota should not lose this opportunity to take positive action in support of freedom and democracy throughout the state.

HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION?

Section V

WHO DRAFTED? WHO SUPPORTS? and WHO OPPOSES THIS BILL?

1. Opponents have said that the bill is supported by impractical idealists, politicians, and radicals. "It is strictly Marxian socialism in nature." "This type of legislation was the main plank of the Communist platform - also of Henry Wallace's platform." "This bill is proposed by politicians who are wooing the votes of minority group members."

Fortunately for the citizens of America, the Communist party has no prior claim to the conviction that all men are created equal and are endowed with certain inalienable rights. A fair employment practice law is one of the basic steps in making effective the guarantee of civil rights set forth in our Constitution.

The first state to enact a fair employment law was New York in 1945, with bipartisan support in a legislature which had a Republican majority and under the leadership of Republican governor Thomas E. Dewey. While support of fair employment legislation usually cuts across party lines, Republicans point with pride to the fact that of the other 10 states which have passed fair employment legislation, 6 were enacted by Republican legislatures and Republican governors, 1 by a Republican senate and a Republican governor, and 1 by a Republican legislature.

Democrats, on the other hand, remind us that in 1941 President Roosevelt's Executive Order 8002 first established a federal fair employment practices commission as a war measure. In 1947 President Truman appointed the Committee on Civil Rights, headed by Charles E. Wilson, President of the General Electric Corporation, which, after an exhaustive study of discrimination against minorities in all phases of our national existence, recommended fair employment legislation at both the state and national level. Pursuant to these recommendations President Truman directed the establishment of a Fair Employment Board in the Civil Service Commission which administers an executive order prohibiting discrimination in Government employment. The President also directed that all government contracts include a provision that private contractors will treat applicants for employment and employees non-discriminatorily. A group of distinguished private citizens was appointed to oversee administration of the order.

In 1948 both Republicans and Democrats included Civil Rights planks in their national platforms calling upon Congress to safeguard the rights of all citizens of any race, color or religion, to equal opportunity for employment.

Governor Adlai E. Stevenson has demonstrated clearly where he stands on fair employment legislation; he worked for a fair employment law in his own state of Illinois and declared himself openly, even in the Southern state of Virginia as standing strongly behind the national Democratic Civil Rights plank, which calls for the enactment of a Federal fair employment law. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower has said that this is a problem for the individual state to handle, that he would try to get the states to pass such laws. Although he said "in law itself we do not find the answer always", he added, "However, I really believe that each state should get this thing on its books in such a way so that each of its citizens may understand exactly where it is.. where he is." He also said "My own belief is this: No true American worthy of the name would want deliberately to exclude another American from full opportunity to enjoy every right guaranteed him under the Constitution. If he does, there is something wrong, and we must get at it."

It is difficult or impossible to compare the contributions made to fair employment legislation by the two major parties in this country. Whatever Communist support there has been, on the other hand, has been of comparatively minor importance and has been a liability, rather than an asset.

The bill which was introduced into the 1951 session of the Minnesota Legislature, and of which we send you a copy, was drafted, as the accompanying statement tells you, by a large and representative group of Minnesota citizens, including legislative leaders of both Republican and Democratic-Farmer-Labor parties, businessmen, civic leaders,

labor representatives, representatives of minority groups, and law and human relations experts. It was endorsed by both parties, was sponsored in both the House and the Senate by legislative leaders of both parties, and was urged by Governor Youngdahl. The 1952 state convention of both parties have again included fair employment legislation in their platforms, and both candidates for the governorship and also for the lieutenant governorship have declared themselves in favor of it.

The endorsements indicated in the answer to the next question, and in other parts of this report, from thoughtful, responsible, and informed businessmen and civic leaders who have gone on record in support of this bill will show that any implication that this proposal is Communistic in origin, in purpose, or in effect, is simply a false statement designed to arouse emotional antagonism to the bill.

The number of minority group voters in the state is not large enough to constitute a threat to any office-seeker. It is the 72% of Minnesota citizens who have declared themselves in the Minnesota Poll as favoring fair employment legislation, of whom our representatives in the legislature should take cognizance. The support of the law by the political leadership of both parties is based upon the conviction that it is sound policy and that it will benefit all the citizens of the state.

2. The opponents sometimes say that many people are opposed to the bill. "Industry, large and small, is opposed to it."

Most of the opposition to the bill is based on lack of information or misinformation as to the actual operating experience with this kind of legislation in other cities and states. Informed businessmen favor this proposal. The following names of responsible business leaders in Minnesota are taken from the list of those who supported the bill in 1951:

Julius Barnes, Duluth, President, Barnes Shipbuilding Co., Former President of U. S. Chamber of Commerce

Donald C. Dayton, Minneapolis; President and General Manager, The Dayton Co., Chairman, Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc.

Harry A. Bullis, Minneapolis; Chairman of the Board, General Mills, Inc.

Bradshaw Mintener, Vice-President & General Counsel, Pillsbury Mills; former chairman, Minn. Methodist Conference

S. S. Grais, President, Gray's Drug Store, Inc., St. Paul

Lloyd Hale, Minneapolis; President, G. H. Tennant Co.; Chairman, Minneapolis Industrial Manpower Committee

D. W. Onan, Minneapolis; Chairman of the Board, D. W. Onan & Sons, Inc.

Campbell W. Elliott, Hopkins; Vice-President in charge of Industrial Relations, Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Company

York Langton, Minneapolis; Trade Extension Manager, Coast-to-Coast Stores; President, Minnesota United Nations Association

Warren Burger, St. Paul; Attorney, Vice-Chairman, St. Paul Council of Human Relations

George M. Jensen, Minneapolis; Vice-President, The Maico Co., Inc.; Chairman, Minn. Council for FEPC

Arthur Randall, Minneapolis; Vice-President in charge of Personnel, D. W. Onan & Sons, Inc.

Stuart W. Leck, Minneapolis; President, James Leck Co., Builders; President, Citizens League of Greater Minneapolis

Abbott Washburn, Minneapolis; former Public Services Director, General Mills, Inc. now in charge of General Eisenhower's Denver hdqtrs.

These are not only some of the most outstanding names in Minnesota business, but most of them had been operating in the one city in the state where a fair employment ordinance had already been in force for three years.

3. In 1951 the claim was made that "Forty states and our American Congress have turned it down." This statement is definitely erroneous. The National Congress, due to the failure of the Senate to impose cloture on debate, has not yet had an opportunity to either accept or reject a Federal fair employment practice law.

As to the 40 states, quite the contrary of the opponent's statement is true. Beginning with New York in 1944, attempts have been made to pass fair employment laws in 27 states. 11 states have now passed laws, and in addition 25 cities with an aggregate population of over 9 million people have passed ordinances. This brings the total of people who are successfully doing business under some form of fair employment legislation to over 60 million in 18 states, or well over 1/3 of the population of the United States. If we add to this the states which have anti-discrimination legislation applying to some but not all occupations, or to religion but not to race, we find only 8 states which are not included. (There are at least 152 of these laws in 28 states) 8 city ordinances were passed in 1951 and 5 more have already been added to the list in 1952. No state has repealed its fair employment laws.

Here we see the same pattern that has marked every new approach to the solution of human and economic problems — workmen's compensation laws, child labor laws, free public education came first in the more progressive states and were gradually adopted throughout the nation.

Fair Employment marches on! We hope that Minnesota, as a great progressive state, will assume its proper position of leadership in this movement.

HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION?

Section VI

IS A FAIR EMPLOYMENT BILL WORKABLE? AND IS IT CONSTITUTIONAL?

1. It is charged that the bill "will subject employers to public hearings and legal prosecution for acts which might be subject to a variety of interpretations or judged on the basis of intangible factors".

(a) It has been contended that it is impossible to prove discriminatory practices in employment.

Discrimination can be proved by the acts and statements of persons against whom a complaint is lodged. In many cases discrimination is flagrant and revealed by union contracts, newspaper advertising, or discriminatory job orders. In other cases, an employer's pattern of rejections or statements made to personnel officers indicates discrimination. It is no more difficult to prove discrimination in employment than to prove the violation of any other law in which the intent of the violator is a matter of importance.

(b) How can an enforcement agency determine whether discrimination exists in an employer's mind? "The commission will 'guess' many an employer guilty."

The law deals with acts of discrimination, not with discrimination in an employer's mind. The burden of proof always rests with the complainant in supporting a charge of discrimination. It is true that this proof is often difficult to establish. Where it cannot be established the case is either dismissed or tabled for further evidence. The Minneapolis Fair Employment Commission, after five years' experience, reported that in 40% of all cases brought before it, no discrimination had been found and another 6% were tabled for further evidence. In only 49% of cases was the complaint judged to be justified. E very case, however, had educational value for either the complainant or the employer or both.

Comparison of the qualifications of the rejected applicant and others employed, and examination of the employment records of the company to determine whether it employs any minority group members are two kinds of evidence which are sometimes useful, although not necessarily conclusive unless supported by other evidence. The ultimate recourse of an employer who feels that he has been unjustly accused is an established court of law, where evidence must meet the same standards as for any other law.

As a practical matter, only four out of more than five thousand cases in the entire nation have been taken to court since the first commission was established in 1945 (See Section I, 2). In all of the other cases, proof of discrimination was not a critical question. The conciliation process simply served to make certain that a sound policy of employment on merit was established and maintained. The commission is concerned primarily not with proving guilt, but with establishing employment on the basis of merit.

2. "It does not seem....that the problem of the Jew and the Negro and sufficiently alike that they can both be dealt with in the same manner, either by law or otherwise"

This is not true, and this argument is simply designed to divide some of the groups supporting the proposed bill. The practice of discrimination in employment is essentially the same regardless of the group against which it may be directed. Fair employment practice laws protect every individual against discrimination because of his race, color, regligion or national origin. More complaints are received from some groups than from others because the members of these groups more often encounter the barriers of discrimination.

The procedures established by the law have been proved to be sound and effective instruments for dealing with the problem of discrimination, wherever it may be found. In Minneapolis both racial and religious minorites had recourse to the law; 78% of complaints referred to the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practices Commission were based on alleged racial discrimination and 18% were based on alleged religious discrimination.

3. A fair employment law would be unconstitutional.

No competent lawyer seriously questions the constitutionality of the proposed bill. The suggestion that the proposed law would be unconstitutional has not been seriously argued, even by the opponents, at the hearings that have been held by committees of the state legislature. The question of constitutionality has been thoroughly studied by Judge Edward F. Waite, retired Judge of the District Court. His article, appearing in Volume 32, Number 4, of the Minnesota Law Review, dated March, 1948, ends with the following words: "Does it not therefore seem as certain as a matter to be determined by human judgment can ever be in advance of the actual test, that this bill, if passed in substantially its 1947 form, will be held constitutional?"

* * * * *

Asked for a comment on this manuscript and WHY THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS WANTS A FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW FOR MINNESOTA, two young college graduated remarked, "The opposition puts up many arguments which sound convincing but are based on hypothesis and conjecture; most of the arguments of the proponents are drawn from actual experience."

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 South Tenth Street, Room 406
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

September, 1952

Additional Copies- 5¢

WHY THE MINNESOTA LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS WANTS A FAIR EMPLOYMENT LAW FOR MINNESOTA

After a year of careful study the Minnesota League of Women Voters participated in the 1951 attempt to pass a fair employment law for Minnesota. Following further study, the May 1952 annual convention voted to resume efforts to pass such legislation.

We ask our legislators to support a law which puts emphasis on education and conciliation but which provides court procedure for ultimate enforcement in any extreme case which does not yield to conciliation. We ask their support for the following reasons:

I. Americans all believe that employment on merit is morally right; equal opportunity for equal ability is basic to the American ideology.

A. We believe that no person should be denied employment because of his race, religion, or national origin.
That the discrimination which we practice belies the democracy which we profess is the American paradox and the American dilemma, according to the great Swedish social economist, Gunnar Myrdal, who says, "The glaring disparity between, on the one hand, the high and uncompromising ideals adhered to in a sense by the entire nation and, on the other hand, the very spotted reality causes Americans and foreigners to accuse America of hypocrisy, but this nation is not hypocritical in the ordinary sense of the word. It is the least cynical of all nations. It confesses its sins to the entire world and labors persistently with its moral problems. And here again is the glory of America that it has a national conscience and that it does not get peace with its conscience before it has entirely reformed itself."

B. Employment on merit helps to make the theory of democratic government a reality. It strengthens our nation by
1. Clearing our conscience
2. Restoring hope and faith to our fellow-citizens who have been the victims of discrimination.
3. Setting up a machinery of justice as a recourse for those who believe their rights to have been violated. This would act as a safety valve and would prevent the development of explosive underground tensions and bitterness.

II. If we in the leading democracy of the world can put our own house in order
A. We shall hearten the free world.
B. We may be able to win the confidence of a large fraction of the 65% of the world's population who are colored.
C. We shall wrest from Communism what has been its more effective propoganda weapon against us.

III. Fair Employment is good business.
A. "The basis of the free enterprise system in America is the concept of free opportunity. It would appear to be good business to support the concept", according to John A. Davis, writing in the July, 1952 issue of Fortune magazine on fair employment without discrimination, and the success of fair employment laws in the states where they have been tried.
B. Fair employment helps to eliminate waste of potential skills of minority group workers and to satisfy critical manpower needs. "There is full evidence that the wartime national policy of nondiscrimination contributed much to the shortening of the war," according to the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

C. Fair employment stimulates our economy. Employment of millions of minority group workers in the nation or thousands in the state at wage levels commensurate with their actual ability would create important new markets by enabling these people to spend more for homes, radios, cars, better clothes, books, magazines, etc.

D. Fair employment benefits the entire community; when minority group members formerly discriminated against are able to find employment, they disappear from relief rolls, and crime, delinquency, and disease are reduced.

E. The beneficial effects of a fair employment law would be cumulative over a long period of time. They would reverse a vicious circle which has been very costly to the American economy. As better jobs become available to qualified members of minority groups, young people of these groups would be encouraged to make the most of their educational opportunities and counselors would counsel them more fairly in accordance with their potentialities *. As minority group fathers were enabled to earn a more adequate wage, mothers will not be forced to leave young children inadequately cared for while they supplement the family income, minority group children can remain in school to complete their education and become productive citizens, and more of them can go to college.

IV. "Voluntary" plans have not produced the desired results.

A. Too often the plea for "voluntary action and education" has been used, whether consciously or not, to postpone and inhibit change. Much is said about the possibilities of a voluntary program by the opposition when legislation is under consideration, but between legislative sessions no more is heard about it. This is understandable, since employers have neither the time nor the inclination to undertake, in addition to their own business, a project requiring full time of a creative executive.

B. The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce went "all out" for a voluntary program in 1948-9, using streetcar ads, radio spot announcements, speeches,

---

* In Minneapolis, which has been stressing fair employment for 5 years, with a fair employment ordinance supported and supplemented by a community educational program by civic groups, some of these results are already in evidence. The Minneapolis public schools have an excellent policy of counseling all students on the basis of their abilities and potentialities, without regard to whatever discrimination still remains but will, it is hoped, rapidly disappear in the next few years.

pamphlets, stickers, etc. After spending $31,500 in fifteen months without attaining the desired results, they chose the alternative of helping to write an FEPC ordinance for the city. The Chamber has been satisfied with the operation of the ordinance, which opened several thousand jobs never before available to Negroes. Fortune magazine (July 1952, P. 158) says, "The Chamber had learned...that a voluntary plan, while it might work, required intensive preparation, and a cost few private agencies could stand. A law is simpler, and effective because it places community sanction squarely behind a right. Some Cleveland employers, who had feared opposition by workers to hiring Negroes, discovered that the law provides an authority to back them up, and as one put it candidly, 'gets management off the hook.'"

