



League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

Legislative
Committee Reports

1956 - 1957

Vol. II.

Doris Guthrie ~~Winters~~

Size O.K?

NAME _____ LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT _____

HOME ADDRESS _____ SENATOR? _____
REPRESENTATIVE? _____
_____ HOW MANY TERMS SERVED _____

DISTRICT INFORMATION: IN SENATE? _____
IN HOUSE? _____

IS LABOR STRONG?
IS FARM GROUP STRONG?
WHAT BUSINESS PREDOMINATES?

ORGANIZATION AFFILIATIONS:
VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS?
SERVICE CLUB?
LABOR GROUPS?
FARM GROUPS?
OTHERS?

POLITICAL LEADERS IN HIS DISTRICT?

WHAT GROUPS SUPPORTED HIM?

WHAT FAVORS MIGHT HE WANT TO CONFER?

WHAT GROUPS OPPOSED HIM?

WHAT REPRISALS?

FAMILY CONNECTIONS?

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS?

POLITICAL PARTY?

Biennial Legislation
DNY
February 20, 1957

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and Washington Avenue S.E. Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Federal 8-8791

February 11, 1957

On February twentieth the Minnesota League of Women Voters will hold its biennial Legislative Day in the Weyerhaeuser Room of the Minnesota Historical Society. It will be attended by representatives of fifty-four local Leagues. The purpose is to bring members up-to-date on the status of bills related to League program and to plan for action throughout the state.

In the morning there will be speakers on "The Constituent and His Role In Influencing Legislation" and on Party Designation. We invite you to speak to us on "The Constituent and His Role In Influencing Legislation." Your part will be on the morning program which will be from 10:15-11:00. You will be first speaker after the introductory remarks and we would like you to speak for fifteen or twenty minutes. We also invite you to be our guest at luncheon at 12:30 when we will have other speakers on our program.

We would like you to give your suggestions on how the constituent can most effectively influence legislation. We hope you can be with us on February twentieth.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman



Affiliated with the
League of Women Voters of the U.S.

I welcome you to our First Legislative Day. Last April there appeared an article in the New Yorker magazine which told a ^{story} of the L.W.V. of New York and their 3 day Legislative conference. They ^{went} came to their state capital to get a glimpse into the inner workings of the law-making bodies and to plan how they could get their senators and representatives to consider seriously those bills that their organization believes are of paramount interest to citizens of the state. ^{He will stay only one day, but from your petition you saw could have taken 30 days + here had several hundred of men} He too will visit our law-making bodies, ^{He will bring up to date on the status of our bills,} and with ^{steering} from the anchors we will plan how we can convince our legislators that a C. Convention, reapportionment + party designation are of paramount importance to the people of Minnesota.

Announcement -

We are very happy to have ^{the use of} this beautiful ^{space} Room in the Historical Society. This floor is ^{is true it is expensive} ~~some~~ ^{of wood inlay} a prized feature of the room, and

the management has asked that we ~~not~~^{not} 2.
do use the ash trays + do not put out
cigarettes on this floor.

1-Macalester
2-Public Relations

Our program will begin with a
look at individual citizen and his role
in democracy. This role is, of course to
decide what legislation he wants passed
and then to make his wishes known to
his legislators.

Sen Daniel Ziedt, ^{from} Minneapolis 34th

District, will speak to us on "The
Role of the Constituent in Influencing
Legislation." Senator Ziedt.

Has been a legislator since 1937. So
he has lots of experience with constituents

2 Meeting at Macalester - all encouraged to come
This was for them to eat. - Reservations are
taken -

3- But his relations encourage your home town
before to include a story of this matter

3.

•• Im sure Rep. Grittner is the proudest
author here today for his ^{party's} bill has
already cleared the several amending hurdles
and has come out victorious.
~~Sen~~ Rep. Karl Grittner from St Pauls
39th District

•• The Senate convened at 10: today. There
will be guided to take you to the
Senate gallery- we have reserved the
west section.

There are two committee meetings at
11:30. Reapportionment in room 304

Welfare in room 302

•• Or you may visit anywhere you
wish in the capital. Be back here for
lunch promptly at 12:30.

We have found that conducting tours

for 3 or 3000 League members is
a full time job.

~~more than we can manage.~~ So we

bought we would have one Legislative
Day to which you could send representatives
then you can make the arrangements
for your local league tours in the future.

copy

February 4, 1937

The Honorable Daniel S. Foote
Senate Chambers
State Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Senator Foote:

On February twentieth the Minnesota League of Women Voters will hold its biennial Legislative Day in the Waymouther Room of the Minnesota Historical Society. It will be attended by representatives of fifty-four local leagues. The purpose is to bring members up-to-date on the status of bills related to league program and to plan for action throughout the state.

In the morning there will be speakers on "The Constituent and His Role in Influencing Legislation" and on Party Designation. We invite you to speak to us on "The Constituent and His Role in Influencing Legislation." Your part will be on the morning program which will be from 10:15-11:00. You will be first speaker after the introductory remarks and we would like you to speak for fifteen minutes (approximately). We also invite you to be our guest at luncheon at 12:30 when we will have other speakers on our program.

We would like you to give us your suggestions on how the constituent can most effectively influence legislation. We hope you can be with us on February twentieth.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

copy

February 4, 1957

The Honorable Earl Brittnor
House of Representatives
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Brittnor:

On February twentieth the Minnesota League of Women Voters will hold its biennial legislative day in the Bayntower Room of the Minnesota Historical Society. It will be attended by representatives of fifty-four local leagues. The purpose is to bring members up-to-date on the status of bills related to league program and to plan for action throughout the state.

In the morning there will be speakers on lobbying and party designation and a visit to the Senate. At the luncheon meeting there will be a speaker on reorganization and a bill to submit the question of a constitutional convention. We hope that you will speak to us as introducing author of H. R. 43, the party designation bill. Your part will be on the morning program which will be from 10:45- 11:00. Will you speak about fifteen minutes from 10:45- 11:00?

We would like you to tell something of the bills program: where it is and how it arrived; what the problems and hazards of getting it passed by the House and Senate are. Should it have passed the House by the twentieth we will be happy to hear a review of the triumph. As you can judge, we want to stress technique, rather than subject matter, at this meeting and what our leagues members can do, as individuals and as an organization, to aid passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

January 27, 1957

The Honorable Joe Barth
House Chambers
The Capitol
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Barth:

On February twentieth the Minnesota League of Women Voters will hold its biennial Legislative Day in the Upper Chamber Room of the Minnesota Historical Society. It will be attended by representatives of fifty-four local Leagues. The purpose is to bring members up-to-date on the status of bills related to League program and to plan for action throughout the state.

In the morning there will be speakers on lobbying and party designation and a visit to the Senate. At the luncheon meeting there will be speakers on reappointment and a bill to submit the question of a constitutional convention. We hope that you will be our guest at luncheon at 12:15 and will speak to us as introducing author of H.F. 298. One of the authors of the Senate bill will be invited, also. We are asking our guests to speak fifteen or twenty minutes and plan that this part of the afternoon meeting will be over by two o'clock.

We would like you to tell something of the bill's progress: where it is and how it arrived; what the problems and hazards of getting it through the House are. If it should happen - delightful thought! - that H.F. 298 has passed the House by the twentieth, we will be happy to hear a review of the triumph. As you can judge, we want to stress technique, rather than subject-matter, at this meeting and what the League members can do, as individuals and as an organization, to aid passage of this legislation.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves, Chairman
Constitutional Revision

*See F.S. Hargraves
with copy of
1-10-57*

*Justice
State Office*

Don't copy

March 4, 1957

Rep. Alf Bergerud
House of Representatives
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Bergerud,

We want to thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to address our League of Women Voters Legislative Day on February 20th. Our people enjoyed hearing a first hand report from you and the other members of the House and Senate. We do appreciate all you are doing on reapportionment.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie,
Legislative Chairman

March 4, 1957

Senator Daniel Feidt
State Senate
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Senator Feidt,

We want to thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to address our League of Women Voters Legislative Day on February 26th. Our people enjoyed hearing a first hand report from you and the other members of the House and Senate.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

March 4, 1957

Representative Earl Grittner
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Grittner,

We want to thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to address our League of Women Voters Legislative Day on February 20th. Our people enjoyed hearing a first hand report from you and the other members of the House and Senate. We hope that come April 25th, all of our bills will be as successfully passed, as your Party Designation Bill has been in the House.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

March 4, 1957

Representative Joe Karth
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Karth,

We want to thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to address our League of Women Voters Legislative Day on February 20th. Our people enjoyed hearing a first hand report from you and the other members of the Legislature. We hope that now the first hurdle is over -- that of the committee's favorable vote -- we'll make progress in the other House.

We do appreciate all you are doing.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

March 4, 1957

Senator Stanley Holmquist
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Senator Holmquist,

We want to thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to address our League of Women Voters Legislative Day on February 20th. Our people enjoyed hearing a first hand report from you and the other members of the House and Senate.

We are eagerly awaiting news of the hearing to be held in the Senate Judiciary Committee, and hope that the results of that meeting are good.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

Legislative Action
H57 Session

LEGISLATIVE BOXSCORE - ROLL CALL

1957 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

| | CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION | REAPPORTIONMENT BERGERUD BILL | PARTY DESIGNATION |
|--------|------------------------------|---|---|
| HOUSE | <u>Committee</u> | <u>Committee</u> | <u>Committee</u> |
| | Passed - 11 yes, 6 no | Passed - 10 yes, 7 no | Passed - Voice Vote, 2 no |
| | <u>Floor</u> | <u>Floor</u> | <u>Floor</u> |
| | Passed - 89 yes, 38 no | Passed - 68 yes, 61 no | Passed, 95 yes, 32 no |
| SENATE | <u>Committee</u> | <u>Committee</u> | <u>Committee</u> |
| | Failed - 9 to 9 tie | Passed - Voice vote Amended to restore almost completely the status quo in the Senate. To take effect only on passage of a constitutional amendment. | Failed - Motion was to table, 9-4 |
| | <u>Floor</u> | <u>Floor</u> | <u>Floor</u> |
| | No vote taken | Passed - 47 yes, 17 no | Failed - 41 no, 24 yes Motion was to call bill to the floor for a roll call vote. Supporters voted yes on the motion. |
| HOUSE | | <u>Floor</u> | |
| | | Failed - 68 yes, 59 no Motion was to lay bill on table. Supporters voted no on motion, opponents voted yes. | |

CONSTITUTIONAL

AMENDMENTS

1. Home Rule - extension of Home Rule privileges to counties and municipalities.
2. Four Year Term for governor and other constitutional offices.
3. Allows legislators to run for other state offices.