The Illinois Chamber of Commerce late in 1950 initiated an ambitious educational program for employers. These are the only two programs of any importance of which we have been able to learn.

V. Forthright action is necessary to correct the existing evil of discrimination.

A. Progress has been made during the past decade. Most of it has come as a result of the manpower shortage, presidential fair employment executive orders, state FEPC laws, and city ordinances.

B. The fact that progress has been made in the past is no guarantee of its continuance; progress has come as the result of effort, and continued progress will require further effort.

C. The greatest hope of progress at the present time is at the state level. Not until every Minnesotan, of whatever race, creed, color, or national origin, who seeks employment, can apply for any vacancy and be confident that he will be given an opportunity to compete fairly on the basis of his merit, qualifications, and personality without discrimination, will we have fair employment in our state.

D. Even if a national FEPC law were passed it would not fulfill the same functions as a state law. Proposed national legislation would be limited to employers engaged in interstate commerce who employ 50 or more persons. This would involve less that five percent of our employers and probably not more than one third or one half of the employees who need protection.

VI. Fair employment laws have been successful where tried.

A. Fair employment laws have been adopted in the following states:

New York	1945	Oregon	1947
Indiana	1945	New Mexico	1949
New Jersey	1945	Oregon	1949 (strengthened)
Wisconsin	1945	Rhode Island	1949
Massachusetts	1946	Washington	1949
Connecticut	1947	Colorado	1951

Fair employment ordinances have been adopted in the following cities:

In Arizona, Phoenix
In California, Richmond
In Illinois, Chicago, 1945
In Indiana, Gary and East Chicago
In Iowa, Sioux City
In Minnesota, Minneapolis
In Ohio, Akron, Campbell, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Girard, Hubbard, Lorain, Lowellville, Miles, Steubenville, Struthers, Warren and Youngstown - 13 in all
In Pennsylvania, Farrell, Nonessen, Philadelphia, and Sharon
In Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

These twenty-five cities in 9 states have a combined population of over 9 million people. Over 60 million Americans, in all, or over one-third of our total population, live under some kind of fair employment law. In addition, there are some 152 laws in twenty-eight states which prohibit discrimination in certain specified occupations.

B. Enforcement policies in New York State are typical; they have set the pattern for the nation. "The Commission," says Morroe Berger, in his book Equality by Statue, "emphasizes that conciliation and education are the chief methods by which employment discrimination is to be eliminated." "SCAD (State Commission Against Discrimination) fully appreciates the danger involved in applying punitive measures to long-standing patterns of behavior based upon human attitudes. It therefore seeks a type of compliance with the law which is voluntary in some degree." "It would be of little avail if compulsive action on the basis of individual complaints resulted in temporary compliance which could only be maintained by policing operation that in the end would assume formidable proportions", says the Commission in its 1948 annual report. However, it is well to keep in mind that according to Morroe Berger, "The most important features of the Ives-Quinn law is its provision for full use of the coercive power of the state in cases where conciliation has failed to eliminate a verified discriminatory practice...In a sense... there is really no 'persuasion' under the statute, for the suspected violator knows, when he talks with SCAD, that the full power of the law can be applied...The first chairman of SCAD pointed out that while this reserve power did not mean that conferences were conducted under duress, it did make the respondent 'more willing to sit down and realize he had to make certain concessions.'"

C. Articles in the February 25, 1950, Business Week, the September 1950 Fortune and the July 1952 issue of Fortune cite surveys which have been made, and quote prominent business leaders representing 45 United States Corporations which have had experience with FEPC laws in five states. These business men testified that:

1. FEPC laws have not hampered employers; they have not interfered with any employer's basic right to choose the most competent man for the job.
2. Disgruntled jobseekers have not swamped commissions with complaints.
3. Practically no employee resistance has developed; the law gets voluntary acceptance by the vast majority of employers, employment agencies, and unions.
4. In one case it eliminated entirely a large and growing Communist campaign being waged among the large Negro groups.
5. Pitney-Bowes of Stamford, Connecticut, which has begun a voluntary program before legislation was enacted, said, "Many of the problems which we encountered would have been much less difficult had we had the support of legislation."

D. When the chairmen of the New York, New Jersey and Massachussetts Commissions, the three states with the longest experience with FEPC laws, testified before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, all reported that there had not been a single instance of a business leaving the state, of a mass walkout, or of a complaint by any employer that compliance with the law had resulted in a loss of either customers or revenue. On the contrary, they testified that an increasing number of concerns had come to the conclusion that FEPC laws help business by promoting a more efficient utilization of labor.

E. In our own state, Minneapolis has had a fair employment ordinance in successful operation since June 1947. During that time the Commission has handled cases by conference and conciliation, with only one public hearing and with no court action.

1. In 49% of cases listed in the 1952 report a favorable adjustment was reached; in another 40% of cases the employer was exonerated and the case dismissed. 6% were tabled for further evidence, in 4% of cases the Commission lacked jurisdiction, and 1% were still in process.
2. Encouraging progress in eliminating discrimination in numerous fields of employment is listed by the Commission and testified to by employers and labor leaders. A number of employers who opposed the law before it was passed have become convinced of its value and have testified publicly as to its success.

F. A thirty eight page report issued in June 1952 by the Human Resources Division of the National Security Resources Board, in cooperation with the US Department of Labor, lists the 36 states and municipalities that have some form of fair employment legislation and analysis the results of the work done in seven states and two cities which have had enforceable laws in effect for several years. They found:

1. About 5900 complaints of discrimination have been handled in these 7 states and 2 cities. In 54% of the 5000 for which there is data as to the findings, the agencies found some form of discrimination, which they were able to eliminate by informal conciliation, with the exception of 6 cases which required public hearings.
2. There have been only four court cases, and in no case has the ruling of a commission been reversed.
3. F.E.P.C. laws have opened many opportunities for workers previously barred because of race, color, religion, or national origin.
4. A significant improvement in the use of skills of workers formerly victims of discrimination was found in each of the areas covered by fair employment practice laws.
5. Laws containing enforcement powers were more effective than those without enforcement powers.
6. "The integration of minority groups into American industry, resulting from FEP laws and ordinances, has been accomplished to the satisfaction of employers, workers, and labor unions. Although employers generally opposed the enactment of an enforceable FEP law, many of them have since expressed their belief that such legislation...has had positive beneficial effects."

G. Fair employment laws have helped to eliminate discrimination in labor unions.

1. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination persuaded 7 unions to eliminate discrimination from their by-laws entirely. An additional 11 unions have suspended the restrictions in FEPC states. In Oregon a union was ordered to cease discriminating against Negroes.

VII. The proposed legislation is by-partisan. Both parties have endorsed it and leaders of both parties have sponsored it.

A. The Minnesota Public Opinion Poll of January 1951 indicated that 72% of Minnesota men and women favor a fair employment law.

B. 61 organizations representing church, political, labor, veterans', farmers', human relations, and educational groups, and many of the state's most prominent business and civic leaders have endorsed this legislation.

VIII. To be consistent with its traditions the League cound not do otherwise than to support fair employment legislation.

Mrs. Abbot Washburn, speaking before the 31st Annual Convention of the Minnesota League of Women Voters on May 16, 1950, said: "No League member anywhere forgets that her own organization was born out of a legal move to end discrimination in one area of civil rights. Many

League women today recall what it means to be a minority and to need governmental action to secure a certain right. League policy, formed in the twenties, stated that if human beings are to keep the peace, there must be an understanding that human beings are not to be exploited. The League's history shows that point by point, the League has worked to eliminate discriminations by law, mainly in states. Such work has included the work for extension of suffrage to the District of Columbia, abolition of the poll tax, jury service for everyone, elimination of discrimination in our immigration laws, equal pay for equal work, equal employment opportunities for members of minority groups, independent economic citizenship for women and for the preservation of the greatest degree of civil liberty consistent with national safety in wartime."

* * * * * * * * * * *

The study by the Minnesota League of Women Voters of the objections raised by the opponents of fair employment legislation entitled HOW VALID ARE THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION? (Sept. 1952) will give added and more detailed information on many points.

Sept

MEMORANDUM TO STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

August 7, 1953

Enclosed is a copy of the voting record of the members of the 1953 Legislature on 18 key issues. It is entitled "Did Your Legislator Represent You?"

You will be proud of the record of the Liberal members of the Legislature. Not all members of this group are right on every issue, but the record in the main is impressive and clearly indicates what could be done if Liberals were in control of both Houses of the Minnesota Legislature.

You will find that the Conservatives, on the other hand, had a majority voting against the interests of the people of this state. A large majority of the Liberals voted right on every one of the 18 issues.

If you have a Conservative representing your district, you ought to plan the widest distribution possible of this tabloid. He will be defeated if the voters know what his votes have been on these key issues. If you have a Liberal representing you, this sheet will help to re-elect him.

We have worked hard to compile this record. Its wide use now depends on you in your county. An order blank, with prices noted, is printed on the back page of the tabloid. Get your DFL county committee to authorize a wide distribution. DO NOT DELAY. SEND IN YOUR ORDER TODAY.

Sincerely yours,

Karl F. Rolvaag

Karl F. Rolvaag
State Chairman

KFR:m
ceiu:12

Those who voted "yes", to end rent control, were:

Allen	Ernst	Lorentz
Anderson, A. A.	Fitzsimmons	Madden
Anderson, D. F.	Forbes	McKee
Anderson, H. J.	French	Moore
Anderson, H. R.	Friberg	Moriarty
Anderson, J. A.	Furst	Mueller
Anderson, M.	Gibbons	Nelson, K. O.
Aune	Haeg	Nordin
Basford	Hinds	Oberg
Beanblossom	Holmquist	Ottinger
Bergerud	Holtan	Parks
Blomquist	Howard	Peterson, O.
Bouton	Iverson	Peterson, P. K.
Croswell	Jensen, C. A.	Pischel
Cummings	Jensen, R. C.	Schulz
Dahle	Kaplan	Sundet
Daley	Karas	Thompson
Dirlam	Kennedy, R. B.	Tweten
Dunn	Kinzer	Van De Riet
Duxbury	Langen	Voxland
Erdahl	Langley	Welch
	Legvold	Windmiller
	Lloyd	Mr. Speaker

Those who voted to allow each community to make its own decision on rent control were:

Anderson, G. A.	Holm	Popovich
Anderson, O.	Johnson, A. I.	Prifrel
Appeldorn	Johnson, L. A.	Reed
Biernat	Johnson, V. C.	Rinke
Campton	Karth	Rutter
Chilgren	Kennedy, K.	Shipka
Cina	Knutson	Shovell
Clark	Kording	Silvola
Day	Kosloske	Sorensen
Dominick	LaBrosse	Swanstrom
Enestvedt	Luther	Swenson
Franz	Mosier	Talle
Frederickson	Murk	Tiemann
Gallagher	Nelson, W. N.	Tomczyk
Grittner	O'Dea	Volstad
Hagland	Odegard	Wanvick
Halsted	O'Malley	Widstrand
Herzog	Otto	Wozniak
Hofstad	Podgorski	Yetka

The liberals secured the largest vote of the session in both the House and the Senate against this bill. Public pressure on the Governor was so great that he vetoed this bill which would have worked such a hardship on so many renters. The real estate interests and the landlords were the main supporters of this bill which would have ended all rent control.

* * *

H.F. 2 Repeal of Old Age Lien Law S.F. 11

This bill would have repealed the present old age lien law which provides that all Minnesota citizens receiving old age assistance from the state, regardless of their age, must sign over all their property to the state, otherwise the state will not give assistance to the senior citizen in need.

The DFL party platform calls for repeal of this law. Mr. Ottinger from the Committee on Welfare reported the bill back with the recommendation that the bill be indefinitely postponed. Mr. Murk moved that the minority report to pass the bill be adopted. This motion was defeated by a vote of 49 yeas and 74 nays.

Those who voted "yes", for repeal of the lien law, were:

Anderson, O.	Halsted	Podgorski
Appeldorn	Hofstad	Popovich
Biernat	Iverson	Prifrel
Campton	Johnson, A. I.	Reed
Chilgren	Johnson, L. A.	Rutter
Cina	Kaplan	Shipka
Clark	Karth	Shovell
Enestvedt	Kennedy, K.	Silvola
Ericson	Kording	Skeate
Friberg	La Brosse	Sorensen
Gallagher	Luther	Swanstrom
Gibbons	Mosier	Tomczyk
Goodin	Murk	Volstad
Grittner	Nordin	Wanvick
Hagland	O'Dea	Widstrand
	O'Malley	Wozniak
	Otto	Yetka

Those who voted to continue the lien law were:

Allen	Ernst	McGill
Anderson, A. A.	Fitzsimmons	McKee
Anderson, D. F.	Forbes	Moore
Anderson, G. A.	Franz	Moriarty
Anderson, H. J.	Frederickson	Nelson, K. O.
Anderson, H. R.	French	Nelson, W. N.
Anderson, J. A.	Furst	Oberg
Anderson, M.	Haeg	Odegard
Aune	Hinds	Ottinger
Basford	Holm	Parks
Beanblossom	Holtan	Peterson, O.
Bergerud	Howard	Peterson, P. K.
Blomquist	Jensen, C. A.	Pischel
Bouton	Jensen, R. C.	Rinke
Croswell	Johnson, V. C.	Schulz
Cummings	Karas	Schwanke
Dahle	Kennedy, R. B.	Sundet
Day	Kinzer	Swenson
Dirlam	Knutson	Talle
Dominick	Kosloske	Thompson
Dunn	Langen	Tweten
Duxbury	Legvold	Van De Riet
Eddy	Letnes	Voxland
Erdahl	Lloyd	Welch
	Lorentz	Mr. Speaker

Later, the report of the Committee on Welfare, to indefinitely postpone the bill, was adopted and the bill was killed for the session.

* * *

H.F. 45 Old Age Assistance Bill H.F. 1146 S.F. 994

H.F. 45 would have increased the maximum old age assistance grants from $60 to $75, exclusive of medical, hospital, dental, surgical, nursing and rest-home care. The passage of this bill would have more equitably met the needs of our senior citizens. The DFL platform calls for elimination of a fixed maximum on payments and the giving of assistance in accordance with need.

On April 13, 1953, Mr. Ottinger from the Committee on Welfare moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed. Mr. Shovell moved that the minority report of the committee recommending passage, signed by Shovell, Tomczyk, Murk and Mrs. Luther, be passed. This motion lost by a vote of 50 yeas to 68 nays.