SENATE VOTES

Votes were not taken in the Senate on Constitutional Convention this 1957 Session. Therefore we are including for your information the Senate vote on this matter in the 1955 Session (C.C. 1955). You may want to check with your Senator and see if he has changed his position and now supports the bill. Supporters voted yes on this bill.

Votes taken on the Bergerud Reapportionment bill (H.F. 450) were on the version as amended by the Senate Elections & Reapportionment Committee. Supporters voted yes.

Votes taken on the Party Designation bill (S.F. 705) were on a motion to call the bill to the floor for a vote. Supporters voted yes on the bill.

| Cau- ous | Dis- trict | Senator | Rep. P.D. | | | Cau- ous | Dis- trict | Senator | Rep. P.F. | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | C.C. 1955 | H.F. 450 | S.F. 705 | | | | C.C. 1955 | H.F. 450 | S.F. 705 |
| C | 42 | Andersen, E.L. | Y | Y | Y | C | 62 | McKee, John | N | N | N |
| C | 11 | Anderson, A.A. | N | Y | N | C | 39 | Masek, Joseph | N | Y | N |
| C | 7 | Anderson, E.J. | N | Y | N | C | 17 | Malone, Martin | N | N | N |
| L | 32 | Anderson, M.H. | Y | Y | Y | C | 31 | Mayhood, Ralph | N | Y | N |
| C | 48 | Behmler, F.W. | N | Y | N | C | 21 | Metcalfe, John | N | N | N |
| L | 22 | Bonniwell, M. | Y | N | Y | C | 36 | Miller, Archie | N | A | N |
| C | 4 | Burdick, W. | N | Y | Y | C | 55 | Mitchell, C.C. | N | Y | N |
| C | 57 | Butler, G.H. | N | Y | N | C | 35 | Mullin, Gerald | Y | N | N |
| L | 59 | Carr, H. | N | Y | Y | L | 66 | Murray, Louis | N | N | Y |
| C | 24 | Child, F.G. | N | N | N | C | 16 | Nelson, H.S. | Y | N | N |
| C | 3 | Dunlap, R.R. | N | N | N | L | 38 | Novak, B.G. | N | A | A |
| C | 9 | Erickson, C.L. | N | Y | N | L | 50 | Nycklemoe, H. | Y | NV | Y |
| C | 34 | Feidt, D.S. | N | Y | N | C | 52 | O'Brien, Geo. | N | Y | Y |
| C | 10 | Franz, W.J. | N | N | N | C | 40 | O'Loughlin, H.J. | Y | Y | N |
| L | 29 | Fraser, Donald | Y | Y | Y | L | 23 | Olson, Oscar L. | Y | N | Y |
| C | 19 | George, G.C. | N | N | N | L | 60 | Peterson, Elmer | Y | Y | Y |
| C | 20 | Gillen, A. | Y | Y | Y | C | 18 | Quie, Albert | Y | Y | Y |
| L | 54 | Hanson, N.W. | Y | Y | Y | C | 45 | Richardson, J.L. | N | Y | N |
| C | 6 | Hanson, R. | Y | Y | N | C | 58 | Rogers, Herbert | N | Y | N |
| C | 46 | Harren, H.M. | N | Y | N | C | 33 | Root, Charles | N | Y | N |
| L | 51 | Heuer, Jm. C.F. | Y | N | Y | C | 53 | Rosenmeier, G. | N | Y | N |
| C | 5 | Holand, P.J. | N | Y | N | L | 43 | Salmore, H. | Y | Y | Y |
| C | 26 | Holmquist, S. | Y | Y | Y | L | 37 | Schultz, H.W. | Y | Y | Y |
| C | 8 | Imm, Val | N | Y | N | C | 67 | Sinclair, D. | N | Y | N |
| L | 56 | Johnson, C.E. | Y | Y | NV | C | 12 | Vadheim, J. | Y | N | N |
| C | 1 | Johnson, J.A. | N | Y | N | L | 61 | Vukelich, T. | Y | Y | Y |
| L | 44 | Johnson, R.W. | Y | Y | Y | C | 25 | Wahlstrand, H. | Y | Y | N |
| C | 13 | Josefson, J.A. | N | Y | N | L | 63 | Walz, N.J. | Y | N | Y |
| L | 28 | Kalina, H. | Y | Y | Y | C | 49 | Wefald, M. | N | Y | N |
| C | 2 | Keller, J.R. | N | Y | N | C | 27 | Welch, Thomas | N | Y | N |
| C | 15 | Kroehler, F.P. | N | Y | N | C | 41 | Westin, L.E. | Y | Y | Y |
| C | 64 | Larson, N. | N | N | N | L | 65 | Wiseth, Roy | Y | N | Y |
| C | 47 | Lofvegren, C. | N | Y | N | C | 30 | Wright, Donald | N | Y | N |
| | | | | | | C | 14 | Zwach, John | N | Y | N |

Code: C -- Conservative caucus
 L -- Liberal caucus
 Number -- Legislative District
 Y -- Yes
 N -- No
 NV -- Not voting
 A -- Absent

Note: The League reports the roll call votes, only the Legislators can interpret them.

HOUSE VOTES

Votes were taken in the House of Representatives on Constitutional Convention (H.F. 49). Supporters voted yes on this bill.

Votes were taken on the Bergerud Reapportionment bill (H.F. 450). Supporters voted yes on this bill.

Votes were taken also on the Senate amended version of the Bergerud Reapportionment Bill (Amended Bill). This bill came back to the House for concurrence. While the supporters of the bill were considering a compromise, the opponents made a motion to table the bill, thus killing it. This vote does not give a clear picture of support or opposition to the bill.

Votes were taken on the Party Designation bill (H.F. 41). Supporters voted yes on this bill.

| Caucus | District | Representative | C.C. H.F. 289 | Bergerud-Reapportionment H.F. 450 | Party Designation Amended Bill | Party Designation H.F. 41 |
|--------|----------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| L | 31 | Adams, James L. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 66 | Affeldt, Leland A.Sr. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 55 | Alderink, George | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 47 | Anderson, D. F. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 33 | Anderson, H. J. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 15 | Anderson, H. R. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 42 | Anderson, J. T. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 1 | Anderson, Moppy | N | N | Y | Y |
| C | 55 | Angstman, Geo. L. | N | Y | N | Y |
| C | 50 | Aune, Ole O. Jr. | A | A | Y | A |
| L | 63 | Basford, Harry | N | Y | Y | Y |
| L | 67 | Battles, Everett | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 37 | Beanblossom, Sheldon | N | Y | N | Y |
| C | 36 | Bergerud, Alf | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| L | 64 | Bergeson, Burnett J. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 62 | Berglund, Elmer E. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 57 | Campton, Chas. E. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 62 | Childgren, E. J. | Y | Y | NV | Y |
| C | 30 | Christie, Thomas N. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 61 | Cina, Fred A. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 6 | Conn, Edmond F. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 48 | Conroy, Dan | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 11 | Cummings, Roy d. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 12 | Cunningham, L. P. | N | N | Y | Y |
| L | 65 | Day, Walter E. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 14 | Dirlam, Aubrey W. | Y | N | Y | N |
| C | 50 | Dunn, Roy E. | N | N | NV | Y |
| C | 1 | Duxbury, L. L. Jr. | N | N | Y | Y |
| L | 23 | Enestvedt, Odean | Y | Y | N | N |
| C | 7 | Erdahl, L. B. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 22 | Ernst, Emil C. | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| L | 21 | Fitzgerald, John H. | N | N | Y | Y |
| C | 67 | Fitzeimons, Richard | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 4 | Franke, Donald T. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 10 | Franz, Sam | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 33 | French, George | N | Y | NV | Y |
| L | 28 | Fudro, Stanley J. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 61 | Fugina, Peter X. | Y | Y | N | Y |

| <u>Cau-</u> <u>cus</u> | <u>Dis-</u> <u>trict</u> | <u>Representative</u> | <u>C.C.</u> <u>H.F.289</u> | <u>Bergerud-Reapportionment</u> <u>H.F. 450</u> | <u>Amended Bill</u> | <u>Party Legis.</u> <u>H.F. 41</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| C | 12 | Fuller, Graham | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 3 | Furst, Frank | N | N | Y | Y |
| L | 53 | Gerling, Gordon | Y | Y | N | N |
| L | 35 | Goodin, H. F. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 39 | Grittner, Karl F. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 24 | Grussing, George P. | N | N | Y | N |
| L | 31 | Hagland, Carl G. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 53 | Halsted, Charles L. | Y | Y | Y | N |
| C | 16 | Hartle, John A. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 5 | Herzog, Jacob J. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 24 | Hofstad, Alvin O. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 48 | Huebner, Fred H. | N | N | Y | N |
| L | 48 | Iverson, Carl M. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 14 | Jensen, Carl A. | N | N | Y | Y |
| L | 25 | Johnson, Alfred I. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 49 | Johnson, E. P. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 54 | Johnson, O. L. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 27 | Jude, Victor N. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 41 | Karth, Joe | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 37 | Kelley, Jerry | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 13 | Kelly, Dr. J. J. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 56 | King, Carroll F. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 46 | Kinzer, John J. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 20 | Klaus, Walter E. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 25 | Knudsen, E. P. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 32 | Kording, H. J. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 59 | LaBrosse, Francis | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 67 | Langen, Odin E. S. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 19 | Langley, Clarence G. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 5 | Larson, Alf | Y | N | Y | N |
| C | 36 | Lindquist, Leonard E. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 51 | Lorentz, Joe P. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 63 | Lovik, A. W. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 30 | Luther, Sally | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 34 | McCarty, Glenn D. | Y | Y | NV | Y |
| L | 2 | McGill, John D. | Y | Y | Y | N |
| L | 17 | McGuire, Michael E. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 2 | McLeod, Donald | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 11 | Mitchell, Don | Y | N | Y | N |
| L | 35 | Mosier, Leo D. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 15 | Mueller, August B. | N | N | N | Y |
| L | 59 | Munger, Willard M. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 29 | Murk, George E. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 49 | Nelson, R. M. | N | N | Y | Y |
| L | 47 | Newhouse, Julian O. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 44 | Nordin, John H. | Y | Y | N | N |
| C | 26 | Nordlie, O. Gerhard | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 57 | Noreen, Roger F. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 56 | Oberg, A. F. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 43 | O'Dea, Richard W. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 8 | Ogle, Arthur H. | A | Y | N | Y |
| L | 9 | Olson, Carl G. | Y | N | Y | N |
| L | 10 | Olson, G. W. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 21 | Ottinger, Howard | N | N | Y | N |
| L | 40 | Otto, Alfred J. | Y | Y | N | Y |

| Caucus | District | Representative | C.C. | Bergerud-Reapportionment | | Party Design. |
|--------|----------|---------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | | H.F. 289 | H.F. 450 | Amended Bill | H.F. 41 |
| C | 42 | Parks, Clifton | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 14 | Paulson, Harvey N. | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 58 | Peterson, Jack M. | Y | Y | N | N |
| L | 38 | Podgorski, Anthony | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 40 | Popovich, Peter S. | Y | Y | N | NV |
| L | 38 | Prifrel, Joseph Jr. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 45 | Reed, Dewey | Y | Y | N | NV |
| C | 52 | Renner, Robert G. | N | N | Y | A |
| L | 60 | Rutter, Loren S. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 8 | Schulz, Roy | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 45 | Schumann, Marvin C. | N | N | Y | Y |
| C | 16 | Searle, Rod | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 52 | Shipka, Vladimir | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 41 | Shovell, Bill | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 29 | Skeate, John P. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 48 | Sorensen, Wm. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 18 | Sundet, A. O. | N | Y | Y | Y |
| C | 43 | Swenson, Edwin T. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 27 | Swenson, Glen W. | Y | N | Y | N |
| C | 51 | Thompson, Helmer | N | N | Y | N |
| C | 1 | Thompson, Teman | A | N | Y | Y |
| L | 46 | Tiemann, Edmund C. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 28 | Tomczyk, Edward J. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 50 | Ukkelberg, Cliff | N | N | Y | Y |
| C | 9 | Van De Riet, G. J. | N | N | Y | N |
| L | 52 | Volstad, Edward J. | A | A | N | Y |
| C | 19 | Voxland, Roy L. | N | N | Y | N |
| L | 58 | Wanwick, Arne C. | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| L | 13 | Warnke, Curtis B. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 12 | Wee, Reuben | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 53 | Wetzel, George P. | Y | Y | Y | N |
| L | 65 | Wichterman, B. M. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| L | 60 | Widstrand, Paul B. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 66 | Wilder, Harvey A. | Y | N | Y | Y |
| C | 50 | Windmiller, E. J. | N | N | Y | Y |
| L | 39 | Wozniak, D. D. | Y | Y | N | Y |
| C | 34 | Wright, F. Gordon | Y | Y | N | Y |
| L | 54 | Yetka, Lawrence | Y | Y | N | Y |

Code: C - Conservative caucus
 L - Liberal caucus
 Number - Legislative District
 Y - Yes
 N - No
 NV - Not voting
 A - Absent

Note: The League reports the roll call votes, only your legislator can interpret them.

Muriel Grundtz - Legislative
Report

Mrs. Hargraves---This is my report of the legislative session as I saw it. You have much more skill in writing than I do and may have some very different ideas so perhaps you can use what you wish of my report and add your thoughts. I sent a carbon to Doris too. I wasn't present the day the bill was passed in the House (3-20-57) so probably Doris will want to add something at that point.

Doris felt we should include more about our methods of lobbying and the effects than about the actual happenings in the legislature. I did feel that the happenings should be down somewhere, however, ~~add~~ but cut wherever you wish.

Doris also wanted me to send you my ideas about our report at State Convention. She had a good suggestion about a skit type of report which I am sure she sent on to you. I am just not good at that sort of thing, and right now can't think of anything--the hour is very late. I feel that you have done so much more actual work than I have on the whole problem of C.C., that you should do most of the reporting at convention. I shall be very glad to help in whatever way I can, however, so let me know what you want.

Doris - is it dangerous on page 5 to mention
just some leagues or is this all right? I really
have no record of what the leagues actually
did - just what we did from our end.

Muriel

Sorry I didn't have any ideas to send Mrs. H.
about the skit but I felt it was most important
to get this material taken. M.B.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ITEM
1957 Report

INTRODUCTION
OF BILLS

Senate File # 135 was introduced in the Senate on January 23, 1957. Authors: Stanley Holmquist, E.L. Andersen, and Harold Schultz.

House File # 289 was introduced in the House on January 24, 1957. Authors were Joe Karth, A.I. Johnson, Clarence Langley, Sally Luther, and Roger Noreen.

Both bills provided for submission to the electors at the general election to be held November, 1958, the question: "Shall there be a convention to revise the constitution of the State of Minnesota?" If a majority of the voters voting at the election shall have voted for a convention, the legislature at its session next succeeding the election shall provide for calling such a convention.

FIRST HOUSE
HEARING

H.F. 289 was referred to the General Legislation Committee, and the first hearing was held on February 18, 1957 at 8:30 A.M. Mr. Joe Karth, chief author, presented the bill to the members of the committee and introduced those who wished to testify for the bill: Mr. William Pearson of the State Grange; Mr. Donald Holmes, Chairman of the Minnesota Citizens Constitutional Committee; Professor William Anderson of the University of Minnesota political science department; Mr. William Carlson speaking for the joint legislative committee of the DFL and Republican parties; Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves, League of Women Voters (See Mrs. Hargraves' speech); Mrs. Ellis Peilen, Council of Jewish Women; Mr. George W. Lawson, University regent and active in A.F.L.; Mrs. G.J. Kilborn for Honnepin County Republican Workshop; Mr. Stanley Platt, an interested private citizen; Speaker A.I. Johnson, Mr. Roger Noreen, and Mrs. Sally Luther, all authors. Before this meeting some of these people were asked by the LWV to bring out certain points in answer to arguments of the opponents and the testimony was excellent. For example, Mr. Holmes, a practicing attorney, quoting from experiences in Missouri and New Jersey, handled the question as to whether a new constitution would create much litigation. He ended his testimony by saying that a new constitution would reduce litigation. Professor Anderson had been a member of President Eisenhower's Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, and he spoke also with the voice of authority as a student of Minnesota's constitution.

Several of the persons who testified emphasized the necessity of having faith in the democratic process and allowing the people to have the final decision about calling a constitutional convention.

SECOND HOUSE
HEARING

On February 25th at 8:30 A.M. the opponents of the bill were to be heard. Mr. Orville Peterson, attorney for the League of Minnesota Municipalities, asked to speak as a proponent, and he said that H.F. 289 was "League" endorsed.

The opponents were: Mr. Otto F. Christensen, Executive Vice President of the Minnesota Employers' Association, and Mr. Mike Galvin, attorney for the railroads but Mr. Galvin said he was speaking as an individual.

Mr. Christensen handed out a booklet just off the press "Yes, Minnesota Has a Constitution and It's a Great Constitution". This was in answer to the LMV publication, "Well, What D'Ya Know" which Mr. Christensen described as a "snippy" booklet casting aspersions on our constitution. His main arguments (his discussion lasted more than one hour) were that amendments are cheap and safe and that a convention would be costly. With a constitutional convention you aren't sure what you would get and all you would be buying for Minnesota is uncertainty.

Mr. Calvin cast no aspersions on the LMV using a different approach than in the past. He suggested that the League was made up of "very fine women". He felt that the railroads had been the "whipping boy" in the fight against convention and without reason. Basing his opinion on the Dartmouth College case, he stated that there is no chance of taxing the railroads in any other way than the gross earnings method because of their original charter with the State.

THIRD HOUSE HEARING March 4, 1957.. Mr. Earth opened his rebuttal arguments for C.C. by apologizing to the LMV and to committee members for Mr. Christensen's remarks of the week before (Mr. C. had seemed to imply that League members were being disloyal to the State in their efforts to promote C.C.). Mr. Earth's main point was that the bill should be passed out of committee so that the whole House would be allowed to debate its merits. Mr. Langley remarked that he had "both a doubt and a conviction" about the question of a C.C. He had doubt that our constitution is such an inviolate document that it can't be improved and a conviction that we can do as good a job in 1958 and probably better than they did in 1957.

The only real committee opposition came from Mr. Carl Iversen.

HOUSE COMMITTEE
VOTE

Voting yes were : Hagland, Kelly, Bergerud, Ernst, Earth, Klaus, Kording, Mark, Skeate, Tomczyk, and Wee.

Voting no were: Alderink, Enestvedt, Fitzsimons, Iversen, T. Thompson, and Windmiller.

Mr. Lovik and Mr. Belmer Thompson passed the vote

SENATE COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

S.F. 135 had its first hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 14, 1957. Speaking for the bill were: Senator Holmquist, chief author; Dr. William Anderson; Mr. Donald A. Holmes; John Mooty, Bi-partisan Committee Member; Mr. Stanley Platt; Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves; Mrs. Ellis Feilen; Mrs. Stanley Peterson, Republican Workshop; and Mr. Bill Carlson.

Many of the same points made before the House Committee were reiterated. Several stressed that fears of a convention should be put away and faith in democracy should be demonstrated by giving the people the right to vote on the calling of a convention.

One proponent emphasized that fundamental issues relating to forms of government should be voted on by the people.

Senator Fraser asked a significant question after the proponents had finished. He wondered whether any of the speakers were paid lobbyists, and the answer, of course, was "no".