Those who voted "yes", for increased old age assistance, were:

Anderson, G. A.	Johnson, A. I.	Popovich
Anderson, O.	Johnson, L. A.	Prifrel
Biernat	Johnson, V. C.	Reed
Campton	Kaplan	Rutter
Cina	Karth	Shipka
Enestvedt	Kennedy, K.	Shovell
Franz	Knutson	Silvola
Furst	Kording	Skeate
Gallagher	La Brosse	Sorensen
Gibbons	Luther	Swanstrom
Goodin	McGill	Tiemann
Grittner	Mosier	Tomczyk
Hagland	Murk	Volstad
Halsted	O'Dea	Wanvick
Hofstad	O'Malley	Widstrand
Jensen, R. C.	Otto	Wozniak
	Podgorski	Yetka

Those who voted against increased old age assistance were:

Allen	Forbes	Moore
Anderson, A. A.	Frederickson	Nelson, K. O.
Anderson, D. F.	French	Nelson, W. N.
Anderson, H. J.	Friberg	Nordin
Anderson, H. R.	Haeg	Oberg
Anderson, J. A.	Herzog	Odegard
Aune	Hinds	Ottinger
Basford	Holm	Parks
Beanblossom	Holmquist	Peterson, O.
Bergerud	Holtan	Pischel
Blomquist	Howard	Rinke
Cummings	Jensen, C. A.	Schulz
Dahle	Karas	Schwanke
Day	Kennedy, R. B.	Sundet
Dirlam	Kosloske	Swenson
Dominick	Langen	Talle
Dunn	Langley	Thompson
Duxbury	Legvold	Tweten
Eddy	Letnes	Van De Riet
Erdahl	Lloyd	Voxland
Ericson	Lorentz	Welch
Ernst	Madden	Windmiller
	McKee	Mr. Speaker

So the majority report was then adopted and the bill was killed.

The same effort to increase old age assistance came before the Senate on April 17, 1953, when H.F. 1146 on old age assistance came before that body. Mr. Novak moved to amend to increase maximum assistance from $60 to $65 a month. This amendment carried with 26 yeas to 22 nays. The Conservatives immediately rallied their forces and secured a vote of reconsideration by a vote of 36 yeas to 30 nays. So another vote was forced on Mr. Novak's amendment and this time it lost by a vote of 31 yeas to 36 nays.

Those who voted "yes", for increased old age assistance, were:

Anderson, M. H.	Johnson, J. A.	Murray
Baughman	Julkowski	Novak
Bonniwell	Keller	O'Brien
Burdick	Larson	Palm
Carr	Lauerman	Peterson
Covert	Lemm	Rogers
Dickinson	Lofvegren	Salmore
Duemke	Masek	Schultz
Feidt	Mattson	Siegel
	Mayhood	Vukelich
	Mitchell	Wahlstrand

Those who voted against increased old age assistance were:

Almen	Erickson	Root
Andersen, E. L.	George	Rosenmeier
Anderson, A. A.	Gillen	Sageng
Anderson, E. P.	Grottum	Sinclair
Butler	Imm	Sletvold
Carey	Johanson	Sullivan
Child	Johnson, C. E.	Wagener
Dahlquist	Ledin	Wefald
Daun	Lightner	Welch
Duff	Miller	Wrabeck
Dunlap	Mullin	Wright
Engbritson	Pedersen	Zwach

The Senate then passed H.F. 1146. It was signed by the Governor and became law.

* * *

H.F. 1322 Charges For Care of Mental Patients

This bill related to charges for care and treatment by the state of mental patients. Responsible relatives must pay average per capita institution cost for mentally-ill patients in state hospitals and 52% for feeble-minded or epileptic patients. Inmates are to be screened more thoroughly as to need for continued treatment. Voluntary patients must pay full cost. County welfare boards must cover the cost when patients cannot. This act is unworkable and means that many patients of modest income will delay seeking treatment until it is too late. The DFL party platform calls for a strong prevention program which this act stifles.

This bill came before the House on April 16, 1953, and was passed with a vote of 73 yeas to 36 nays.

Those who voted "yes" were:

Anderson, D. F.	French	Madden
Anderson, H. R.	Furst	Moriarty
Anderson, J. A.	Grittner	Nelson, K. O.
Anderson, M.	Haeg	Nelson, W. N.
Anderson, O.	Herzog	Oberg
Aune	Hinds	O'Dea
Basford	Hofstad	Odegard
Bergerud	Holm	Ottinger
Biernat	Holmquist	Peterson, O.
Blomquist	Holtan	Peterson, P. K.
Bouton	Howard	Pischel
Croswell	Iverson	Prifrel
Cummings	Jensen, C. A.	Rinke
Dahle	Jensen, R. C.	Schulz
Day	Johnson, L. A.	Schwanke
Dirlam	Karas	Shovell
Dominick	Kennedy, R. B.	Sundet
Duxbury	Kinzer	Swenson
Eddy	Kording	Thompson
Ernst	Kosloske	Tiemann
Fitzsimmons	Langen	Van De Riet
Forbes	Langley	Volstad
Franz	Legvold	Voxland
Frederickson	Lloyd	Windmiller
	Lorentz	Wozniak

Those who voted "no" were:

Anderson, G. A.	Johnson, A. I.	Otto
Campton	Johnson, V. C.	Popovich
Chilgren	Kaplan	Reed
Cina	Karth	Rutter
Clark	Kennedy, K.	Shipka
Enestvedt	Knutson	Silvola
Ericson	La Brosse	Skeate
Friberg	Letnes	Sorensen
Gallagher	Luther	Tomczyk
Goodin	McGill	Wanvick
Hagland	Murk	Widstrand
Halsted	Nordin	Yetka

This bill came before the Senate on April 20, 1953, and passed with a vote of 45 yeas and 2 nays.

Those who voted "yes" were:

Almen	Gillen	O'Brien
Andersen, E. L.	Grottum	Palm
Anderson, A. A.	Imm	Pederson
Anderson, M. H.	Johnson, C. E.	Peterson
Baughman	Johnson, J. A.	Root
Bonniwell	Keller	Rosenmeier
Burdick	Lauerman	Sageng
Butler	Ledin	Schultz
Carey	Lightner	Siegel
Child	Lofvegren	Sinclair
Dahlquist	Masek	Sletvold
Duemke	Mattson	Sullivan
Dunlap	Miller	Wagener
Feidt	Mitchell	Welch
George	Murray	Wrabek

Those who voted "no" were:

Anderson, E. P. Carr

The bill was approved by the Governor on April 24, 1953, and becomes law on January 1, 1954.

VII. Special Interests

H.F. 685 Tidelands Oil Resolution

This was a joint resolution memorializing Congress to oppose the Holland Tidelands Oil bill giving the oil rights beneath the submerged sea to four states, Florida, Louisiana, Texas and California. Senator Humphrey and our four DFL Congressmen have been leaders in Congress fighting against this "give-away".

On March 17, 1953, the bill came before the House for final consideration and passed with 76 yeas and 39 nays.

Those who voted "yes", for Minnesota sharing in the rich tidelands oil revenue, were:

Anderson, A. A.	Goodin	O'Dea
Anderson, G. A.	Grittner	Odegard
Anderson, O.	Hagland	O'Malley
Appledorn	Halsted	Otto
Basford	Herzog	Parks
Biernat	Hofstad	Pischel
Blomquist	Holm	Podgorski
Bouton	Iverson	Popovich
Campton	Jensen, R. C.	Prifrel
Chilgren	Johnson, A. I.	Reed
Cina	Johnson, L. A.	Rinke
Clark	Karth	Rutter
Cummings	Kennedy, K.	Shipka
Daley	Knutson	Shovell
Day	Kording	Silvola
Dominick	Kosloske	Skeate
Enestvedt	La Brosse	Sorensen
Erickson	Letnes	Swanstrom
Fitzsimmons	Luther	Swenson
Franz	Madden	Tiemann
Frederickson	McGill	Tomczyk
Friberg	Moriarty	Volstad
Furst	Mosier	Wanvick
Gallagher	Murk	Widstrand
Gibbons	Nelson, W. N.	Wozniak
		Yetka

Those who voted to give away Minnesota's share in the tidelands oil were:

Anderson, D. F.	Forbes	McKee
Anderson, J. A.	French	Moore
Aune	Holmquist	Nelson, K. O.
Beanblossom	Holtan	Oberg
Bergerud	Howard	Ottinger
Croswell	Jensen, C. A.	Sundet
Dahle	Johnson, V. C.	Talle
Dirlam	Kaplan	Thompson
Dunn	Kennedy, R. B.	Van De Riet
Duxbury	Langen	Voxland
Eddy	Langley	Welch
Erdahl	Legvold	Windmiller
Ernst	Lloyd	Hartle

In spite of the passage of this resolution by a large majority in the House, Gov. Anderson sent a wire to Washington supporting the "give-away".

The bill never reached a vote in the Senate.

ORDER BLANK

Single Copy 5c
10 Copies 25c
50 Copies $1.00
500 Copies $6.00
1000 Copies $10.00

DFL PARTY
325 - 2ND AVE. SO.
MINNEAPOLIS 1, MINN.

Enclosed find check for $________

Please forward me________copies of "Did Your Legislator Represent You?"

Name________

Address________

City________ State________

The DFL Newsletter is published by the Democratic Farmer Labor State Central Committee, Karl F. Rolvaag, Chairman, 325 Second Avenue South, Minneapolis 1, Minnesota.

Section 34.66 P. L. & R.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Minneapolis, Minn.
PERMIT No. 3653

DID YOUR LEGISLATOR REPRESENT YOU?

Voting Record on Key Issues of the 1953 Session of the Minnesota Legislature

Your DFL NEWSLETTER
Special Edition
PRICE 5 CENTS
Vol. 1, No. 4 — Summer, 1953

SENATORS

1. Fillmore-Houston—JOHN A. JOHNSON—Preston (C)
2. Winona—J. R. KELLER—Rollingstone (C)
3. Wabasha—ROBERT R. DUNLAP—Plainview (C)
4. Olmsted—WALTER BURDICK—Rochester (C)
5. Dodge-Mower—PHILIP E. DUFF, Jr.—Kasson (I)
6. Freeborn—EARL L. ENGBRITSON—Hollandale (C)
7. Faribault—D. M. CAREY—Wells (C)
8. Blue Earth—VAL IMM—Mankato (C)
9. Martin-Watonwan—CHRIS. L. ERICKSON—Fairmont (C)
10. Cottonwood-Jackson—H. E. GROTTUM—Jackson (C)
11. Nobles-Rock—ANDY A. ANDERSON—Luverne (C)
12. Lincoln-Pipestone-Murray—HANS C. PEDERSEN—Ruthton (C)
13. Lyon-Yellow Medicine—A. L. ALMEN—Balaton (C)
14. Brown-Redwood—JOHN M. ZWACH—Walnut Grove (C)
15. Nicollet-Sibley—JOSEPH J. DAUN—St. Peter, Rt. No. 1 (C)
16. Steele-Waseca—CLAUDE G. BAUGHMAN—Waseca (C)
17. Le Sueur—FRANK M. WRABEK—LeCenter (I)
18. Rice—HOMER J. COVERT—Faribault (C)
19. Goodhue—GROVER C. GEORGE—Goodhue (C)
20. Dakota—ARTHUR GILLEN—South St. Paul (C)
21. Carver-Scott—HENRY WAGENER—Waconia (C)
22. McLeod—MILAN BONNIWELL—Hutchinson (I)
23. Renville—LEO J. LAUERMAN—Olivia (C)
24. Chippewa-Lac qui Parle—FAY GEORGE CHILD—Maynard (C)
25. Kandiyohi-Swift—HARRY L. WAHLSTRAND—Willmar (C)
26. Meeker—PHIL PALM—Litchfield (I)
27. Wright—THOMAS P. WELCH—Buffalo (C)
28. Hennepin—RAYMOND J. JULKOWSKI—1928 3rd St. N.E. Minneapolis (C)
29. Hennepin—EMMETT DUEMKE—2730 Stinson Blvd., Mpls. (C)
30. Hennepin—DONALD O. WRIGHT—1112 Washburn Ave. So., Minneapolis (C)
31. Hennepin—RALPH L. MAYHOOD—Curtis Hotel, Mpls. (C)
32. Hennepin—MARVIN H. ANDERSON—3234 32nd Ave. South, Minneapolis (I)
33. Hennepin—CHAS. W. ROOT—3101 Colfax Ave. S., Mpls. (C)
34. Hennepin—DANIEL S. FEIDT—1115 W. Franklin, Mpls. (C)
35. Hennepin—GERALD T. MULLIN—3218 Xerxes Ave. N., Minneapolis (C)
36. Hennepin—ARCHIE H. MILLER—Route No. 2, Hopkins (C)
37. Ramsey—HAROLD W. SCHULTZ—982 Jenks Ave., St. Paul (I)
38. Ramsey—R. G. NOVAK—743 VanBuren, St. Paul (I)
39. Ramsey—JOSEPH H. MASEK—138 Prospect Blvd., St. Paul (C)
40. Ramsey—MILTON C. LIGHTNER—500 Summit Ave., St. Paul (C)
41. Ramsey—GEORGE L. SIEGEL—778 E. 4th St., St. Paul (I)
42. Ramsey—ELMER L. ANDERSEN—2236 W. Hoyt, St. Paul (C)
43. Washington—RAPHAEL F. SALMORE—Stillwater (I)
44. Anoka-Isanti—WENDELL L. LEDIN—Bethel (C)
45. Benton-Sherburne-Stearns—HENRY H. SULLIVAN—St. Cloud (C)
46. Stearns—HOMER F. LEMM—Melrose (I)
47. Douglas-Pope—CLIFFORD LOFVEGREN—Alexandria (C)
48. Big Stone-Grant-Stevens-Traverse—A. R. JOHANSON—Wheaton (C)
49. Clay-Wilkin—MAGNUS WEFALD—Hawley (C)
50. Otter Tail—OLE O. SAGENG—Dalton (C)
51. Todd-Wadena—ERNEST P. ANDERSON—Wadena (C)
52. Cass-Itasca—GEORGE O'BRIEN—Grand Rapids (C)
53. Crow Wing-Morrison—GORDON ROSENMEIER—Little Falls (C)
54. Aitkin-Carlton—HENRY W. MATTSON—Cloquet (C)
55. Kanabec-Mille Lacs-Sherburne—C. C. MITCHELL—Princeton (C)
56. Chisago-Pine—C. ELMER JOHNSON—Almelund (I)
57. Cook-Lake-St. Louis—GORDON H. BUTLER—Duluth (C)
58. St. Louis—HERBERT ROGERS—Rt. 2, Duluth 6 (C)
59. St. Louis—HOLMER M. CARR—Proctor (I)
60. St. Louis—ELMER PETERSON—Hibbing (I)
61. St. Louis—THOMAS D. VUKELICH—Gilbert (I)
62. Beltrami-Lake of the Woods—LEONARD R. DICKINSON—Bemidji (C)
63. Becker-Hubbard—A. O. SLETVOLD—Detroit Lakes (C)
64. Norman-Mahnomen—NORMAN J. LARSON—Ada (C)
65. Clearwater-Pennington-Red Lake—WILLIAM E. DAHLQUIST—Thief River Falls (C)
66. Polk—LOUIS A. MURRAY—East Grand Forks (I)
67. Kittson-Roseau-Marshall—DONALD SINCLAIR—Stephen (C)

(C) is Conservative. (I) is Independent.

REPRESENTATIVES

1. Fillmore-Houston-at-Large—MOPPY ANDERSON—Preston (C)
Fillmore—TEMAN THOMPSON—Lanesboro (C)
Houston—LLOYD DUXBURY Jr.—Caledonia (C)
2. Winona-1st Division—JOHN D. McGILL—Winona (L)
Winona-2nd Division—GEO. P. DALEY—Lewiston (C)
3. Wabasha—FRANK FURST—Lake City (C)
4. Olmsted—LEO D. MADDEN—Eyota (C)
5. Dodge—OLIVER J. HOLTAN—Mantorville (C)
Mower—JACOB HERZOG—Austin (L)
6. Freeborn—IRVIN M. TALLE—Albert Lea (C)
7. Faribault—L. E. ERDAHL—Frost (C)
8. Blue Earth—WALTER J. CROSWELL—Lake Crystal (C)
—ROY SCHULZ—Mankato (C)
9. Martin—G. J. VAN DE RIET—Fairmont (C)
Watonwan—WILLIAM O. LEGVOLD—St. James (C)
10. Cottonwood—SAM FRANZ—Mountain Lake (L)
Jackson—H. A. FREDERICKSON—Windom (C)
11. Nobles—GORDON FORBES—Worthington (C)
Rock—ROY H. CUMMINGS—Luverne (C)
12. Lincoln—WILHELM HOLM—Tyler (C)
Murray—B. W. LLOYD—Fulda (C)
Pipestone—J. H. APPELDORN—Pipestone (L)
13. Lyon—WILL N. NELSON—Tracy (C)
Yellow Medicine—OSCAR PETERSON—Clarkfield (C)
14. Brown-Redwood-at-large—R. B. KENNEDY—New Ulm (C)
Brown—CARL A. JENSEN—Sleepy Eye (C)
Redwood—AUBREY W. DIRLAM—Redwood Falls (C)
15. Nicollet—HAROLD R. ANDERSON—North Mankato (C)
Sibley—AUGUST B. MUELLER—Arlington (C)
16. Steele—JOHN A. HARTLE—Owatonna, Route 4 (C)
Waseca—OMAR DAHLE—Waseca (C)
17. LeSueur—FRED A. PISCHEL—LeCenter (C)
18. Rice—A. O. SUNDET—Faribault (C)
19. Goodhue-1st Division—ROY L. VOXLAND—Kenyon (C)
Goodhue-2nd Div.—CLARENCE G. LANGLEY—Red Wing (C)
20. Dakota—FRANK X. GALLAGHER—Savage (L)
21. Carver—HOWARD OTTINGER—Chaska (C)
Scott—MICHAEL R. MORIARTY—Jordan (C)
22. McLeod—EMIL C. ERNST—Lester Prairie (C)
23. Renville—ODEAN ENESTVEDT—Sacred Heart (L)

REPRESENTATIVES (Cont'd)

24. Chippewa—OLIVER ANDERSON—Montevideo (L)
Lac qui Parle—ALVIN O. HOFSTAD—Madison (L)
25. Kandiyohi—ROY C. JENSEN—Raymond, Route 2 (C)
Swift—ALFRED I. JOHNSON—Benson (L)
26. Meeker—STANLEY W. HOLMQUIST—Grove City (C)
27. Wright—GLENN W. SWENSON, Buffalo (C)
—PAUL L. EDDY—Howard Lake (C)
28. Hennepin—TED L. BIERNAT—324 Lowry Ave. N.E., Mpls. (L)
—EDWARD J. (Ed) TOMCZYK—405 Adams St. N.E., Minneapolis (L)
29. Hennepin—GEORGE MURK—2307 Lincoln St. N.E., Mpls. (L)
—JOHN P. SKEATE, 609 Taylor N.E., Mpls. (L)
30. Hennepin—SALLY LUTHER, 1936 Kenwood Pkwy., Mpls. (L)
—VERNE C. JOHNSON, 1308 Douglas Ave., Mpls. (C)
31. Hennepin—CARL G. HAGLUND—1913 S. 6th St., Mpls. (L)
—LEONARD A. JOHNSON—240 21st Ave. S., Minneapolis (L)
32. Hennepin—HERMAN KORDING, 3533 36th Ave. S., Mpls. (L)
—EDW. J. (Eddie) VOLSTAD—2227 25th Ave. S., Minneapolis (L)
33. Hennepin—GEORGE A. FRENCH—5140 Penn Ave. S., Minneapolis (C)
—HAROLD J. ANDERSON—4819 Colfax Ave. S., Minneapolis (C)
34. Hennepin—P. KENNETH PETERSON—2303 W. 21st St., Minneapolis (C)
—VERNON S. WELCH—2001 Benton Blvd., Mpls. (C)
35. Hennepin—H. P. (Pat) GOODIN—3113 Knox Ave. N., Mpls. (L)
—LEO D. MOSIER—4340 Washburn Ave. N., Minneapolis (L)
36. N. Hennepin—LAWRENCE F. HAEG—3811 Beard Ave. N., Robbinsdale (C)
—ALF L. BERGERUD—5400 Ridge Road, Edina (C)
37. Ramsey North—SHELDON L. BEANBLOSSOM—692 E. Wheelock Pkwy., St. Paul (C)
Ramsey South—ARTHUR T. GIBBONS—1781 Ford Parkway, St. Paul (C)
38. Ramsey North—JOSEPH PRIFREL, Jr.—1031 Woodbridge, St. Paul (L)
Ramsey South—ANTHONY (Al) PODGORSKI—824 Van Buren Ave., St. Paul (L)
39. Ramsey Ward 5—D. D. WOZNIAK—1216 Bayard Ave., St. Paul (L)
Ramsey Ward 6—KARL F. GRITTNER—824 Cherokee, St. Paul (L)
40. Ramsey Ward 4—ALFRED J. OTTO—194 Summit Ave., St. Paul (C)
Ramsey Ward 7—PETER POPOVICH—1208 Fairmount, St. Paul (L)
41. Ramsey—BILL SHOVELL—78 Bates Ave., St. Paul (L)
Ramsey—JOE KARTH—2324 E. Co. Rd. D, St. Paul (L)
42. Ramsey North—CLAUDE H. ALLEN—965 Lakeview Avenue St. Paul (C)
Ramsey South—CLIFFORD PARKS, 1675 Beechwood, St. Paul (C)
43. Washington—JOHN F. HOWARD—RFD, St. Paul Park (C)
—R. W. O'DEA—Willernie (L)
44. Anoka-Isanti—JOHN H. NORDIN—44 68th Way N.E., Mpls. (C)
45. Benton-Sherburne—JOHN T. KOSLOSKE—Sauk Rapids (C)
Stearns—DEWEY REED—1949 6th Ave. N., St. Cloud (L)
46. Stearns-1st Division—EDMUND C. TIEMANN—Sauk Centre (L)
Stearns-2nd Division—JOHN J. KINZER—Cold Spring (C)
47. Douglas—OTTO E. CLARK—Osakis (C)
Pope—DELBERT F. ANDERSON, Starbuck (C)
48. Stevens—G. A. ANDERSON, Morris (C)
Grant—CARL M. IVERSON—Ashby (L)
Traverse—CARL J. RINKE—Wheaton (C)
Big Stone—WM. SORENSEN—Graceville (L)
49. Clay—CHARLES N. BOUTON—Glyndon (C)
Wilkin—K. O. NELSON, Breckenridge (C)
50. Otter Tail—OLE O. AUNE, JR.—Underwood (C)
—ROY E. DUNN—Pelican Rapids (C)
—J. A. (Turp) ANDERSON—New York Mills (C)
—E. J. WINDMILLER—Fergus Falls (C)
51. Wadena—JOE P. LORENTZ—Wadena (C)
Todd—KEITH KENNEDY—Staples (C)
52. Cass—GEORGE E. ERICSON—Pequot Lakes (C)
Itasca—VLADIMIR SHIPKA—Grand Rapids (L)
53. Crow Wing-Morrison-at-Large—FRED W. SCHWANKE—Deerwood (C)
Crow Wing—CHAS. L. HALSTED—Brainerd (L)
Morrison—ALBERT DOMINICK—Pierz (C)
54. Aitkin—F. C. KAPLAN—Aitkin (C)
Carlton—LAWRENCE YETKA—Cloquet (L)
55. Mille Lacs-Kanabec—AXEL A. ANDERSON—Bock (C)
Sherburne—EDWIN ODEGARD—Milaca (C)
56. Chisago—A. F. OBERG—Lindstrom (C)
Pine—JOE KARAS—Pine City (C)
57. St. Louis—WARREN S. MOORE—Duluth (C)
Cook-Lake—CHAS. E. CAMPTON—Two Harbors (C)
58. St. Louis—THOMAS F. (Tommy) O'MALLEY—1007 Lake Ave. S., Duluth (C)
—ARNE C. (Painter) WANVICK—215 W. Third St., Duluth (L)
59. St. Louis—DWIGHT A. SWANSTROM—2216 W. Sixth St., Duluth (C)
—FRANCIS (Frenchy) LaBROSSE—30 W. Summit, Duluth (L)
60. St. Louis—PAUL R. WIDSTRAND—Hibbing (L)
—LOREN S. RUTTER—Kinney (L)
61. St. Louis—FRED A. CINA—Aurora (L)
—RICHARD H. SILVOLA—113 2nd St. S., Virginia (L)
62. Koochiching—E. J. CHILGREN—Littlefork (L)
Beltrami-Lake of the Woods—JOHN H. McKEE—Bemidji (C)
63. Hubbard—TEMPLE HINDS—Hubbard (C)
Becker—HARRY BASFORD—Wolf Lake (L)
64. Norman-Mahnomen—JOHN R. BLOMQUIST—Waubun (C)
65. Pennington-Red Lake—WALTER E. DAY—Bagley (L)
Clearwater—MRS. COYA KNUTSON—Oklee (L)
66. Polk—THOMAS A. LETNES—Nielsville (L)
—REUBEN H. TWETEN—Fosston (C)
67. Kittson—ODIN E. S. LANGEN—Kennedy (C)
Marshall—R. W. FITZSIMONS—Argyle (C)
Roseau—ERIC FRIBERG—Roseau (C)

(C) is Conservative. (L) is Liberal.

Did Your Legislator Represent You?

The answer to this question may well cost you hundreds of dollars. A major decision must be made by your legislator in the 1955 Session as to who is going to pay the taxes in this state, those who make the most money, or those who earn the least.

With this in mind, the DFL Party has prepared this voting record of the members of the 1953 Legislature on the important controversial issues that came before it, so that you will have the facts to judge the calibre of your legislator, whether he is a member of the Senate, or the House. Remember that it is by his voting record, and not his speeches, that a legislator is to be judged. Talk is easy, but it is the vote that counts.

In the next two years, the state of Minnesota will spend over $30 million more than it receives. This is possible because of the surpluses which have existed. Our general revenue balance of about $5 million will be reduced to zero in the next two years. The present balance in the income tax school fund will be depleted over $20 million.

Consequently, the 1955 Legislature will face a most serious financial problem. It will be obliged either to cut the budget severely, or raise new funds. In 1955, the much discussed general sales tax will assuredly be a definite possibility. Roy Dunn, the Republican Conservative House majority leader, declares "it is inevitable". Another very influential Republican, Donald O. Wright, Conservative President Pro Tem of the Senate, has also endorsed a sales tax. Its passage would make the ordinary person, who is already carrying more than his share of the tax load, shoulder an extra burden.

The DFL Party is unalterably opposed to a general sales tax. We have advocated for several years that a truly bipartisan commission be established to make a thorough study of the entire taxing structure in Minnesota. We think there should be a revision of the tax laws, especially bringing up-to-date the gross earnings tax and the methods of taxing mining ore and timber products. The iron ore companies, the railroads, and some other special interests are not now carrying their fair share of taxation. The state and the local communities must both be protected in the tax revision.

This information and the voting record that follows must reach the voters. We must use every means to inform them. NOW IS THE TIME. MAIL IN YOUR REQUEST FOR SUCH EXTRA COPIES OF THIS REPORT AS YOU CAN WISELY DISTRIBUTE.

* * *

I. Legislative Procedures

Election of Speaker of the House

This is an exceedingly important vote. The Speaker appoints committee chairmen and members. They can determine the legislation presented to the House. The appointment of all employees of the House is made by the winning group. The Speaker makes the decision as to what committee a bill is referred. This act can often determine its future. Similarly, parliamentary rulings exercised by the Speaker are very important.

John A. Hartle of Owatonna was nominated by Clarence G. Langley of Red Wing.

Fred A. Cina of Aurora was nominated by Richard H. Silvola of Virginia.

The contest was between the two blocs; the Conservative (mainly Republicans), and the Liberal (mainly DFL'ers). Hartle was elected with 85 votes to Cina's 46 votes.

Those who voted for Hartle were:

Allen	Forbes	Moore
Anderson, A. A.	Frederickson	Moriarty
Anderson, D. F.	French	Mueller
Anderson, G. A.	Friberg	Nelson, K. O.
Anderson, H. J.	Furst	Nelson, W. N.
Anderson, H. R.	Gibbons	Nordin
Anderson, J. A.	Haeg	Oberg
Anderson, M.	Hinds	Odegard
Aune	Holm	O'Malley
Beanblossom	Holmquist	Ottinger
Bergerud	Holtan	Otto
Blomquist	Howard	Parks
Bouton	Jensen, C. A.	Peterson, O.
Campton	Jensen, R. C.	Peterson, P. K.
Clark	Johnson, V. C.	Pischel
Croswell	Kaplan	Rinke
Cummings	Karas	Schulz
Dahle	Kennedy, K.	Schwanke
Daley	Kennedy, R. B.	Sundet
Dirlam	Kinzer	Swanstrom
Dominick	Kosloske	Swenson
Dunn	Langen	Talle
Duxbury	Langley	Thompson
Eddy	Legvold	Tweten
Erdahl	Lloyd	Van De Riet
Ericson	Lorentz	Voxland
Ernst	Madden	Welch
Fitzsimmons	McKee	Windmiller
		Mr. Speaker

Those who voted for Cina were:

Anderson, O.	Hofstad	Prifrel
Appledorn	Iverson	Reed
Basford	Johnson, A. I.	Rutter
Biernat	Johnson, L. A.	Shipka
Chilgren	Karth	Shovell
Cina	Knutson	Silvola
Day	Kording	Skeate
Enestvedt	LaBrosse	Sorensen
Franz	Letnes	Tiemann
Gallagher	Luther	Tomczyk
Goodin	McGill	Volstad
Grittner	Mosier	Wanvick
Hagland	Murk	Widstrand
Halsted	O'Dea	Wozniak
Herzog	Podgorski	Yetka
	Popovich	

Election of President Pro Tem. of the Senate

This is an important vote as the President pro tem. often acts for the Lieutenant-Governor. The President pro tem. usually presides when the Senate goes into the Committee of the Whole and his rulings and influence in this position can be decisive.

Donald O. Wright of Minneapolis was nominated by Raymond L. Julkowski of Minneapolis.

George L. Siegel of St. Paul was nominated by Homer M. Carr of Proctor.

The contest was between the conservative and Independent groups, largely paralleling the Republican and DFL Parties. Wright was elected with 51 votes to Siegel's 15 votes. With Ancher Nelsen's resignation, Mr. Wright has now become acting Lieutenant-Governor, though he will not take the oath of office. It is interesting to recall that he led the fight in opposition to the anti-gambling legislation enacted under Governor Youngdahl. Recently, he has been defending the sales tax.