Opponents then took the floor: Mr. Otto Christensen; the Ramsey County Republican Club Chairwoman; Mr. Mike Galvin; Mrs. Lee Runyon, Public Relations Chairman for the First Minnesota Council of "We the People".

Mr. Christensen stressed that he had to be convinced that something was wrong with the constitution and that he had heard of no business, person, farm, etc. being harmed by the present constitution. Unless proponents could demonstrate specific evils, there seemed to him no need to call a C.C. The "package deal" aspect of a C.C. seemed dangerous to him. He emphasized that only people who have a special interest would be delegates to a C.C.--party people, labor unions, city political machines, school boards, Old Age Assistance recipients, cooperatives, etc--these seemed to us to be a fairly good cross section of the citizens of Minnesota.

SENATE COMMITTEE

NOTES

3-26-57. Before vote was taken, Senator Wright opposed C.C. and supported the amendment process of revision. Senator Wefald also argued that a C.C. would submit the state's most vital document to "an uninformed electorate".

There were two votes taken. One on a motion to indefinitely postpone the bill.

For postponement:

Dunlap, Erickson, Feidt, Masek, Root, Rosenmeier, Wefald, Welch, Wright----9

Against:

Fraser, Gillen, R. Hanson, Kalina, Mitchell, Nelson, Nycklemoe, O'Loughlin, Schultz-----9

On a motion to recommend passage:

For Passage:

Fraser, Gillen, R. Hanson, Kalina, Mitchell, Nelson, Nycklemoe, O'Loughlin, Schultz-----9

Against:

Dunlap, Erickson, Feidt, Masek, Root, Rosenmeier, Wefald, Welch, Wright----9

So both motions were lost for lack of a favorable majority.

HOUSE DEBATE

Meanwhile on March 19, 1957 H.F. 289 was debated before the Committee-of-the-Whole. This debate occurred around 4:00 o'clock (two hours after the House went into session) with the exception of two bills, most of the bills debated during

Two trustees, Archie Miller and
Dennis Miller, about 4:00 p.m. vote.

count

count

the first two hours were of no particular significance to the state as a whole, and yet most of the representatives remained in their seats. When Mr. Karth arose to give his arguments for passage of the convention bill, many of the representatives (most of them opposed to the bill) walked out. This seemed to us to indicate that they knew how they were going to vote on the bill. Mr. Karth's debate was excellent--well thought out and well presented. Again his emphasis was on his belief in the people.

Opposition came mostly from Duxbury, French, Iverson, and Jensen. Duxbury brought up the point that the constitution states that "whenever two-thirds of the members elected to each branch of the legislature shall think it necessary to call a convention", they shall allow the people to vote. He and other opponents did not "think it necessary" at present so they were under no obligation to refer it to the people. Other arguments were that (1) noone knows what will come out of a convention, (2) Let's amend and ~~not~~ throw the book at the people, (3) proponents have shown nothing which is radically wrong with the constitution that can't be changed by the safe amending method. Minnesota has enjoyed as good times as any state in the union during the last century.

Speaking for the bill, Mr. Noreen mentioned the changes needed in the Home Rule section of the constitution. Mrs. Luther and Mr. Searle also supported the bill.

The vote was taken by machine and there were 60 yeas and 36 nays.

The Bill
Passes the
House

The next day, 3-20-57 for the first time in the history of the state, the constitutional convention bill passed the House by a vote of 89-38--one more vote than was needed to make up the two-thirds majority. Following passage, Cina moved to nail the vote down irrevocably by calling up a house rule which says a member of the prevailing side may move for a vote of reconsideration within 3 days. Cina moved at once to reconsider. His motion was defeated by voice vote so the bill was in the clear in the House.

ACTION IN
SENATE COMMITTEE

Efforts were made at subsequent meetings of the Senate Judiciary Committee (3-28-57 and 4-4-57) to get the members to reconsider their tie vote on the convention bill and to allow it to come out on the Senate floor, but these came to nought. League members from Senator Miller's and Mullin's districts put pressure on them to be present for the re-voting. Senator Mullin did appear but was ineffective in his handling of the matter. Senator Miller who had promised his constituents to vote for the C.C. bill had been

absent from committee meetings because of illness during the early part of the session and had asked to be relieved from committee duty later (this request was not granted) so he said he did not feel he could attend future meetings.

Both Senator Fraser and Nyklemoos made attempts to get further consideration of the bill and Senator Holmquist appeared several times to ask the committee to pass the bill out so that it could be debated on the floor, but no action was taken. Those doing most of the arguing against reconsideration were: Feidt, Dunlap, Root, Rosenmeier, and Wright.

The Chairman, Mr. Welch, had appointed a subcommittee consisting of three with Rosenmeier as chairman to consider all amendments before the committee and the excuse of wanting to consider the amendments first before doing anything with convention was used. Four amendments did pass out of committee with recommendations and these included some of the changes the LWV wanted made in the constitution so the strategy used by committee members seemed well planned.

HOW WE LOBBIED
FOR C.C.

We had decided we would try to keep our arguments for convention as general as possible emphasizing the people's right to vote. The plan was to work as much as possible through local leagues--stress being put on the constituent seeing her legislator. We did have a core of members seeing committee members and legislators whose districts had no leagues, but the greatest effort was spent in telephoning, telegraphing, and writing local leagues which had legislators who needed prodding or whose votes were significant. Lovik from Park Rapids showed uncertainty about his vote, and he passed in committee, but voted "yes" on the floor and we feel that the Park Rapids League had much to do with this. Mr. Ernst voted "yes" in committee and on the floor, and the Hutchinson League probably played a part in this. Mr. Ernestvedt voted "no" in committee and "yes" on the floor and our St. Louis Park lobbyist as well as the Olivia League probably had a great deal to do with his change. Mr. Newhouse from Alexandria voted "no" on the floor of the House on 3-19-57 and "yes" on 3-20-57 and we hope that our telephone call to Alexandria about this produced these results. These are just some of the results of your work and I am sure they could be repeated many times by citing what other Leagues have done. We do feel that all of our League efforts were effective in the passage of the bill in the House.

All during the session we were helped immeasurably by the Public Relations committee which not only attended committee hearings but which also handled newspaper, T.V. and radio publicity. Letters to the Editors of newspapers throughout the State were encouraged by them.

Our legislative chairman was always present at the legislature and not only kept us well informed ~~of~~ about what was happening but also gave much needed support by her friendly relationship with the legislators.

REASONS FOR
DEFEAT

1. Fear--both of the unknown and of the people. Effective leaders particularly in the Senate used the argument that what we have now is known, but what we would get from a convention is unknown.

Many legislators seemed to fear the people and the democratic process. Democracy implies a trust in the people, and when our leaders lose that trust, democracy suffers. As Abraham Lincoln said in a speech delivered October 16, 1854, "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent".

2. The great influence of certain members of the Senate in particular. Quoting from Mrs. Norgaard's 1955 legislative report: "And one cannot discount the influence of lawyer-legislators who sit as the people's representatives and yet, because of their means of livelihood, represent the people only in part." How much the League can do in this area is something which will have to be discussed by State Board and members together in the future.
3. The success in passing amendments during the 1954-1956 elections made a good talking point for the opponents of convention who wanted the safe and sure method of revision by amendment. The LWV as one organization which has contributed to the passage of such amendments and this success was a strong point in our defeat this session. Our attitude towards support of amendments should be discussed thoroughly at convention.
4. In spite of the wonderful public relations job which the LWV carried on for two years in selling C.C. to the citizens of Minnesota, there is still a great apathy on the part of many citizens in regard to C.C. Defeat of the bill can certainly be attributed in great measure to this unconcern and lack of knowledge.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
15th & Washington Aves., S. E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

February 1, 1957
Additional copies ____

LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN

PATRICIA'S ESSAY



Last April the League of Women Voters of Minnesota sponsored an essay contest for high school students on the Minnesota Constitution. The first four winners were to be awarded a trip to the 1957 Legislature. Plans were made for a tour of the capitol, a visit to a committee meeting and lunch with the legislators. We also asked that the first prize winner be given permission to read her essay before the Senate and the second prize winner before the House. Verbal permission was granted to us so we sent out newspaper releases and arranged for radio and TV coverage. Plans were well under way when the Senate Rules Committee met and turned down the request because the issue discussed in the essay was controversial, and legislation on the issue was pending in the Senate. We accepted their decision without question and changed our plans accordingly. Patricia was to be introduced to the Senate and copies of her essay were to be put on every Senator's desk. At the last minute the Senate relented and decided to permit Patricia to read her essay right after adjournment. The press picked up the story as a newsworthy one and for three days Patricia's essay was headline news. Lots and lots of people heard about Constitutional Revision for the first time. On February 1 the Minneapolis Morning Tribune wrote an editorial and printed the entire essay.

1 8 5 7

Patricia's essay was titled Minnesota's Only Constitutional Convention and started out this way:

"1857! A constitutional convention..... Since then there have been 83 amendments made to our constitution, but never a revising convention. The cause for delay in this much needed revision is controversy in the legislature. According to Article I of the constitution the people are to decide whether or not to have a constitutional convention. They can only do this when the question is submitted to them at the polls, but the legislature has so far refused to allow this".

1 9 5 7

Let's take our cue from Patricia's essay and insist that in 1957 - 100 years later - the legislature allow the people of Minnesota a chance to call a constitutional convention "to give Minnesota a real, a working constitution."

ENCLOSURE

Enclosed is one tear sheet from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 1, 1957, which includes Patricia Graf's first prize winning Essay on the Minnesota Constitution, which she read to the Minnesota Senators, and an excellent editorial entitled, "Patricia's Essay."

● CONSTITUTIONAL
CONVENTION

A bill for an act proposing a convention to revise the constitution of the state of Minnesota was introduced in the Senate January 23, and in the House, January 24, 1957.