Those who voted for Wright were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, A. A., Anderson, E. P., Baughman, Burdick, Butler, Carey, Child, Covert, Dahlquist, Daun, Dickinson, Duemke, Dunlap, Engbritson, Erickson, Feidt, George, Gillen, Grottum, Imm, Johanson, Johnson, J. A., Julkowski, Keller, Larson, Lauerman, Ledin, Lightner, Lofvegren, Masek, Mattson, Mayhood, Miller, Mitchell, Mullin, O'Brien, Pedersen, Rogers, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Sinclair, Sletvold, Sullivan, Wagener, Wahlstrand, Wefald, Welch, Zwach

Those who voted for Siegel were:

Anderson, M. H., Bonniwell, Carr, Duff, Johnson, C. E., Lemm, Murray, Novak, Palm, Peterson, Salmore, Schultz, Siegel, Vukelich, Wrabek

* * *

Cina Amendment to the Rules Committee Report

The question as to the membership of each committee is very important. In the U.S. Congress, membership on committees is divided between the Republicans and Democrats on the same basis of the same proportion that the two parties bear to one another in the whole House or Senate. Mr. Cina's amendment asked for the same procedure in the Minnesota House of Representatives with appointments to the various comittees in accordance with the recommendations received from the candidate for Speaker of the Conservatives and the Liberals. At present, there are committees like the important Rules Committee without a single representative from the Liberals. This motion was defeated by a vote of 46 yeas and 76 nays.

Those who voted 'yes" were:

Anderson, O., Appeldorn, Basford, Chilgren, Cina, Day, Enestvedt, Franz, Furst, Gallagher, Goodin, Grittner, Hagland, Halsted, Herzog, Hofstad, Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Karth, Knutson, Kording, LaBrosse, Luther, McGill, Mosier, Murk, O'Dea, Odegard, Podgorski, Popovich, Prifrel, Reed, Rutter, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Sorensen, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Volstad, Wanvick, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka

Those who voted "no" were:

Allen, Anderson, A. A., Anderson, D. F., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, M., Aune, Beanblossom, Bergerud, Blomquist, Bouton, Campton, Clark, Croswell, Cummings, Dahle, Daley, Dirlam, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ericson, Ernst, Fitzsimmons, Forbes, Frederickson, Friberg, Gibbons, Haeg, Holm, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Kaplan, Karas, Kennedy, K., Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Koslosky, Langen, Langley, Legvold, Letnes, Lloyd, Lorentz, Madden, McKee, Moore, Moriarty, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Nelson, W. N., Nordin, Oberg, O'Malley, Ottinger, Otto, Parks, Peterson, O., Peterson, P. K., Pischel, Rinke, Schulz, Schwanke, Sundet, Swanstrom, Talle, Thompson, Van De Riet, Voxland, Windmiller

* * *

H.F. 329 Party Designation

This bill would have amended the Minnesota law by making candidates for the Legislature file under party designation. At present, they run without party designation and many feel no responsibility to party platforms. Both the Republican and the Democratic Parties carried planks endorsing such a bill. On March 13, 1953, the bill was passed by the House by a vote of 88 yeas and 36 nays.

Those who voted "yes," for party designation, were:

Allen, Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, M., Aune, Beanblossom, Bergerud, Biernat, Bouton, Campton, Chilgren, Cina, Croswell, Cummings, Day, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ernst, Forbes, Franz, French, Friberg, Gallagher, Gibbons, Grittner, Hagland, Halsted, Herzog, Hinds, Hofstad, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, C. A., Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Kaplan, Karas, Karth, Kennedy, K., Knutson, Kording, LaBrosse, Langley, Legvold, Lorentz, Luther, McKee, Mosier, Murk, Nelson, K. O., Oberg, O'Dea, Odegard, O'Malley, Otto, Parks, Peterson, O., Peterson, P. K., Podgorski, Popovich, Prifrel, Rutter, Schulz, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Sundet, Swanstrom, Talle, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Tweten, Van De Riet, Volstad, Wanvick, Welch, Widstrand, Windmiller, Wozniak, Yetka, Mr. Speaker

Those who voted against party designation, were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, D. F., Anderson, G. A., Anderson, O., Appeldorn, Basford, Blomquist, Clark, Daley, Dirlam, Enestvedt, Ericson, Fitzsimons, Frederickson, Furst, Holm, Jensen, R. C., Kennedy, R. B., Koslosky, Langen, Letnes, Lloyd, Madden, McGill, Moriarty, Nelson, W. N., Nordin, Ottinger, Pischel, Reed, Rinke, Schwanke, Sorensen, Swenson, Thompson, Voxland

The bill came before the Senate on April 14, 1953 when Mr. Sageng moved that the bill be placed on Special Orders in order to bring it to a vote. Since this motion requires a two-thirds vote, it lost with 37 yeas and 25 nays.

Those who voted "yes," for party designation, were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, A. A., Baughman, Bonniwell, Burdick, Butler, Covert, Dickinson, Duff, Dunlap, Engbritson, Erickson, George, Gillen, Imm, Johanson, Johnson, J. A., Larson, Lightner, Lofvegren, Mattson, Miller, Mitchell, Murray, Novak, Palm, Pedersen, Root, Sageng, Salmore, Siegel, Sletvold, Wagener, Wahlstrand, Wefald, Wright

Those who voted against party designation were:

Anderson, E. P., Anderson, M. H., Carey, Child, Dahlquist, Daun, Duemke, Feidt, Grottum, Johnson, C. E., Julkowski, Keller, Lauerman, Ledin, Lemm, Masek, Mayhood, Mullin, Peterson, Rogers, Rosenmeier, Schultz, Sullivan, Vukelich, Welch

So the bill was killed by this failure to get a special order for a vote in the Senate. It is interesting to note that the paid lobbyists of special interests were the main opponents of the bill.

* * *

H.F. 1835 Reapportionment Bill

This was a bill proposing an amendment to the State Constitution reapportioning the senators and representatives among the several districts. The Constitution specifies that there shall be reapportionment every ten years after the official U.S. Census. Such reapportionment has not taken place since 1913, though the population of many districts has changed considerably. On April 2, 1953, Mr. Nordin moved that this bill be made a Special Order for April 7, 1953. This motion requires a two-thirds majority and lost with 56 yeas and 44 nays.

Those who voted "yes," for consideration of reapportionment were:

Allen, Anderson, H. J., Beanblossom, Bergerud, Biernat, Chilgren, Cina, Day, Dirlam, Enestvedt, Franz, French, Gallagher, Gibbons, Grittner, Halsted, Herzog, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Kennedy, K., Knutson, Kording, Koslosky, LaBrosse, Letnes, Luther, Madden, McGill, Moriarty, Mosier, Nordin, Oberg, O'Dea, Ottinger, Otto, Parks, Podgorski, Popovich, Rutter, Shipka, Silvola, Skeate, Swanstrom, Talle, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Volstad, Voxland, Wanvick, Widstrand, Wozniak, Mr. Speaker

Those who voted against reapportionment were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, D. F., Anderson, G. A., Anderson, M., Anderson, O., Aune, Campton, Clark, Cummings, Dahle, Daley, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ericson, Forbes, Frederickson, Friberg, Haeg, Hagland, Hofstad, Holm, Iverson, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Karas, Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Langen, Langley, Legvold, Lloyd, Lorentz, McKee, Odegard, Pischel, Reed, Rinke, Schwanke, Tweten, Van De Riet, Welch

On April 8, 1953, the Senate bill on reapportionment came before that body. The bill passed with a vote of 38 yeas and 26 nays.

Those who voted "yes," for reapportionment, were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, M. H., Butler, Dahlquist, Daun, Duemke, Duff, Engbritson, Feidt, George, Gillen, Imm, Johanson, Johnson, C. E., Julkowski, Ledin, Lightner, Masek, Miller, Mitchell, Novak, O'Brien, Palm, Pedersen, Rogers, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Salmore, Schultz, Siegel, Sinclair, Vukelich, Wagener, Wahlstrand, Wrabek, Zwach

Those who voted against reapportionment were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, E. P., Baughman, Bonniwell, Burdick, Carey, Carr, Child, Covert, Dickinson, Dunlap, Erickson, Grottum, Johnson, J. A., Keller, Larson, Lauerman, Lemm, Lofvegren, Mayhood, Mullin, Murray, Sletvold, Sullivan, Welch, Wright

Reapportionment was defeated because a special order to vote on the bill in the House, could not be secured.

* * *

H.F. 100 Constitutional Revision

This bill provided for a convention to revise the state Constitution, which is outmoded and has many obsolete provisions. Both political party conventions in their platforms carried planks endorsing such action. This bill, on March 11, 1953 came before the House on a motion to place it on Special Orders. It lost by a vote of 78 yeas to 49 nays, failing to secure the two-thirds vote required.

Those who voted "yes" favoring constitutional revision were:

Anderson, G. A., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, O., Aune, Bergerud, Biernat, Bouton, Campton, Chilgren, Cina, Croswell, Cummings, Day, Dominick, Eddy, Enestvedt, Ericson, Franz, Frederickson, Gallagher, Gibbons, Goodin, Grittner, Hagland, Halsted, Herzog, Hinds, Hofstad, Holm, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, R. C., Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Kennedy, K., Knutson, Kording, LaBrosse, Langley, Letnes, Luther, Madden, McGill, Moore, Mosier, Murk, Nelson, W. N., Oberg, O'Dea, Odegard, O'Malley, Otto, Peterson, P. K., Podgorski, Prifrel, Reed, Rutter, Schulz, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Swenson, Talle, Tieman, Tomczyk, Volstad, Wanvick, Welch, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka, Mr. Speaker

Those who voted opposing constitutional revision were:

Allen, Anderson, A. A., Anderson, D. F., Anderson, M., Appeldorn, Basford, Beanblossom, Blomquist, Clark, Dahle, Daley, Dirlam, Duxbury, Erdahl, Ernst, Fitzsimons, Forbes, French, Friberg, Furst, Iverson, Jensen, C. A., Kaplan, Karas, Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Koslosky, Langen, Legvold, Lloyd, Lorentz, McKee, Moriarty, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Nordin, Ottinger, Parks, Peterson, O., Pischel, Rinke, Schwanke, Sorensen, Sundet, Thompson, Tweten, Van De Riet, Voxland, Windmiller

This killed the bill for the Session.

The main opponent of this bill was the paid lobbyist of the railroads, who now enjoy special tax protection under our present constitution. A "yes" vote was a vote for the people, while a "no" vote was a vote for the railroads. A majority of the liberals voted for constitutional revision, while a majority of the conservatives voted against it.

* * *

II. Taxes

H.F. 1824 Package Sales Tax

This bill would have imposed a sales tax on most of the things which people buy. It would have eliminated the personal property tax, which is insignificant for most town people, although farmers pay more. The bill would have saved millions of dollars for large corporations. When the bill came before the House on March 28, 1953, Mr. Cina, under Rule 5 of the House, objected to the introduction of the bill as harmful to the general welfare. His motion was defeated by a vote of 49 yeas and 65 nays, those voting "yea" rejecting a sales tax, and those voting "nay" willing to accept consideration of a sales tax. Some of those voting "nay" may seek to excuse their vote by declaring that any type of bill should be accepted for discussion. If so, why Rule 5 which the conservatives wrote into the rules of the House, and has been there for years? Mr. Dunn, majority leader, in introducing the bill said, "We mean business about this."

Those who voted "yes," rejecting a sales tax, were:

Anderson, G. A., Anderson, O., Appledorn, Basford, Biernat, Campton, Chilgren, Cina, Day, Enestvedt, Franz, Gallagher, Gibbons, Goodin, Grittner, Hagland, Herzog, Hofstad, Iverson, Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Karth, Knutson, Kording, La Brosse, Letnes, Luther, Mosier, Murk, O'Dea, O'Malley, Otto, Podgorski, Popovich, Prifrel, Reed, Rutter, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Sorensen, Tieman, Tomczyk, Volstad, Wanvick, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka

Those who voted for a sales tax were:

Anderson, D. F., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, M., Aune, Beanblossom, Bergerud, Blomquist, Croswell, Cummings, Dahle, Dirlam, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ericson, Ernst, Fitzsimmons, Forbes, Frederickson, French, Friberg, Furst, Hinds, Holm, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Johnson, V. C., Kaplan, Karas, Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Langen, Langley, Legvold, Lorentz, Madden, McKee, Moriarty, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Nelson, W. N., Nordin, Odegard, Ottinger, Parks, Peterson, O., Peterson, P. K., Pischel, Rinke, Sundet, Swanstrom, Swenson, Talle, Thompson, Tweten, Van De Riet, Voxland, Welch, Windmiller, Mr. Speaker

The bill was referred to the Committee on Taxes and never came before the House again. There seems little doubt, however, that there will be a concerted effort of the conservatives to pass such a bill in the next session. The DFL Party is on record as unalterably opposed to any form of general sales tax.

* * *

H.F. 1940 Increased Property Tax

This bill increased the state tax on real estate and personal property three mills, making it the highest level since 1940.

This bill was brought to the House on the last day of the session, April 21, 1953 and passed with a vote of 74 yeas and 37 nays.

Those who voted "yes", to increase your property tax, were:

Allen, Anderson, A. A., Anderson, D. F., Anderson, G. A., Aune, Beanblossom, Bergerud, Blomquist, Bouton, Campton, Clark, Croswell, Dahle, Daley, Day, Dirlam, Dominick, Dunn, Erdahl, Ericson, Ernst, Fitzsimons, Forbes, Frederickson, French, Friberg, Furst, Gibbons, Goodin, Haeg, Halsted, Herzog, Hinds, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Kaplan, Karas, Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Knutson, Kording, Langen, Langley, Legvold, Letnes, Lloyd, Madden, Moore, Moriarty, Mosier, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Nordin, Oberg, Odegard, Ottinger, Parks, Peterson, O., Reed, Rinke, Schulz, Schwanke, Sorensen, Sundet, Talle, Thompson, Tweten, Van De Riet, Volstad, Voxland, Windmiller, Mr. Speaker

Those who voted "no", against increasing your property tax, were:

Anderson, H. J., Anderson, O., Chilgren, Cina, Cummings, Eddy, Enestvedt, Franz, Gallagher, Grittner, Hofstad, Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Karth, La Brosse, Luther, McGill, Murk, O'Dea, O'Malley, Peterson, P. K., Pischel, Podgorski, Popovich, Prifrel, Rutter, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Swanstrom, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka

On the same day the bill was rushed over to the Senate and passed with a vote of 47 yeas and 12 nays.

Those who voted "yes", to increase your property tax, were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, E. P., Baughman, Bonniwell, Carey, Carr, Child, Dahlquist, Daun, Duemke, Dunlap, Engbritson, Erickson, Feidt, George, Gillen, Grottum, Johanson, Johnson, C. E., Johnson, J. A., Julkowski, Keller, Larson, Lauerman, Lemm, Lofvegren, Masek, Mattson, Miller, Mullin, Novak, O'Brien, Pedersen, Peterson, Rogers, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Schultz, Siegel, Sletvold, Vukelich, Wahlstrand, Wefald, Welch, Wright

Those who voted "no", against increasing your property tax, were:

Anderson, M. H., Burdick, Butler, Dickinson, Duff, Lightner, Mayhood, Mitchell, Murray, Palm, Salmore, Zwach

This bill was approved by the Governor on April 24, 1953 and became law.

Once again the home-owners, farmers, and small business men were made to bear the brunt of taxation, with no increase on iron ore, railroad companies, and other special interests.

* * *

H.F. 1116 Air Flight Property Tax Reduction

This bill was introduced for the purpose of granting a reduction in the property tax of airplane companies who used the threat that they would move from the State if the reduction was not granted. It follows up previous reductions given to refinery properties and other groups, establishing a precedent which will repeatedly plague the Legislature and cause competitive inequality among industrial organizations. Home owners, farmers, and Main Street merchants must make up the difference.