Senate File: #135

Authors: Stanley Holmquist (C, 26); E. L. Andersen (C, 42); and Harold Schultz (L, 37). *

The Senate bill has been referred to the Judiciary Committee with the following members:

| | | |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Welch, Chm. C, 27 | Kalina L, 28 | O'Loughlin C, 40 |
| Dunlap C, 3 | Masek C, 39 | Root C, 33 |
| Erickson C, 9 | Miller C, 36 | Rosenmeier C, 53 |
| Feidt C, 34 | Mitchell C, 55 | Schultz L, 37 |
| Fraser L, 29 | Mullin C, 35 | Wefald C, 49 |
| Gillen C, 20 | Nelson, H. C, 16 | Wright C, 30 |
| Hanson, R. C, 6 | Nycklemoe L, 50 | |

House File: #289

Authors: Joe Karth (L, 41); A. I. Johnson (L, 25); Clarence Langley (C, 19); Sally Luther (L, 30); Roger Noreen (C, 57).

The House bill has been referred to the General Legislation Committee made up of:

Feb March 3 - Passed

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Hagland, Chm. L, 31 | Fitzsimons C, 67 | Murk L, 29 |
| Kelly, J.J., V. Chm. L, 13 | Iverson L, 48 | Skeate L, 29 |
| Alderink C, 55 | Karth L, 41 | Thompson, H. C, 51 |
| Bergerud C, 36 | Klaus C, 20 | Thompson, T. C, 1 |
| Enestvedt L, 23 | Kording L, 32 | Tomczyk L, 28 |
| Ernst C, 22 | Lovik C, 63 | Wee L, 12 |
| | | Windmiller C, 50 |

* C - Conservative L - Liberal Number - legislative district

What you can do - If your senator or representative is an author of the bill, write or tell him "thank you." If either one of your legislators is on either committee, write and ask his support in the committee hearings.

Senator Holmquist, chief author of the bill in the Senate, mentioned when League representatives met with the authors of the bills, that the most helpful thing we could do was to get people in communities throughout the state to write their legislators asking them to vote for the bill. It is you, the constituent, on whom we have to depend for the real work.

PARTY DESIGNATION This elections bill would have the effect of providing party designation for state legislators.

● House File: #41

Authors: Karl Grittner (L, 39); A. F. Oberg (C, 56); John Hartle (C, 16); Joe Karth (L, 41); Burnett Bergeson (L, 64).

The House bill was referred to the Elections Committee made up of:

Grittner, Chm. L, 39
Fudro, V. Chm. L, 28
Bergeson L, 64
Christie C, 30
Dunn C. 50

Fitzgerald L, 21
Fuller C, 12
Grussing C, 24
Jensen C, 14
Karth L, 41

Klaus C, 20
Knudsen L, 25
Langley C, 19
Luther L, 30
Yetka L, 54

This bill was considered by the House Elections Committee on Thursday, January 31. Mrs. Albert Richter, speaking for the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, said that party labels for legislators, in the League's opinion, "are the best way to promote responsible government."

What you can do - If any of these legislators are your representatives, it would be helpful to the bill's passage if you remind them (by letter or in person) of the League's interest in obtaining party designation for state legislators.

Senate File: No bill has been introduced as yet in the Senate.

The Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee, to which the bill will be referred when introduced, is composed of:

| | |
|----------------|-------|
| Erickson, Chm. | C, 9 |
| Anderson, A.A. | C, 11 |
| Anderson, M.H. | L, 32 |
| Behmler | C, 48 |
| Burdick | C, 4 |
| Carr | L, 59 |

Peidt C, 34
Holand C, 5
Johnson, R., L., 44
Keller C, 2
Kroehler C, 15
Mitchell C, 55

O'Laughlin C, 40
Peterson L, 60
Root C, 33
Rosenmeier C, 53
Sinclair C, 67

REAPPORTIONMENT The Bergerud Bill has been introduced in the House. Several other reapportionment bills are being considered. We will send you complete information on them later.

House File # 450

Authors: Bergerud (C, 36); Popovich (L, 40); Noreen (C, 57);
Anderson, H. J. (C, 33); Adams (L, 31).

The House bill has been referred to the Committee on Reapportionment made up of

Iverson, Chm. L, 48
Adams, V. Chm. L, 31
Angstman C, 55
Anderson, J.T. C, 42
Bergerud C, 36
Bergeson L, 64

Battles L, 67
Enestvedt L, 23
Fitzgerald L, 21
Jensen C, 14
Klaus C, 20
Kording L, 32

Mosier L, 35
Noreen C, 57
Olson, C.G. L, 9
Parks C, 42
Searle C. 16

G O P and the D F L The Republican and Democratic-Farmer-Labor Parties in Minnesota have united for a drive for passage of constitutional revision, reapportionment and party tags for lawmakers. The bi-partisan approach to putting pressure on the legislature will be headed by a joint committee. Chosen by the Republicans were P. Kenneth Peterson, Minneapolis; Sen. Albert Quie, Dennison; Mrs. Leonard Wilson, Carlton; Rep. Alf Bergerud, Edina, and Mrs. Marge Howard, Chanhassen. Chosen by the DFL's are William E. Carlson, St. Paul; Mrs. Marge Waki, North St. Paul; Dr. C. F. McQuiggan, Marshall; Mrs. Betty Green, St. Louis Park; and Gerald Dillon, Minneapolis. This bi-partisan approach should be a good talking point for us in promoting our program. If any of these people are from your community - offer them congratulations, encouragement and material.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
15th & Washington Aves., S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

.. February 22, 1957
Additional copies, 2#

LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN - No. 3

CONSTITUTIONAL
CONVENTION

The first hearing for the proponents was held before the General Legislation Committee on February 18, at 8:30 A.M. in Room 304, State Capitol. Those testifying for the bill, House File # 289 were: Mr. William Pearson, of State Grange; Mr. Donald Holmes, Chairman of the Minnesota Citizens Constitutional Committee; Professor William Anderson of University of Minnesota political science department; William Carlson speaking for the joint legislative committee of the DFL and Republican parties; Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves for the League of Women Voters of Minnesota; Mrs. Ellis Peilen for the Council of Jewish Women; Mr. George W. Lawson, University regent, and active in AFL; Mrs. G. Kilborn for the Republican Workshop; Speaker A. I. Johnson, Mr. Roger Noreen, Mrs. Sally Luther, all authors of the bill, spoke for its passage; and Mr. Joe Karth, introducing author, presented the bill to the members of the committee and introduced all those who wished to give testimony. Mr. Stanley Platt also spoke for the bill. The hearing on February 25, 8:30 A.M. will be for the opponents of the bill.

PARTY
DESIGNATION

The Senate bill has been referred to the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee. See page 3 of Feb. 1 Legislative Bulletin.

Senate File: # 705

Authors: Quie (C, 18); Holmquist (C, 26); Fraser (L, 29)

House File: # 41 - This bill was passed out of the House Elections on February 7, 1957. On February 14 it was discussed, debated and amended in the House Committee of the Whole. The amendment, authored by Rep. George French, Minneapolis, would give a state lawmaker, or a person of his choice, a seat on the county committee of his respective political party. On February 15, it was voted its final passage - 95 for and 32 against. Three did not vote.

REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate bill was introduced on January 31.

Senate File: # 401

Authors: Gillen (C, 20); Andersen, E. L. (C, 42); Wefald (C, 49).

This bill was referred to Senate Elections & Reapportionment Committee. See page 3 of Legislative Bulletin, dated Feb. 1, 1957 for listing of this committee.

LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN -- No. 4

The legislative session is half over and League supported bills are just beginning to move. From now on they will move fast, and those of us who are planning to take action must "get set" and be "ready to go" when the time for action comes.

PARTY DESIGNATION

The Party Designation bill has passed the House 95 to 32.

It is now awaiting action in the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee. If you have any influence with Senators on this committee (see page 3, Legislative Bulletin, Feb. 1), use it to hurry up action on this matter before it gets so late in the session that a special order will be required. (S.F.705)

FEPC

The FEPC supporters have appeared before the House Appropriations and the Senate Finance Committees, asking for an appropriation of \$70,000 for the next biennium, an increase of \$5,000 a year over last session.

CONSTITUTIONAL
CONVENTION

The Constitutional Convention bill (H.F.289) was passed out of the House General Legislation Committee by a vote of 11 yes votes to 6 no votes, with 2 passes. Every member

was present, and they voted as follows:

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| Hagland, L, 31 | yes | Fitzsimons, C, 67 | no | Murk, L, 24 | yes |
| ally, J.J., L, 13 | yes | Iverson, L, 48 | no | Skeate, L, 29 | yes |
| Alderink, C, 55 | no | Karth, L, 41 | yes | Thompson, H., C, 51 | pass |
| Bergerud, C, 36 | yes | Klaus, C, 20 | yes | Thompson, T., C, 1 | no |
| Enestvedt, L, 23 | no | Kording, L, 32 | yes | Tomczyk, L, 28 | yes |
| Ernst, C, 22 | yes | Lovik, C, 63 | pass | Wee, L, 12 | yes |
| | | | | Windmiller, C, 50 | no |

The vote last session in the Committee was 20 to 1. So it's clear that the 11 to 6 vote this year is too close for us to relax. The bill will come up on the House floor the last part of the week of March 11 or, if debate moves too slowly, the first part of the following week. There is opposition to the bill in the House. Some of the rural legislators are telling us that they will vote against the bill because the convention would be controlled by liberals and labor people and they fear the Constitutional Convention would solve the reapportionment problems to the disadvantage of the rural people. We have found our most effective argument is that the legislature should no longer deny the right of the people to express themselves, as for or against a constitutional convention.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ACTION --- ITS TIME TO WRITE YOUR
REPRESENTATIVES TO VOTE FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION BILL.

The Senate Judiciary Committee hearing for Constitutional Convention will be Thursday, March 14, from 8 to 9 A.M. for the proponents, and from 9 to 10 A.M. for the opponents. The Senate Committee personnel is the same as it was in the 1955 session. There is much work to be done in the committee. If your Senator is on the Judiciary Committee (see page 2, Legislative Bulletin, Feb. 1), please write and ask that he support the bill.

REAPPORTIONMENT

The Bergerud Reapportionment bill (H.F.450) passed out of the House Reapportionment Committee on March 6 by a vote of 10 to 7 with recommendation to pass. The vote was as follows:

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|
| Iverson, L, 48 | no | Battles, L, 67 | yes | Mosier, L, 35 | yes |
| Adams, L, 31 | yes | Ernestvedt, L, 23 | no | Noreen, C, 57 | yes |
| Angutman, C, 55 | yes | Fitzgerald, L, 21 | no | Olson, C.G., L, 9 | no |
| Anderson, J.T., C, 42 | yes | Jensen, C, 14 | no | Parks, C, 42 | yes |
| Bergerud, C, 36 | yes | Klaus, C, 20 | yes | Searle, C, 16 | no |
| Bergeson, L, 64 | no | Kording, L, 32 | yes | | |

This is a larger vote of approval than the bill had last year. This is, however, only the first of four hurdles. The next, the Senate Committee, will be particularly difficult. Will you write your Senator and Representatives telling them we urge their support for H.F.450 and S.F.401.

The House Reapportionment committee also voted out an area compromise amendment without a recommendation to pass. If the Senate committee approves an amendment, there will probably be a conference committee to work out an agreement suitable to both Houses. We will advise you of progress in the next bulletin. We do remind you that the LWV is backing both a statute under the present constitution to remedy immediately Minnesota's bad situation (the Bergerud bill) and will support a compromise amendment to permanently solve the problem of apportionment in Minnesota, if an acceptable amendment makes any progress. Your lobbyists are keeping in close touch with legislators on this matter.

There will be a half hour TV show on Reapportionment on Sunday, March 17, at 1:30 P.M. on Channel 5. The Bergerud bill will be debated by the author and Senator Gillen, and an area compromise constitutional amendment on Reapportionment will be debated by Senator Erickson and Representative Iverson.

LAST MINUTE BULLETIN

The Reapportionment bill will be given its first Senate hearing on Monday, March 11, in room 237 at 9 A.M. before the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee. The proponents will speak the first forty minutes. Senator Erickson is chairman of this committee, and the rest of the committee is listed on page 3, Legislative Bulletin, Feb. 1. Your lobbyists say the interest in Reapportionment is at a peak of interest at the Capitol..... something will be done.....they want the question settled this session.

LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN -- No. 5

CONSTITUTIONAL
CONVENTION

On March 26, the Senate Judiciary Committee, with two members absent, voted 9 to 9 on killing the bill, and again 9 to 9 on sending it to the Senate floor by recommending it to pass.

Therefore the bill remained before the committee.

On March 28, committee members, by moving adjournment, avoided setting time for a re-vote.

On April 4, the committee voted against setting a time for another committee vote. The strategy, as voiced by Senators Wefald and Wright, was that they wanted to hear the report of a sub-committee on constitutional amendments before taking another vote on the convention bill.

We still have hope of another committee vote on the Constitutional Convention bill, after the amendments have been acted upon, but hope of Senate passage is very dim!

The members of the sub-committee are Senators Rosenmeier, Root and Fraser. Twenty-nine separate amendments to the constitution were introduced into the Senate this session. The work of the sub-committee was to consolidate the subject matter and report a few amendments to the main committee to act upon. This report was presented Friday morning, April 5. The report included 4 amendments: 1) Home Rule Amendment, 2) Amendment on length of sessions, 3) Four year term for constitutional officers, and 4) a section eliminating "dead wood." Final committee action on these amendments has not been taken at this writing. We report this to you so that you may understand the strategy the committee is using.

The passage of these amendments out of committee and onto the ballot greatly reduces the need for and chances for a convention. This is precisely what the Judiciary committee intended. Our conviction that the citizen is the constitution maker is being circumvented, by action of the Senate Judiciary Committee in delegating to a three man sub-committee the responsibility of recommending revision in these areas. Once again the Senate is denying the citizens the right to make the choice that is theirs -- to decide if they want a Constitutional Convention.

WHAT WOULD YOU AS A CITIZEN DO NOW?

REAPPORTIONMENT

At a late, long and confusing meeting of the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee April 4, the following decisions were made on legislative reapportionment. The Bergerud-Gillen Bill was amended to preserve almost completely the status quo in the Senate. However, the metropolitan areas would retain the additional seats given them in the Senate, and the House reapportionment would remain substantially as accepted by that body on March 29.

Here is the new angle: The Bergerud-Gillen bill would become effective not at the next election, but in 1963, and only if an area amendment was accepted by the voters in 1958. We feel this is an unacceptable solution because:

1. the whole point of statutory reapportionment would be immediate relief,
2. conditioning a statute upon an amendment is not good legislative procedure,
3. there is no indication what the amendment would be (House and Senate are still far apart on which body should receive the area consideration, and
4. Any statute and amendment offered together should at least be like each other in purpose and effect. No possible amendment could be anything but incongruous with the Bergerud-Gillen bill as amended (modified population, House; modified area in Senate).

WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL YOUR SENATOR WHY WE OBJECT TO THIS PACKAGE DEAL, AND THAT WE STILL HOPE FOR A STATUTE AND A SEPARATE AMENDMENT.

TIME FOR ACTION ON REAPPORTIONMENT

The Bergerud bill and a reapportionment amendment, which would forever freeze Senatorial districts, were married by action of the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee, April 4. Since the League of Women Voters considers this marriage an extremely ill-mated one, it is our policy to press for annulment. (Our reasons for objecting were set forth in Legislative Bulletin No. 5 which you have just received in the last President's mailing.)

After talking with the chief authors, Rep. Bergerud and Senator Gillen, and representatives from the Binartisan Committee, the League has joined in a last attempt to pass either the Bergerud bill or - more probably - a reapportionment amendment which the League can support.

This is what will be tried:

1. Senator Gillen will move on Friday, April 12, that the Senate vote on the Senate version of reapportionment - that is, Bergerud bill a part of a reapportionment amendment - on Monday, April 15. It will be the strategy of the friends of reapportionment to try to separate the bill and the amendment on the Senate floor.
2. If this separation fails in the Senate (and there is little hope that it will succeed), and if the Senate should pass the bill and the amendment in their present unified form, the bill would have to go to a conference committee of the Senate and House.
3. The last hope for a form of reapportionment which the League could support would depend on how representatives from both the House and Senate would resolve the differences between the two versions of reapportionment legislation. The only "compromise" which the authors and the League can probably hope for would be rejection of the Bergerud bill and acceptance of a more "reasonable" amendment.

This action is being taken to get a commitment from each Senator with respect to his position on reapportionment and to secure further public education through the process of Senate debate.

In this strategy, local League members can be most helpful if they:

- will watch the papers to see if Senator Gillen gets the special order for a Senate vote on April 15. If he fails, reapportionment legislation may be lost in the last minute rush.
- urge their Senators - if Senator Gillen gets this commitment for an April 15th vote - to support either the Bergerud bill or an amendment, or both, but not the present version of bill-amendment.

No reapportionment legislation in the present Senate form will be accepted by the House. It will certainly not be supported by the League. We do have a chance of securing a good reapportionment amendment if we all let our Senators know that reapportionment by statute or by amendment should be considered and voted separately.

AN ACT proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article IV, Section 9, pertaining to the Legislature.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. An amendment to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article IV, Sec. 9, is proposed to the people of the state for their approval or rejection, which section when amended shall read as follows:

Sec. 9. No senator or representative shall during the term for which he is elected, hold any nonelective office under the authority of the State of Minnesota except that of Notary Public or of the United States except that of postmaster. No senator or representative shall be disqualified for election to any elective office, but any senator or representative who is elected to any elective office under the authority of the state of the United States, who shall qualify for the office to which elected shall automatically terminate his term of office as senator or representative and create a vacancy therein, provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall preclude any senator or representative from serving as attorney for any school district or political subdivision of the state except that he shall not serve as a county attorney.

Sec. 2. The proposed amendment shall be submitted to the people of the state for their approval or rejection at the general election for the year 1958 in the manner provided by law for the submission of amendments to the constitution. The votes thereon shall be counted, canvassed, and the results proclaimed as provided by law. The ballots used at the election shall have printed thereon the following:

"Shall Article IV, Sec. 9 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota be amended so as to permit a senator or representative to hold certain elective and nonelective offices under authority of the State of Minnesota or the United States?"

AN ACT proposing an amendment to the constitution of the state of Minnesota, Article V, Sections 3 and 5, providing for a four year term for the office of governor and other constitutional officers.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. The following amendment of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article V, Sections 3 and 5, is hereby proposed to the people of the state for their approval or rejection, which sections when amended shall read as follows:

Sec. 3. The term of office for the governor and lieutenant governor shall be four years, and until their successors are chosen and qualified. Each shall have attained the age of 25 years and shall have been a bona fide resident of the state for one year next preceding his election. Both shall be citizens of the United States.

Sec. 5. The official term of the secretary of state, treasurer, attorney general, and state auditor shall be four years, and each shall continue in office until his successor shall have been elected and qualified. The further duties and salaries of the executive officers shall each be prescribed by law.

Section 2. This proposed amendment shall be submitted to the voters for their approval or rejection at the general election for the year 1958 in a manner provided by law, and if adopted this amendment shall take effect as to terms of office beginning on the first Monday in 1963. The ballots used at the election shall have printed thereon:

"Shall the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article V, Sections 3 and 5, be amended so as to provide for the election of the governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, treasurer, and attorney general for four year terms beginning with the general election in 1962?"

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
15th and Washington Aves., S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Release: Wednesday, March 6,
or thereafter

League, Bipartisan Committee
Warn People to Guard Rights

Minnesotans were warned today, as a result of testimony at a legislative hearing, "not to let a smoke screen of side issues hide the basic fact that they have the right to vote on whether they want a convention to revise the state constitution". The warning was made by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota in consultation with the joint GOP-DFL legislative committee headed by P. Kenneth Peterson of Minneapolis and William Carlson of St. Paul. Calling a constitutional convention is in both party platforms.

"Opponents of the constitutional convention bill testifying at a House hearing have tried to switch the spotlight to many other issues," the statement said, "but not one has given a single real reason why the people should not be allowed to vote on having a convention."