H.F. 1116 came before the House on April 6, 1953. Efforts by the Liberals to amend the bill so as to decrease the concessions were all defeated. The key vote was on an amendment by Mr. Cina to increase the reduced assessment from 20% to 30% of the full and true value. This amendment was defeated by a vote of 45 yeas and 55 nays.

Those who voted "yes" to increase the assessment, were:

Anderson, D. F., Anderson, G. A., Anderson, M., Anderson, O., Chilgren, Cina, Clark, Dahle, Daley, Day, Enestvedt, Franz, Gallagher, Goodin, Grittner, Hofstad, Holm, Iverson, Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Karth, Kennedy, K., Knutson, Kording, Luther, McGill, Mosier, Murk, Nelson, W. N., O'Dea, Popovich, Rinke, Rutter, Schulz, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Sorensen, Tomczyk, Volstad, Wanvick, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka

Those who voted to permit a much reduced assessment were:

Allen, Anderson, A. A., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Basford, Beanblossom, Bergerud, Biernat, Blomquist, Bouton, Campton, Cummings, Dirlam, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ericson, Fitzsimons, Forbes, Frederickson, French, Furst, Gibbons, Halsted, Herzog, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Johnson, V. C., Kaplan, Kinzer, Langley, Lorentz, Madden, McKee, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Nordin, Oberg, Odegard, Otto, Parks, Pischel, Sundet, Swanstrom, Talle, Van De Riet, Voxland, Windmiller, Mr. Speaker

The bill then passed the House by a vote of 87 yeas and 32 nays.

The bill came before the Senate on April 18, 1953. Several amendments were adopted and the bill was finally passed by a vote of 57 yeas and 5 nays.

Those who voted "yes" were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, A. A., Anderson, E. P., Anderson, M. H., Baughman, Bonniwell, Burdick, Butler, Carey, Carr, Child, Covert, Daun, Duemke, Duff, Engbritson, Erickson, Feidt, George, Gillen, Grottum, Imm, Johanson, Johnson, C. E., Johnson, J. A., Julkowski, Keller, Lauerman, Lightner, Lofvegren, Masek, Mattson, Mayhood, Miller, Mitchell, Mullin, Murray, Novak, O'Brien, Palm, Pedersen, Peterson, Rogers, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Schultz, Siegel, Sinclair, Sullivan, Wagener, Wahlstrand, Wefald, Welch, Wright, Zwach

Those who voted "no" were:

Dickinson, Larson, Salmore, Sletvold, Vukelich

On April 20, 1953, the bill as amended by the Senate was passed by the House with a vote of 78 yeas to 16 nays. The bill was signed by the Governor and became law.

* * *

III. Labor

S.F. 622 Employment on Merit Bill

This bill provides for Employment on Merit with the aim to prevent discriminatory employment and labor practices based on race, color, religion, or national origin. We do not discriminate when we draft men to defend our country. Why should we permit discrimination in employment? The DFL party since its inception has supported this type of measure.

On April 6, 1953, in the Senate, efforts were made to amend the bill mostly without success. Then the bill was passed by a vote of 39 yeas and 22 nays.

Those who voted "yes," to end discrimination, were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, M. H., Bonniwell, Burdick, Carr, Dahlquist, Daun, Dickinson, Duemke, Duff, Feidt, Gillen, Grottum, Johnson, C. E., Julkowski, Larson, Lemm, Lofvegren, Masek, Mayhood, Miller, Mullin, Novak, O'Brien, Peterson, Rogers, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Salmore, Schultz, Siegel, Vukelich, Wahlstrand, Wefald, Welch, Wright, Zwach

Those who voted to continue discrimination were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, E. P., Baughman, Butler, Child, Covert, Dunlap, Engbritson, Erickson, George, Imm, Johanson, Johnson, J. A., Ledin, Lightner, Mitchell, Palm, Pedersen, Sinclair, Sletvold, Wagener, Wrabek

On April 18, 1953, in the House, Mr. Langley moved to place the bill on Special Orders in order to bring it to a vote. The motion lost by not receiving the necessary two-thirds vote, getting 81 yeas and 44 nays.

Those who voted "yes", to end discrimination, were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, G. A., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, O., Aune, Beanblossom, Bergerud, Biernat, Bouton, Campton, Chilgren, Cina, Cummings, Day, Dirlam, Enestvedt, Erdahl, Ericson, Ernst, Franz, French, Gallagher, Gibbons, Goodin, Grittner, Haeg, Hagland, Halsted, Herzog, Hinds, Holm, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, R. C., Johnson, A. I., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Karth, Kennedy, K., Knutson, Kording, La Brosse, Langen, Langley, Lloyd, Luther, Mosier, Murk, Nelson, W. N., Oberg, O'Dea, Odegard, O'Malley, Otto, Parks, Peterson, P. K., Podgorski, Popovich, Prifrel, Reed, Rutter, Schulz, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Sorenson, Swanstrom, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Volstad, Voxland, Wanvick, Welch, Widstrand, Yetka, Mr. Speaker

Those who voted to continue discrimination were:

Allen, Anderson, D. F., Anderson, M., Basford, Blomquist, Clark, Croswell, Dahle, Daley, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Fitzsimmons, Forbes, Friberg, Furst, Hofstad, Iverson, Jensen, C. A., Kaplan, Karas, Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Koslosky, Legvold, Letnes, Lorentz, Madden, McGill, McKee, Moriarty, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Nordin, Ottinger, Peterson, O., Pischel, Rinke, Sundet, Swenson, Talle, Thompson, Tweten, Van De Riet

The Republican party claims it favors FEPC, but Mr. Dunn, the former National Committeeman, and 38 other Republicans voted against this bill when it needed only 7 more votes for passage.

* * *

IV. Cooperatives

H.F. 144 Co-op Community Health Bill S.F. 134

An enabling act to permit people to incorporate voluntary prepayment hospital and medical care plans and to protect its members against unlimited financial liability. A bill similar to this was passed by the Wisconsin legislature without a dissenting vote.

Two Harbors has such a plan but is unincorporated because there is no enabling act under which it can incorporate. For five sessions the Two Harbors community has been asking for this legislation, but the Legislature has refused to act.

The DFL party is on record for this bill. The Minnesota Medical Society has opposed it. If adopted, users of medical care would secure bargaining power in dealing with doctors on the cost of such care, and co-op hospital and health cënters would be developed in this state.

A minority of the members of the Committee on Health recommended the bill to pass. This motion lost by a vote of 52 yeas to 77 nays.

Those who voted "yes", for the Co-op Community Health Bill, were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, G. A., Anderson, O., Aune, Basford, Campton, Chilgren, Cina, Clark, Cummings, Dahle, Day, Enestvedt, Fitzsimons, Franz, Furst, Gallagher, Gibbons, Goodin, Grittner, Halsted, Herzog, Holm, Iverson, Johnson, A. I., Karth, Knutson, Kording, Letnes, Luther, Mosier, Murk, Nelson, W. N., Nordin, O'Dea, Odegard, Pischel, Podgorski, Prifrel, Rutter, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Sorenson, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Volstad, Wanvick, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka

Those who voted against the Co-op Community Health Bill were:

Allen, Anderson, D. F., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, M., Beanblossom, Bergerud, Biernat, Blomquist, Bouton, Croswell, Daley, Dirlam, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ericson, Ernst, Forbes, Frederickson, French, Friberg, Haeg, Hagland, Hinds, Hofstad, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Johnson, L. A., Johnson, V. C., Kaplan, Karas, Kennedy, K., Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Koslosky, La Brosse, Langen, Langley, Legvold, Lorentz, Madden, McGill, McKee, Moore, Moriarty, Mueller, Nelson, K. O., Oberg, O'Malley, Ottinger, Otto, Parks, Peterson, O., Peterson, P. K., Popovich, Reed, Rinke, Schulz, Schwanke, Sundet, Swanstrom, Swenson, Talle, Thompson, Tweten, Van De Riet, Voxland, Welch, Windmiller, Mr. Speaker

So the bill was killed for the session.

V. Schools

S.F. 1631 State Aid for Schools

This bill related to state aid for schools and provided for tuition and transportation. It increased the state aid from $70 to $80. The DFL party platform calls for "$100 per pupil unit, commensurate with the increasing cost of education."

On April 13, 1953, the bill came before the Senate and Mr. Salmore moved that the aid be increased from $80 to $85 in view of the increased cost of education with higher salaries for teachers, and higher prices for books and equipment. This motion lost by a vote of 17 yeas and 47 nays.

Those who voted "yes", to increase the aid to $85, were:

Almen, Carr, Duemke, Julkowski, Larson, Masek, Mattson, Murray, O'Brien, Palm, Peterson, Rogers, Salmore, Schultz, Siegel, Vukelich, Wright

Those who voted "no", against the increased aid, were:

Anderson, E. L., Anderson, A. A., Anderson, E. P., Anderson, M. H., Baughman, Bonniwell, Burdick, Butler, Carey, Child, Covert, Dahlquist, Daun, Dickinson, Duff, Dunlap, Engbritson, Erickson, Feidt, George, Gillen, Grottum, Imm, Johanson, Johnson, J. A., Keller, Lauerman, Ledin, Lightner, Lofvegren, Mayhood, Miller, Mitchell, Mullin, Novak, Pedersen, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Sinclair, Sletvold, Sullivan, Wagener, Wahlstrand, Welch, Wrabek, Zwach

A minor amendment by Mr. Wright as to dates of payment was adopted and the bill then passed the Senate by a vote of 65 yeas and 0 nays.

The bill came before the House on April 14, 1953. The House version was substituted with minor changes for the Senate version. Mr. La Brosse moved to increase the state aid from $80 to $85. The motion was defeated by a vote of 54 yeas and 66 nays.

Those who voted "yes", to increase the aid to $85, were:

Anderson, G. A., Basford, Biernat, Campton, Chilgren, Cina, Clark, Enestvedt, Ericson, Franz, Gallagher, Gibbons, Goodin, Grittner, Hagland, Halsted, Herzog, Hinds, Holm, Johnson, A. I., Kaplan, Karth, Kennedy, K., Knutson, Kording, Koslosky, La Brosse, Letnes, Luther, McGill, Moriarty, Mosier, Murk, Nordin, O'Dea, O'Malley, Otto, Pischel, Podgorski, Popovich, Prifrel, Reed, Rutter, Shipka, Shovell, Silvola, Skeate, Swanstrom, Tiemann, Tomczyk, Wanvick, Widstrand, Wozniak, Yetka

Those who voted against the increased aid were:

Anderson, A. A., Anderson, D. F., Anderson, H. J., Anderson, H. R., Anderson, J. A., Anderson, M., Anderson, O., Aune, Bergerud, Blomquist, Bouton, Croswell, Cummings, Dahle, Daley, Day, Dirlam, Dominick, Dunn, Duxbury, Eddy, Erdahl, Ernst, Fitzsimmons, Forbes, Frederickson, French, Furst, Haeg, Hofstad, Holmquist, Holtan, Howard, Iverson, Jensen, C. A., Jensen, R. C., Johnson, V. C., Karas, Kennedy, R. B., Kinzer, Langen, Langley, Legvold, Madden, McGee, Moore, Nelson, K. O., Nelson, W. N., Oberg, Odegard, Parks, Peterson, P. K., Peterson, O., Rinke, Schulz, Schwanke, Sundet, Swenson, Talle, Thompson, Tweten, Van De Riet, Volstad, Voxland, Welch, Mr. Speaker

Liberals offered other amendments to increase the aid but without success. The bill then passed by a vote of 123 yeas and 0 nays.

The Senate refused to concur in the original House amendments and asked for a Conference Committee which was appointed on April 17, 1953.

On April 21, 1953, the Conference Committee reported on a compromise bill and as thus written it passed the House by a vote of 112 yeas and 0 nays. On the same day in the Senate the amended bill was passed by a vote of 56 yeas and 0 nays. On April 24, 1953, the bill was approved by the Governor and became law.

* * *

VI. General Welfare

H.F. 574 Termination of Rent Control S.F. 433

This bill called for ending rent controls in the State of Minnesota. The DFL platform of 1952 call for an "extension of the state rent controls 'standby' act," which allows each community to determine for itself whether or not it should retain rent control. The Senate version came before the Senate on March 16, 1953, and was passed by a vote of 37 yeas and 20 nays.

Those who voted "yes", to end rent control, were:

Almen, Anderson, E. L., Anderson, A. A., Anderson, E. P., Baughman, Burdick, Butler, Carey, Child, Covert, Dahlquist, Daun, Dunlap, Erickson, Grottum, Imm, Johnson, J. A., Julkowski, Keller, Lauerman, Ledin, Miller, Mitchell, Mullin, Palm, Pedersen, Root, Rosenmeier, Sageng, Sinclair, Sletvold, Sullivan, Wagener, Wahlstrand, Welch, Wrabek, Zwach

Those who voted to allow each community to make its own decision on rent control, were:

Bonniwell, Carr, Dickinson, Duff, Engbritson, George, Johanson, Larson, Lemm, Lofvegren, Masek, Mattson, Murray, Novak, O'Brien, Peterson, Rogers, Salmore, Schultz, Vukelich

On March 17, 1953, the S.F. 433 was substituted in the House for H.F. 574, the two bills being identical, and on March 20, 1953, S.F. 433 passed the House by a vote of 67 yeas to 57 nays.

COPY

MINNESOTA EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION

1600 Pioneer Building

Phone St. Paul: - CE. 3802
Phone Minneapolis: NE. 4407

Saint Paul 1, Minnesota

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE MEMORANDUM
FROM OTTO P. CHRISTENSON
January 2, 1953

TO THE INDUSTRIAL AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT OF MINNESOTA:

The Minnesota Legislature will convene January 6. Congress will convene on January 3.

What happens in Washington in the next four months will obviously affect every business and citizen in our nation. What happens in St. Paul in the same period of time may determine whether your business operates at a profit or loss for the year.

Much of our work will be in the fields of workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation and labor relations legislation generally. Enclosed is a reprint of a story carried by the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of December 28, 1952, which outlines some of the demands which will be made upon the Legislature by labor groups this session.

In addition to those in the area of labor and compensation laws, other proposals to be considered by the Legislature will be of vital interest to Minnesota business. Among them will be party designation, reapportionment, FEPC, and constitutional convention. In this bulletin we discuss these four important issues at length. Before we get to that, however, we want to outline briefly some of the work we will do in our effort to keep you informed of developments of importance to industry in our Legislature and Congress.

During the session, we will be sending to all our members:

(1) The weekly Legislative Digest, which will be on your desk every Monday morning, containing a digest of legislative events of the preceding week of particular interest to business. Also included will be brief summaries of all bills introduced that week affecting industry.

(2) The Midweek Capitol Gossip newsletter, mailed each Wednesday, containing the off-the-record thinking of legislative and capitol leaders. This bulletin will give you the more important items of gossip around the Legislature. It is not intended to give hard facts, as is the weekly digest, but rather to give you the "feel" of the Legislature as revealed in the shop talk of its members.

(3) The Washington Letter, to be published about every two weeks, containing the news of interest to business on the federal scene as gathered by our Washington contacts, including Charles A. Jordan, our fulltime Washington representative.

(4) Special Bulletins and informational letters will also be sent out occasionally to members engaged in specific types of business when bills affecting them come up for hearing before legislative committees.

(5) Copies of major bills affecting business will go out to our members along with the regular digest summary of them.