"We advise those who believe in this right to tell their legislators immediately."

On the bipartisan committee are: GOP- Mrs. Leonard Wilson, Carlton; Senator Albert Quie, Dennison; Rep. Alf Bergerud, Edina; Mrs. C. E. Howard, Excelsior. DFL- Mrs. Marge Maki, St. Paul; Dr. C. W. McQuiggan, Marshall; Mrs. Betty Green, St. Louis Park; Gerald Dillon, Minneapolis.

Joining in issuing the statement were several persons who testified at the House hearing in favor of the constitutional convention bill. They are William Pearson, Ogilvie, master of the Minnesota State Grange; Donald Holmes, Minneapolis, chairman of the Minnesota Citizens Constitutional Committee; Mrs. Ellis Peilen, Minneapolis, state legislative chairman of the National Council of Jewish Women; George W. Lawson, St. Paul, active in the A.F.L.; Mrs. Graydon J. Milborn, Minneapolis, Hennepin County Republican Workshop; Stanley Platt, Minneapolis; Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves, Rochester, constitutional convention chairman of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION

}

S. F.

No. 412

Introduced and Read First Time Feb. 1, 1957, by Messrs. Welch,
Rosenmeier and Novak.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Reported Back Apr. 15, 1957, to Pass as Amended.

Read Second Time Apr. 15, 1957.

Matter in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article IV, Section 1,
Relating to the Legislature.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. An amendment to Article IV, Section 1, of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota,
2 is proposed to the people of the state for their approval or rejection. The proposed amendment is as
3 follows, and if adopted section 1 will read as follows:

4 Section 1. The legislature shall consist of the senate and house of representatives. The senate
5 shall be composed of members elected for a term of four years and the house of representatives
6 shall be composed of members elected for a term of two years by the qualified voters at the general
7 election. Their terms shall begin on the first Monday in January next following their election.

8 The legislature shall be a continuous body during the term for which the house of representatives
9 is elected. It shall meet at the seat of government at regular session in each odd numbered year at the
10 time prescribed by law for a term not exceeding 120 legislative days unless the term is increased by
11 a law enacted at a previous session of the legislature.

12 A special session of the legislature may be called as otherwise provided by this Constitution or
13 may be called in the manner provided by law or by the joint rules of the senate and house of representa-
14 tives.

Sec. 2. The proposed amendment shall be submitted to the people of this state for their approval
2 or rejection at the general election for the year 1958 in the manner provided by law for the submis-

3 sion of amendments to the Constitution. The votes thereon shall be counted, canvassed and the result
4 proclaimed as provided by law. The ballots used at this election shall have printed thereon the fol-
5 lowing:

6 "Shall the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article IV, Section 1, be amended so that (a)
7 the regular session of the legislature will not be limited to 90 days but will be held in odd numbered
8 years at the time prescribed by law, and for a term not exceeding 120 legislative days unless the term
9 is increased by a law enacted at a previous session of the legislature; (b) a special session of the leg-
10 islature may be called at any time in the manner provided by law or by legislative rules or as other-
11 wise provided; (c) the legislature shall be a continuous body during the term for which the house
12 of representatives is elected.

13

Yes _____

14

No _____"

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION }

S. F.

No. 183

Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 24, 1957, by Messrs. Dunlap
and Root.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Reported Back Apr. 10, 1957, to Pass as Amended.

Read Second Time Apr. 10, 1957.

Matter in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing Amendments to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota by Eliminating Provisions Now Obsolete; Repealing Certain Provisions of Article IV, Section 23 and Certain Provisions of Article VII, Sections 1 and 2; Repealing Article IV, Section 26, and Article VII, Section 8.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. For the purpose of eliminating and repealing certain obsolete provisions of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, the following amendment and repealer is proposed to the people of the state for their approval or rejection.

Subdivision 1. Article IV, Section 23 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota is amended to read:

Sec. 23. At their first session after such enumeration made by the authority of the United States, the legislature shall have the power to prescribe the bounds of congressional, senatorial and representative districts, and to apportion anew the senators and representatives among the several districts according to the provisions of section second of this article.

Subd. 2. Article VII, Section 1 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, is amended to read:

Section 1. Every person of the age of twenty-one (21) years or upward who has been a citizen of the United States for three months and who has resided in this state six (6) months next preceding any election shall be entitled to vote at such election in the election district of which he at the time has been a resident for thirty (30) days for all officers elective by the people.

15 Subd. 3. Article VII, Sec. 2 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, is amended to read:

16 Sec. 2. No person who has been convicted of treason or any felony, unless restored to civil
17 rights; and no person under guardianship, or who may be non compos mentis or insane, shall be
18 entitled or permitted to vote at any election in this state.

19 Subd. 4. Article IV, Section 26 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, pertaining to the
20 election of United States Senators by the legislature, and Article VII, Section 8, pertaining to the
21 franchise of women in certain instances, be repealed.

Sec. 2. The question shall be submitted to the people of this state for their approval or rejection at the general election for the year 1958 in the manner provided by law for the submission of amendments to the Constitution. The votes thereon shall be counted, canvassed, and the result proclaimed as provided by law. The ballots used at this election shall have printed thereon the following:

6 "Shall the Constitution of the State of Minnesota be amended by repealing obsolete provisions
7 contained in Article IV, Sections 23 and 26 and in Article VII, Sections 1, 2 and 8, pertaining
8 to the taking of a census at stated intervals; the election of United States Senators
9 by the legislature; the elective franchise of persons of Indian blood so as to treat them the
10 same as other persons on matters relating to qualification for voting; and pertaining to the
11 franchise of women in certain instances?

12 Yes _____

13 No _____"

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION }

S. F.

No. 187

Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 24, 1957, by Messrs. Fraser
and Rosenmeier.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Reported Back Apr. 10, 1957, to Pass as Amended.

Read Second Time Apr. 10, 1957.

Matter in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article V, Sections 3 and 5, Providing for a Four Year Term for the Office of Governor and Other Constitutional Officers.
Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. The following amendment of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article V, Sections 3 and 5, is hereby proposed to the people of the state for their approval or rejection, which sections when amended shall read as follows:

Section 3. The term of office for the governor and lieutenant governor shall be four years, and until their successors are chosen and qualified. Each shall have attained the age of 25 years and shall have been a bona fide resident of the state for one year next preceding his election. Both shall be citizens of the United States.

Section 5. The official term of the secretary of state, treasurer, attorney general, and state auditor shall be four years, and each shall continue in office until his successor shall have been elected and qualified. The further duties and salaries of the executive officers shall each be prescribed by law.

Sec. 2. This proposed amendment shall be submitted to the voters for their approval or rejection at the general election for the year 1958 in a manner provided by law, and if adopted this amendment shall take effect as to terms of office beginning on the first Monday in 1963. The ballots used at the election shall have printed thereon:

5 "Shall the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, Article V, Sections 3 and 5, be amended so
6 as to provide for the election of the governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, treas-
7 urer, and attorney general for four year terms beginning with the general election in 1962?

8 Yes _____

9 No _____"

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION

{

S. F.

No. 854

Introduced and Read First Time Feb. 20, 1957, by Messrs. Fraser,
Rosenmeier and Dunlap.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Reported Back Apr. 10, 1957, to Pass as Amended.

Read Second Time Apr. 10, 1957.

Matter in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Minnesota Relating to Local Government and
Revising and Consolidating the Provisions Therefor; Amending Article XI and Article IV, Section
33, and Repealing Article IV, Section 36.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. An amendment of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota revising and consoli-
2 dating the provisions relating to local government is proposed to the people of the state for their
3 approval or rejection, which, if adopted, amends Article XI, amends Article IV, Section 33, to remove
4 inconsistent provisions, and repeals Article IV, Section 36. The proposed amendment revises Article
5 XI and Article IV, Section 33, to read as follows:

6

ARTICLE XI

7 Section 1. The legislature may provide by law for the creation, organization, administration,
8 consolidation, division, and dissolution of local government units and their functions, for the change
9 of boundaries thereof, for their officers, including qualifications for office, both elective and appointive,
10 and for the transfer of county seats. No county boundary shall be changed or county seat trans-
11 ferred until approved by a majority of the voters of each county affected voting thereon.

12 Sec. 2. Every law which upon its effective date applies to a single local government unit or to a
13 group of such units in a single county or a number of contiguous counties is a special law and shall
14 name the unit or, in the latter case, the counties, to which it applies. The legislature may enact

15 special laws relating to local government units, but a special law, unless otherwise provided by general law, shall become effective only after its approval by the affected unit expressed through the voters or the governing body and by such majority as the legislature may direct. Any special law may be modified or superseded by a later home rule charter or amendment applicable to the same local government unit, but this does not prevent the adoption of subsequent laws on the same subject.

20 Sec. 3. Any city or village, and any county or other local government unit when authorized by law, may adopt a home rule charter for its government in accordance with this constitution and the laws. No such charter shall become effective without the approval of the voters of the local government unit affected by such majority as the legislature may prescribe by general law. If a charter provides for the consolidation or separation of a city and a county, in whole or in part, it shall not be effective without approval of the voters both in the city and in the remainder of the county by the majority required by law. A general law hereafter enacted is presumed not to prevail over the provisions of home rule charters unless a contrary intent is expressed or necessarily implied in such law.

28 Sec. 4. The legislature shall provide by law for charter commissions. Notwithstanding any other constitutional limitations, the legislature may require that commission members shall be freeholders, provide for their appointment by judges of the district court, and permit any member to hold any other elective or appointive office other than judicial. Home rule charter amendments may be proposed by a charter commission or by a petition of five per cent of the voters of the local government unit as determined by law and shall not become effective until approved by the voters by the majority required by law. Amendments may be proposed and adopted in any other manner provided by law. A local government unit may repeal its home rule charter and adopt a statutory form of government or a new charter upon the same majority vote as is required by law for the adoption of a charter in the first instance.

38 Sec. 5. Existing laws and charters, valid when adopted, shall continue in effect until amended or repealed in accordance with this article.