Occasionally we will issue a complete roster of all the bills introduced to date of interest to business with information as to their progress. All bills passed into law will be noted in the weekly digest.

To put this information to its fullest use, we suggest that you get to know your representatives and senators and talk with them about the important issues. We urge you to meet and write your legislators, and that you see them on weekends when they return home. Tell them your views -- and establish a good relationship so that you can write them, or talk with them while the Legislature is in session.

We have enclosed two pamphlets to give you more information. One leaflet is an alphabetical list of the members of the Legislature and the names of Minnesota's Congressmen and Senators. The other leaflet suggests how letters to your government representatives should be written.

Among the several controversial issues you may wish to discuss with your legislators are these:

PARTY DESIGNATION

Minnesota elects its members to the Legislature on a non-partisan basis, rather than as Republicans or Democrats. The C.I.O., A.F.L., League of Women Voters, Minnesota Republican Platform, and Minnesota DFL Platform favor amending the law to require "Party Designation."

The reasons given in favor of the change are that "it would simplify the voter's choice, develope a stronger two-party system, and clarify legislators' relationship to their party platforms without diminishing independent thought and action." It is also argued that the change would develop "Party responsibility" - whatever that means.

One reason given to retain the present system is that a change would be a big victory for labor groups. They control the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, which has its greatest strength on the Iron Range and in the principal cities of the state. These areas elect labor-endorsed Congressmen, such as Wier, Blatnik and McCarthy, and labor-endorsed councilmen, and so on. A party label system would undoubtedly increase the success of labor-endorsed candidates for the Legislature in these areas, already substantially represented by labor-minded legislators.

For example, Stevenson carried Duluth and St. Louis County, carried St. Paul and Ramsey County overwhelmingly, and while Eisenhower carried Minneapolis and Hennepin County by a narrow margin, many other labor-endorsed candidates were successful there. Yet, several outstanding conservatives are regularly elected to the Legislature under the present system.

It is also believed that in many districts throughout the state conservatives were elected to the Legislature by narrow margins where liberals would have been elected if there had been "Party Designation."

A second reason given to retain the present system is that if "Reapportionment" is effected the city districts will undoubtedly gain a number of additional representatives at the expense of the rural districts which would also militate in favor of the labor controlled districts of the State.

A third reason given is that the change would give too much power to the Administration, regardless of who is elected. Old timers recall the days of Floyd Olson and Elmer Benson, and ask what would have happened in Minnesota if they had been given party-designated control of both Houses. They recall that a Conservative Senate held the line in those days when irreparable damage would have occurred to the state if the administration of those days had control of both Houses.

The fourth and most compelling argument given against party designation is that our Legislature is now one of the best in the nation. Its members are elected not because of some political machine but because a majority of the voters in their home communities esteemed and respected them sufficiently. Under party machines, candidates are endorsed because they have been good party workers and are rewarded upon their ability to sway party leadership, rather than their home community support.

A fifth reason given is that many legislators do not want to be pledged to the platform of any party but want to exercise their own judgment. They say there is little difference between the platforms of our political parties in Minnesota, and if they ran as "party" men and received "Party" support, and had to give "Party" support, they would be impliedly bound to the platform of the "Party."

REAPPORTIONMENT

In the last 15 years the population of Minnesota has shifted so that of our 2,982,483 citizens more than a million now live in the Twin Cities and their suburbs. With another 150,000 in Duluth and the Iron Range, plus many other cities growing in population and in labor-endorsed politics, it is only natural that the labor organizations should strongly urge reapportionment of the legislative districts, and that the same should be viewed with some reluctance by the smaller cities and rural areas. Reapportionment, based on population, could result in every other group in Minnesota having to go hat in hand to the unions for all legislation affecting schools, highways, taxes, etc.

Reapportionment is strongly favored by the C.I.O., the A.F.L., and the League of Women Voters. It is endorsed in both the Republican and the Democratic Farmer Labor Party Platforms.

Personalities in the Legislature also enter into this situation. Some of the most able men in both Houses, from both the conservative and liberal groups, are from districts with comparatively small populations. In a reapportionment process they could be deprived of their districts or put into another one where a capable and well thought of representative already is a resident.

F. E. P. C.

Here is another controversial issue upon which there are widely divergent views, and which is strongly urged by the C. I. O., the League of Women Voters, the A.F.L., and is included as a plank in both the Republican and DFL platforms.

Briefly, the proponents of this measure say that it is necessary to pass legislation "with teeth" to eliminate discrimination in the employment practices of our companies in Minnesota. They say a sufficient amount of discrimination because of race, color or religion prevails so that compulsory legislation with jail sentences for employers is the solution to the problem.

They propose that a commission be created by the Governor, with a Director and staff of assistants, to pass upon the complaints of people who complaint that they were not hired because of their race, creed, color, or national origin. Conciliation procedure would be provided for. If the Commission found an employer had acted contrary to the proposed law, and if conciliation were unable to persuade the employer to discharge the person he hired, hire the person he chose not to hire, and prove compliance with the order of the Commission, then the "teeth" recommended would go into operation. He could be compelled to pay back wages to the person he did not hire - from the time he chose not to hire him - and on contempt proceedings in court he could be committed to jail for contempt of court until he did comply.

This bill has failed of passage by narrow margins in previous sessions, and is commended in the Republican platform this year in the following terms:

> "We strongly urge the next Legislature to enact an equality of opportunity law which will assure all citizens of Minnesota the right to be employed to the full measure of their ability and job qualifications, without regard to race, color, creed or national origin."

The DFL platform includes this statement among others:

> "We reaffirm our belief that national and Minnesota state governments should adopt all measures necessary to protect the civil rights of all our people, regardless of sex, race, color, creed or national origin."
>
> "We propose the enactment of Fair Employment Practices Laws with enforcement powers and adequate finances."

There are many arguments advanced against passage of the law:

(1) Only 8 states in the Far East or Far West part of the United States have passed such a law. They are states with heavily foreign-born populations, and the laws were passed by New Deal Legislatures 8 to 10 years ago. The success of these laws are highly debatable, depending pretty much on the attitude of the people involved. All Middle-Western states have had the law proposed to them and turned down compulsory FEPC laws in each.

(2) Even debate of the law brings on emotional tensions and arouses antagonisms rather than eliminates them.

(3) Employers should be free to select their own personnel without the interference, rulings or enforcements of government agencies. It is taking power away from the people and giving it to the government when many believe that what we need now is to take some powers away from the government and give them to the people.

(4) There is no real need for this legislation in Minnesota. The problem has been and is being met by education and understanding.

(5) Some jobs by their very nature require discrimination. For example, one may need people who can speak certain foreign languages, or at least find such employees desirable in certain areas. Perhaps a Norwegian salesman may appeal to a Norwegian employer who wants him to work in a Norwegian community, etc.

The placing of every man and woman in a job is the matching of his or her personality with the job. Sales people in particular are selected with the view of what type of appearance, speech, etc., will sell the most merchandise. Employers should be free to discriminate in favor of those the employer believes will do the best job, not who a government commission considers may do the job satisfactorily.

The law would also apply to promotions and discharges. Many employers argue that they should be free to make their own promotions, entirely free from governmental interference.

(6) Unfavorable and sometimes disastrous consequences might arise from unfavorable publicity in a community where it became known a complaint was made. The bill might encourage boycotts and picketing. Blackmail is also possible under such a law where some employers would rather pay off somebody than fight charges whether true or untrue.

(7) The bill fails to provide any protection or recourse against false complaints, except that the complaint be dismissed.

(8) The law is discriminatory in itself in that it discriminates against majority groups in favor of minority groups. It gives the minority special privileges because only those of the minority will file complaints.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

There has been a movement on foot for a number of years in Minnesota among a number of groups to revise or redraft the Constitution of the State.

If you ask most proponents of this idea what is wrong with our present constitution, or wherein an evil exists that is in our constitution that is injurious to the welfare of the citizens of the state, they are unable to cite any specific instances, but answer that the constitution is many years old, that it has been amended frequently, and that it should be thoroughly revised - never saying where or how - but just that it ought to be done.

If you point out to them that the Constitution can be amended, as it has in the past, by the Legislature first considering an amendment and then submitting it to the voters the proponents answer that such a process is "too slow."

Here again the principal supporters of this plan are the CIO., the A.F.L., and the League of Women Voters, and planks are in the platforms of both political parties in the state supporting the idea.

The Republican platform says:

> "We urge the Minnesota Legislature to enact a bill submitting to the voters of the State the question of calling a Constituional Convention to revise our state ~~xxxxx~~ constitution. This cannot be accomplished effectively within a reasonable period of time by the slow amending process."

The Democratic Farmer Labor Platform says:

> "Constitutional revision is necessary in order to return the government to the people . . . The 1953 Legislature should provide for the calling of a constitutional convention at the earliest possible date . . . The Constitution should provide that if the Legislature fails to reapportion at its first session after each Federal census, such powers and duties shall automatically transfer to the State Supreme Court."

There are three facts to be borne in mind if such a State Constitutional Convention were called:

(1) Under the provisions of our present constitution no member of the Legislature could participate in such a convention.

(2) Unless such a convention chose to submit their work to the electorate, such constitution as they chose to draft would immediately take the place of our present constitution. It would become the basic law of our state, automatically nullifying any law or procedure now on the books that we in conflict with it.

(3) Pressure groups would be working in such a convention to do such things as:

A. Reapportionment.
B. Party Designation.
C. FEPC
D. Change labor laws. Repeal anti-secondary boycott law, Public Employees Not Strike law, etc.
E. Reduce voting age to 18 years.
F. Abolish time limit on legislative sessions.
G. Reorganize local, city and county governments.
H. Reorganize relief and rehabilitation programs.
I. Authorize some form of socialized medicine.
J. Reorganize the educational system of the state.

K. Deal with highways and highway funds.
L. Deal with taxation in all its phases, approaching it with a strong demand for prohibition of all sales taxes, greater exemptions for lower income levels, etc.
M. Redistrict the judiciary of the state.
N. Handle housing, rent control, urban development, slum clearance, etc.
O. Revise business regulations, develop co-ops, etc.
P. Revise banking regulations, small loans, interest rate maximums, etc.
Q. Revise Unemployment and Workmen's Compensation regulations.

Those opposed therefore argue that until such time as the people of this state would rather entrust the laws of this state to a constitutional convention than to our Legislature that care and caution would dictate that we choose to amend our constitution by submitting each proposed amendment to the electorate rather than by giving carte blanche to a constitutional convention.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

We therefore suggest that whether you favor or oppose any of these measures that your legislator will enjoy having you visit with him as to your views upon these and other measures that you are interested in.

Cordially yours,

(signed) O. F. Christenson

Executive Vice President

(NOTE: INSERT THE NAME OF REPRESENTATIVE B. W. LLOYD, 12TH DISTRICT, MURRAY COUNTY, IN THE ENCLOSED LEGISLATIVE ROSTER. LLOYD SUCCEEDS REPRESENTATIVE TRIGG KNUTSON, SLAYTON, WHO DIED FOLLOWING REELECTION IN NOVEMBER.)

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE MEMORANDUM
FROM OTTO F. CHRISTENSON
January 2, 1953

PARTY DESIGNATION

Minnesota elects its members to the Legislature on a non-partisan basis, rather than as Republicans or Democrats. The CIO, AFL, League of Women Voters, Minnesota Republican Platform, and Minnesota DFL Platform favor amending the law to require "Party Designation."

The reasons given in favor of the change are that "it would simplify the voter's choice, develop a stronger two-party system, and clarify legislators' relationship to their party platforms without diminishing independent thought and action." It is also argued that the change would develop "Party responsibility" - whatever that means.

One reason given to retain the present system is that a change would be a big victory for labor groups. They control the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, which has its greatest strength on the Iron Range and in the principal cities of the state. These areas elect labor-endorsed Congressmen, such as Wier, Blatnik and McCarthy, and labor-endorsed councilmen, and so on. A party label system would undoubtedly increase the success of labor-endorsed candidates for the Legislature in these areas, already substantially represented by labor-minded legislators.

For example, Stevenson carried Duluth and St. Louis County, carried St. Paul and Ramsey County overwhelmingly, and while Eisenhower carried Minneapolis and Hennepin County by a narrow margin, many other labor-endorsed candidates were successful there. Yet, several outstanding conservatives are regularly elected to the Legislature under the present system.

It is also believed that in many districts throughout the state conservatives were elected to the Legislature by narrow margins where liberals would have been elected if there had been "Party Designation."

A second reason given to retain the present system is that if "Reapportionment" is effected the city districts will undoubtedly gain a number of additional representatives at the expense of the rural districts which would also militate in favor of the labor controlled districts of the State.

A third reason given is that the change would give too much power to the Administration, regardless of who is elected. Old timers recall the days of Floyd Olson and Elmer Benson, and ask what would have happened in Minneapolis if they had been given party-designated control of both Houses. They recall that a Conservative Senate held the line in those days when irreparable damage would have occurred to the state if the administration of those days had control of both Houses.

The fourth and most compelling argument given against party designation is that our Legislature is now one of the best in the nation. Its members are elected not because of some political machine but because a majority of the voters in their home communities esteemed and respected them sufficiently. Under party machines, candidates are endorsed because they have been good party workers and are rewarded upon their ability to sway party leadership, rather than their home community support.

A fifth reason given is that many legislators do not want to be pledged to the platform of any party but want to exercise their own judgment. They say there is little difference between the platforms of our political parties in Minnesota, and if they ran as "party" men and received "party" support, and had to give "party" support, they would be impliedly bound to the platform of the "party."

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE MEMORANDUM
FROM OTTO F. CHRISTENSON
January 2, 1953

REAPPORTIONMENT

In the last 15 years the population of Minnesota has shifted so that of our 2,982,483 citizens more than a million now live in the Twin Cities and their suburbs. With another 150,000 in Duluth and the Iron Range, plus many other cities growing in population and in labor-endorsed politics, it is only natural that the labor organizations should strongly urge reapportionment of the legislative districts, and that the same should be viewed with some reluctance by the smaller cities and rural areas. Reapportionment, based on population, could result in every other group in Minnesota having to go hat in hand to the unions for all legislation affecting schools, highways, taxes, etc.

Reapportionment is strongly favored by the CIO, the AFL and the League of Women Voters. It is endorsed in both the Republican and the Democratic Farmer Labor Party Platforms.

Personalities in the Legislature also enter into this situation. Some of the most able men in both Houses, from both the conservative and liberal groups, are from districts with comparatively small populations. In a reapportionment process they could be deprived of their districts or put into another one where a capable and well thought of representative already is a resident.

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE MEMORANDUM
FROM OTTO F. CHRISTENSON
January 2, 1953

F. E. P. C.

Here is another controversial issue upon which there are widely divergent views, and which is strongly urged by the CIO, the League of Women Voters, the AFL, and is included as a plank in both the Republican and DFL platforms.

Briefly, the proponents of this measure say that it is necessary to pass legislation "with teeth" to eliminate discrimination in the employment practices of our companies in Minnesota. They say a sufficient amount of discrimination because of race, color or religion prevails so that compulsory legislation with jail sentences for employers is the solution to the problem.

They propose that a commission be created by the Governor, with a Director and staff of assistants, to pass upon the complaints of people who complain that they were not hired because of their race, creed, color, or national origin. Conciliation procedure would be provided for. If the Commission found an employer had acted contrary to the proposed law, and if conciliation were unable to persuade the employer to discharge the person he hired, hire the person he chose not to hire, and prove compliance with the order of the Commission, then the "teeth" recommended would go into operation. He could be compelled to pay back wages to the person he did not hire - from the time he chose not to hire him - and on contempt proceedings in court he could be committed to jail for contempt of court until he did comply.

This bill has failed of passage by narrow margins in previous sessions, and is commended in the Republican platform this year in the following terms:

> "We strongly urge the next Legislature to enact an equality of opportunity law which will assure all citizens of Minnesota the right to be employed to the full measure of their ability and job qualifications, without regard to race, color, creed or national origin."

The DFL platform includes this statement among others:

> "We reaffirm our belief that national and Minnesota state governments should adopt all measures necessary to protect the civil rights of all our people, regardless of sex, race, color, creed or national origin."
>
> "We propose the enactment of Fair Employment Practices Laws with enforcement powers and adequate finances."

There are many arguments advanced against passage of the law:

(1) Only 8 states in the Far East or Far West part of the United States have passed such a law. They are states with heavily foreign-born populations, and the laws were passed by New Deal Legislatures 8 to 10 years ago. The success of these laws are highly debatable, depending pretty much on the attitude of the people involved. All Middle-Western states have had the law proposed to them and turned down compulsory FEPC laws in each.

(2) Even debate of the law brings on emotional tensions and arouses antagonisms rather than eliminates them.

(3) Employers should be free to select their own personnel without the interference, rulings or enforcements of government agencies. It is taking power away from the people and giving it to the government when many believe that what we need now is to take some powers away from the government and give them to the people.

(4) There is no real need for this legislation in Minnesota. The problem has been and is being met by education and understanding.

(5) Some jobs by their very nature require discrimination. For example, one may need people who can speak certain foreign languages, or at least find such employees desirable in certain areas. Perhaps a Norwegian salesman may appeal to a Norwegian employer who wants him to work in a Norwegian community, etc.

The placing of every man and woman in a job is the matching of his or her personality with the job. Sales people in particular are selected with the view of what type of appearance, speech, etc. will sell the most merchandise. Employers should be free to discriminate in favor of those the employer believes will do the best job, not who a government commission considers may do the job satisfactorily.

The law would also apply to promotions and discharges. Many employers argue that they should be free to make their own promotions, entirely free from governmental interference.

(6) Unfavorable and sometimes disastrous consequences might arise from unfavorable publicity in a community where it became known a complaint was made. The bill might encourage boycotts and picketing. Blackmail is also possible under such a law where some employers would rather pay off somebody than fight charges whether true or untrue.

(7) The bill fails to provide any protection or recourse against false complaints, except that the complaint be dismissed.

(8) The law is discriminatory in itself in that it discriminates against majority groups in favor of minority groups. It gives the minority special privileges because only those of the minority will file complaints.

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE MEMORANDUM
FROM OTTO F. CHRISTENSON
January 2, 1953

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

There has been a movement on foot for a number of years in Minnesota among a number of groups to revise or redraft the Constitution of the State.

If you ask most proponents of this idea what is wrong with our present constitution, or wherein an evil exists that is in our constitution that is injurious to the welfare of the citizens of the state, they are unable to cite any specific instance, but answer that the constitution is many years old, that it has been amended frequently, and that it should be thoroughly revised - never saying where or how - but just that it ought to be done.

If you point out to them that the constitution can be amended, as it has in the past, by the Legislature first considering an amendment and then submitting it to the voters the proponents answer that such a process is "too slow."

Here again the principal supporters of this plan are the CIO, the AFL and the League of Women Voters, and planks are in the platforms of both political parties in the state supporting the idea.

The Republican platform says:

> "We urge the Minnesota Legislature to enact a bill submitting to the voters of the State the question of calling a Constitutional Convention to revise our state constitution. This cannot be accomplished effectively within a reasonable period of time by the slow amending process."

The Democratic Farmer Labor platform says:

> "Constitutional revision is necessary in order to return the government to the people. . . . The 1953 Legislature should provide for the calling of a constitutional convention at the earliest possible date . . . . The constitution should provide that if the Legislature fails to reapportion at its first session after each Federal census, such powers and duties shall automatically transfer to the State Supreme Court."

There are three facts to be borne in mind if such a State Constitutional Convention were called:

(1) Under the provisions of our present constitution no members of the Legislature could participate in such a convention.

(2) Unless such a convention chose to submit their work to the electorate, such constitution as they chose to draft would immediately take the place of our present constitution. It would become the basic law of our state, automatically nullifying any law or procedure now on the books that were in conflict with it.

(3) Pressure groups would be working in such a convention to do such things as:

A. Reapportionment.
B. Party Designation.
C. FEPC
D. Change labor laws. Repeal anti-secondary boycott law, Public Employees Not Strike Law, etc.
E. Reduce voting age to 18 years.
F. Abolish time limit on legislative sessions.
G. Reorganize local, city and county governments.
H. Reorganize relief and rehabilitation programs.
I. Authorize some form of socialized medicine.
J. Reorganize the educational system of the state.
K. Deal with highways and highway funds.
L. Deal with taxation in all its phases, approaching it with a strong demand for prohibition of all sales taxes, greater exemptions for lower income levels, etc.
M. Redistrict the judiciary of the state.
N. Handle housing, rent control, urban development, slum clearance, etc. clearance, etc.
O. Revise business regulations, develop co-ops, etc.
P. Revise banking regulations, small loans, interest rate maximums, etc.
Q. Revise Unemployment and Workmen's Compensation regulations.

Those opposed therefore argue that until such time as the people of this state would rather entrust the laws of this state to a constitutional convention than to our Legislature that care and caution would dictate that we choose to amend our constitution by submitting each proposed amendment to the electorate rather than by giving carte blanche to a constitutional convention.

MINNESOTA POLL Release
January 25, 1953
MINNEAPOLIS SUNDAY TRIBUNE

Reapportionment

The Minnesota Poll is maintained by the Minneapolis Tribune as a public service.

Many See No Need to Re-District

So far as more than half the people of Minnesota are concerned, legislative re-districting is not an urgent problem, a statewide survey of the Minnesota Poll indicates.

A majority of them think the farm residents of the state have "just about what they should have" in the way of representation in the legislature. A majority also think that city residents are equally well represented.

MINNESOTA was last re-districted in 1913, on the basis of 1910 population data as established by the federal census. Governors in recent years have urged repeatedly that the legislature adopt a new districting plan, which would take into account population shifts and trends. The latest such plea came from Gov. Elmer C. Anderson in his inaugural message Jan. 7.

While census reports show that farm population in Minnesota is declining and urban population is growing, 41 per cent of the farmers interviewed by the Minnesota Poll believe that the farm people have "less than their fair share of representation" in the legislature. Twenty per cent think that city people in Minnesota have more representation than they rightfully should.

ON THE OTHER HAND, 13 per cent of the city dwellers contend that the farmers have over-representation; 19 per cent say the urban area residents are under-represented.

Interviewers asked a representative cross-section of Minnesota's men and women 21 years of age and older:

"Do you think that farm people in Minnesota have less than their fair share of representation in the legislature, more than their fair share, or just about what they should have?

"What about city people in Minnesota—do you think they have less than their fair share of representation in the legislature, more, or about what they should have?"

The same questions were asked in a similar statewide survey two years ago. As the comparisons indicate, there has been a small rise in the number of persons who believe that the farmers are inadequately represented:

	January 1951	Today
FARM PEOPLE		
HAVE—Less than fair share	13%	17%
More than fair share	10%	8%
What they should have	52%	51%
No opinion	25%	24%
	100%	100%
CITY PEOPLE		
HAVE—Less than fair share	11%	14%
More than fair share	9%	9%
What they should have	54%	54%
No opinion	26%	23%
	100%	100%

Among college-educated men and women, 19 per cent say that the farmers have more representation than they are entitled to, but 10 per cent believe the farmers are under-represented, 48 per cent think the present representation is fair, and 23 per cent are undecided. However, 27 per cent of the college-educated group say that city people in Minnesota are under-represented, 8 per cent say they have more than their fair share of representation, 48 per cent endorse the present division and 17 per cent express no opinion.

MINNESOTA POLL FINDS:

53% Doubt Ike Can End Korean War by Summer

Whatever President Eisenhower may do to try to end the Korean war, a majority of Minnesotans do not foresee quick success for him in such an effort.

In a Minnesota Poll survey, 53 per cent of a representative cross-section of the state's voting-age men and women say they do not believe Mr. Eisenhower will be able to find a way to bring the fighting in Korea to a close by the summer of 1953.

ABOUT ONE-FOURTH of the people (26 per cent) do think the new President will restore peace by summertime. The rest qualify their answers or decline to venture any opinions.

There are sharply-divided views among Minnesotans, at the same time, on the question of attacking Communist China in an attempt to hasten the end of the conflict in Korea. A few more people believe the United Nations should not try that tactic than say the U.N. should.

Interviewing took place in December. The first question was this:

"General Eisenhower went to Korea early in December to get a look at the war situation and to talk with leaders there. Do you believe Eisenhower will or will not be able to find some means of bringing the Korean war to an end, say, by the summer of 1953?"

The answers:

Believe he will	26%
Believe he will not	53%
Qualified	1%
No opinion	20%
	100%

City, town and farm residents respond in very similar manner. Republicans express more confidence that President Eisenhower will succeed in ending the war by next summer than other segments of the state adult population do; 34 per cent of the GOP voters voice that opinion.

A NUMBER of men and women who doubt that the President will succeed within six months or so of winding up the Korean conflict say they believe he may do so "eventually, but not that soon." And other comments run in this vein:

"It will take more than one man to do it" (an International Falls woman); "I think it's impossible without all-out war" (a Two Harbors woman); "his trip to Korea was worthwhile, but that's too soon" (a Rochester man).

(Adm. Ernest J. King, who was America's naval chief during World War II, said several weeks ago that he thinks Mr. Eisenhower will "come up with a workable solution" to end the Korean stalemate, but he set no time limit on his prediction.)

The Minnesota Poll also asked the same statewide cross-section:

"Do you think the United Nations forces in Korea should or should not attack Communist China in an effort to force an end to the Korean war?"

The replies:

Should attack China	35%
Should not attack	39%
Qualified	3%
No opinion	23%
	100%

Most of the qualified answers were to this effect: "The U.N. should attack if that would end the war"; "as an absolutely last resort, China should be attacked"; "they should if it would not lead to another world war."

WORLD WAR II veterans are more unitedly opposed to the idea of spreading the war in the Far East than are non-veterans; 50 per cent of the veterans say the U.N. should not undertake an attack on Communist China.

People who think an attack should be made offer these kinds of comments: "There's no other way out" (a Stewartville woman); "we need to get it over with" (a Blooming Prairie man); "attack, if the leaders believe that would end it" (an Alexandria man).

Those who oppose such an attack express these kinds of views: "The war should not be broadened—it's too big as it is" (a Pine City man); "that might start World War III" (a Little Falls man); "we would get in over our heads" (a Minneapolis woman).

January 26, 1953

Mrs. Samuel Gale, President
League of Women Voters of Minneapolis
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Gale:

This letter is in reply to the request of the Minneapolis Board that the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis be authorized to lobby at this session of the Legislature in support of the following items:

1. Increase of four mills for the City Council's current expense fund.
2. A bill putting the cost of public relief in Minneapolis on a "pay-as-you-go" basis.
3. Enabling legislation for new forms of taxation for Minneapolis to take the load off of real estate.
4. A Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

At its last meeting, the state Board agreed to grant this authority excepting work for a Metropolitan Transit Authority. The decision to deny your request for the latter was made for two reasons.

1. There was some question about the preparedness of your membership to support such an authority. We know that the board has given some information on this subject to the members, but it has not received the same degree of coverage as have other items on your local program.
2. The more important determining factor involved a question of League policy. In order to endorse such a proposal, the Minneapolis League must have the cooperation of other Leagues which would be affect by this legislation (St. Paul and suburban Leagues). The state Board knows that members in these Leagues are not prepared as League to do so althoughtas individuals many of them undoubtedly feel quite strongly about the subject.

If there is any inaccuracy in the state Board's interpretation of the request, please let us know. We are probably being this firm because of the influence of Miss Sweeney's recent pronouncements on metropolitan matters. You might say that this is done accoring to Sweeney, a League substitute for Hoyle.

Sincerely,

BS:lu

Mrs. K. K. McMillan, President

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNEAPOLIS
84 South Tenth Street, Room 407, Minneapolis 2, Minnesota
Telephone: Atlantic 6319

Jan. 15, 1953

Mrs. K. K. McMillan, President
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
84 S. 10th St.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mrs. McMillan:

The League of Women Voters of Minneapolis, through its Board of Directors, respectfully requests permission to work for legislation affecting Minneapolis which may be introduced during the coming session. Some of the bills which are in the offing, we understand, are:

1. Increase of four mills for the City Council's current expense fund.
2. A bill putting the cost of public relief in Minneapolis on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. It is now financed by bond issues.
3. Enabling legislation for new forms of taxation for Minneapolis to take the load off of real estate.

O.K.

under what authority as Agenda? how about other Metropolitan Agencies?

We should also like permission to work for a Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

May we have your decision soon so that we can formulate our plans?

Sincerely yours,

Stella N. Gale

Mrs. Samuel C. Gale
President

SNG:j

File

FILE COPY

ELMER L. ANDERSEN
SENATOR 42ND DISTRICT
2188 HENDON AVE. 2230 W. HUYT AVE.
ST. PAUL 8, MINN.

State of Minnesota
SENATE CHAMBER

COMMITTEES
CITIES OF THE FIRST CLASS
MILITARY AFFAIRS
PUBLIC WELFARE
UNIVERSITY
INSURANCE
ELECTIONS

November 24, 1952

League of Women Voters
84 South Tenth Street
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

Attention: Mrs. John K. Donohue

Dear Mrs. Donohue:

Thanks for your letter of November 14th and the statements relative to your legislative program, all of which I am in accord.

There is going to have to be some decision as to just what tact those interested in constitutional revision should take in the next legislative session, considering that Amendment No. 2 was defeated.

My own hope would be, at least up to this minute, that we re-submit Amendment No. 2 to the people at the next election and in addition the resolution placing the question of the convention before the people so we wouldn't have to lose two more years by merely resubmitting Amendment No. 2.

In other words then, the voters in 1954 could vote both on the Constitutional Amendment and on the question of having a Constitutional Convention. Then, if they voted yes on both subjects the mechanics for calling the Convention could proceed and under the amended constitutional provisions. Your board and others interested may want to give some consideration as to just what program the friends of Constitutional Revision should follow in the legislative session.

Cordially yours,

Elmer L. Andersen
Elmer L. Andersen

ELA:DP

copy sent J. Mrs. Donohue
2. M. Griffin
3. M. Hargrave

CHARLES N. BOUTON
49TH DISTRICT
GLYNDON, MINN.

COMMITTEES:
GENERAL LEGISLATION,
VICE-CHAIRMAN
AGRICULTURE
ELECTIONS
GAME AND FISH
UNIVERSITY

State of Minnesota

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
JOHN A. HARTLE, Speaker

November 19 1952.

League of Women Voters Of Minnesota. Mrs. John Donohue Chairman,
84 South Tenth St.
Minneapolis 3 Minnesota.

Dear Madam:

Thank you for the copy of your state program and reasons for supporting it.

I find that it is very informative and very well prepared and I am sure it will be useful to me .

Yours very truly,

Charles N. Bouton

Charles N. Bouton.
49th. Diat.