40 ARTICLE IV

41 Sec. 33. In all cases when a general law can be made applicable, no special law shall be enacted, except as provided in Article XI; and whether a general law could have been made applicable in any case is hereby declared a judicial question, and as such shall be judicially determined without regard to any legislative assertion on that subject. The legislature shall pass no local or special law authorizing the laying out, opening, altering, vacating or maintaining roads, highways, streets or alleys; remitting fines, penalties or forfeitures; changing the names of persons, places, lakes or rivers; authorizing the adoption or legitimation of children; changing the law of descent or succession; conferring rights upon minors; declaring any named person of age; giving effect to informal or invalid wills or deeds, or affecting the estates of minors or persons under disability; exempting property from taxation or regulating the rate of interest on money; creating private corporations, or amending, renewing, extending or explaining the charters thereof; granting to any private corporation, associa-

tion or individual any special or exclusive privilege, immunity or franchise whatever, or authorizing public taxation for a private purpose. The inhibitions of local or special laws in this section shall not be construed to prevent the passage of general laws on any of the subjects enumerated.

55 The legislature may repeal any existing special or local law, but shall not amend, extend or modify any of the same except as provided in Article XI.

57 Sec. 36. This section is repealed.

Sec. 2. The proposed amendment shall be submitted to the voters of the state for their approval or rejection. Notwithstanding Minnesota Statutes 1953, Section 3.21, the attorney general shall omit from the statement of purpose and effect the text of the existing sections of the constitution proposed to be amended, repealed, or superseded by the proposed amendment. The question shall be stated on the ballot as follows: "Shall the constitution of Minnesota be amended by revising and consolidating the provisions on local government, regulating the passage of special laws relating thereto, and providing for the adoption and amendment of home rule charters by cities and villages and by other local government units when authorized by law?"



STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION

{

H. F.

No. 289

Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 24, 1957, by Mr. Karth,

Mrs. Luther, Messrs. Langley, Noreen and Johnson, A. I.

Referred to Committee on General Legislation.

Reported Back to Pass Mar. 4, 1957.

Read Second Time Mar. 4, 1957.

Matters in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing a Convention to Revise the Constitution of the State of Minnesota.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. There shall be submitted to the electors, at the general election to be held in November, 1958, the question:

"Shall there be a convention to revise the Constitution of the State of Minnesota?"

Sec. 2. The electors may vote by ballot for or against a convention. The election shall be conducted and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified in the manner provided by law for general elections. The form of the ballot shall be:

Shall there be a convention to revise the Constitution of the State of Minnesota?

Yes _____

No _____

The voter shall designate his choice by a cross mark opposite the word "Yes" or the word "No" in the space provided therefor. If a majority of the voters voting at the election shall have voted for a convention, the legislature at its session next succeeding this election shall provide for calling such convention.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION

{

H. F.

No. 289

Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 24, 1957, by Mr. Karth,

Mrs. Luther, Messrs. Langley, Noreen and Johnson, A. I.

Referred to Committee on General Legislation.

Reported Back to Pass Mar. 4, 1957.

Read Second Time Mar. 4, 1957.

Matters in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing a Convention to Revise the Constitution of the State of Minnesota.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. There shall be submitted to the electors, at the general election to be held in November,
2 1958, the question:

3 "Shall there be a convention to revise the Constitution of the State of Minnesota?"

Sec. 2. The electors may vote by ballot for or against a convention. The election shall be con-
2 ducted and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified in the manner provided by law for
3 general elections. The form of the ballot shall be:

4 _____
5 Shall there be a convention to revise the Yes _____
6 Constitution of the State of Minnesota?
7 No _____
8 _____

9 The voter shall designate his choice by a cross mark opposite the word "Yes" or the word "No" in
10 the space provided therefor. If a majority of the voters voting at the election shall have voted
11 for a convention, the legislature at its session next succeeding this election shall provide for calling
12 such convention.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION }

H. F.

No. 441

Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 31, 1957, by Messrs. Grittner,

Dirlam, Wozniak, Iverson and Oberg.

Referred to Committee on Civil Administration.

Reported Back to Pass as Amended Mar. 4, 1957.

Read Second Time Mar. 4, 1957.

Matter in italics is new, matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Relating to Legislative Counsels or Agents; Requiring That They Be Registered and Providing Penalties for the Violation Thereof.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. Every person, corporation or association which employs for a consideration any person to act as counsel or agent to promote or oppose in any manner, the passage by the legislature of any legislation or to act in any manner as a legislative counsel or agent, or as the regularly retained legal counsel or agent of any person, association or corporation, shall, within one week after the date of such employment, cause the name of the person so employed or agreed to be employed, to be entered upon a legislative docket as hereinafter provided. It shall also be the duty of the person so employed to enter or cause to be entered his name upon such docket. Upon the termination of such employment such fact may be entered opposite the name of any person so employed either by the employer or employee. The provisions of this section shall not apply to a person when representing a bonafide church solely for the purpose of protecting the public right to practice the doctrines of such church.

Sec. 2. The secretary of state shall prepare and keep a legislative docket, which shall be known as the docket of the legislative counsel and agents. In the docket shall be entered the names of counsel or persons employed to appear before a committee of the legislature for the purpose of making an argument or examining witnesses, and also the names of any regular legal counsel or person employed

5 by any person, corporation or association who act or advise in relation to legislation. In such dockets
6 shall be entered names and business address of the employer, the name, residence and occupation of
7 the person employed, the length of time that the employment is to continue, if such time can be
8 determined, and the special subject or subjects of legislation, if any, to which the employment relates.
9 Such dockets shall be public records and open to the inspection of any citizen upon demand at any
10 time during the regular business hours of the office of the secretary of state.

Sec. 3. Legislative counsel and agents required to have their names entered upon the legislative
2 docket shall file with the secretary of state at the time of such entry a written authorization to act
3 as such, signed by the person or corporation employing them.

Sec. 4. Any person, corporation or association violating any provision of this act, shall for such
2 offense be fined not less than \$200 nor more than \$5,000. Any person employed as legislative coun-
3 sel or agent, or regular employed legal counsel or agent, who shall fail to comply with any provision
4 of this act, shall be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000 and shall be barred from acting in
5 the capacity of a legislative counsel or agent for the period of three years from the date of such con-
6 viction. It shall be the duty of the attorney-general, upon information, to bring prosecutions for the
7 violation of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 5. This act shall not apply to any municipality or other public corporation.

Sec. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed as prohibiting free discussion and deliberation upon
2 any question pending before the legislature by members thereof, privately or publicly, nor as pro-
3 hibiting agreements by members to support any single measure pending, on condition that certain
4 changes be made in such measure, nor shall this act be construed as prohibiting agreements to com-
5 promise conflicting provisions of different measures, provided, however, that any member who,
6 directly or indirectly, receives fees, salary, or retainer compensation in any form shall be governed
7 by the provisions of section 1 of this act.

STATE OF MINNESOTA

SIXTIETH
SESSION }

S. F.

No. 183

Introduced and Read First Time Jan. 24, 1957, by Messrs. Dunlap
and Root.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Reported Back Apr. 10, 1957, to Pass as Amended.

Read Second Time Apr. 10, 1957.

Matter in italics is new; matter in capitals when in () is old law to be omitted.

A BILL

For an Act Proposing Amendments to the Constitution of the State of Minnesota by Eliminating Provisions Now Obsolete; Repealing Certain Provisions of Article IV, Section 23 and Certain Provisions of Article VII, Sections 1 and 2; Repealing Article IV, Section 26, and Article VII, Section 8.
Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Section 1. For the purpose of eliminating and repealing certain obsolete provisions of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, the following amendment and repealer is proposed to the people of the state for their approval or rejection.

Subdivision 1. Article IV, Section 23 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota is amended to read:

Sec. 23. At their first session after such enumeration made by the authority of the United States, the legislature shall have the power to prescribe the bounds of congressional, senatorial and representative districts, and to apportion anew the senators and representatives among the several districts according to the provisions of section second of this article.

Subd. 2. Article VII, Section 1 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, is amended to read:

Section 1. Every person of the age of twenty-one (21) years or upward who has been a citizen of the United States for three months and who has resided in this state six (6) months next preceding any election shall be entitled to vote at such election in the election district of which he at the time has been a resident for thirty (30) days for all officers elective by the people.

15 Subd. 3. Article VII, Sec. 2 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, is amended to read:

16 Sec. 2. No person who has been convicted of treason or any felony, unless restored to civil
17 rights; and no person under guardianship, or who may be non compos mentis or insane, shall be
18 entitled or permitted to vote at any election in this state.

19 Subd. 4. Article IV, Section 26 of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota, pertaining to the
20 election of United States Senators by the legislature, and Article VII, Section 8, pertaining to the
21 franchise of women in certain instances, be repealed.

Sec. 2. The question shall be submitted to the people of this state for their approval or rejection
2 tion at the general election for the year 1958 in the manner provided by law for the submission of
3 amendments to the Constitution. The votes thereon shall be counted, canvassed, and the result
4 proclaimed as provided by law. The ballots used at this election shall have printed thereon the
5 following:

6 "Shall the Constitution of the State of Minnesota be amended by repealing obsolete provisions
7 contained in Article IV, Sections 23 and 26 and in Article VII, Sections 1, 2 and 8, pertaining
8 ing to the taking of a census at stated intervals; the election of United States Senators
9 by the legislature; the elective franchise of persons of Indian blood so as to treat them the
10 same as other persons on matters relating to qualification for voting; and pertaining to the
11 franchise of women in certain instances?

12 Yes _____

13 No _____"

Legislative Tours
Also other reports
1957

March 2, 1957

Dear Mrs. Kline,

The State Legislative Committee is not conducting tours for the individual leagues this year. We could not find volunteers to fill this full time job. I will send you the information that you asked for and, if you will let us know when you are coming I may be there and can help you some.

The senate convenes at 10:00 A. M. The house convenes at 2:00 P. M. There are committees meeting at various times all day long. You may get lunch in the cafeteria at any time.

To make arrangements write to Mr. Hugh T. Kennedy, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives. He will make arrangements for tours and reservations for house and senate seats. Personally conducted tours are conducted at 9:15, 10:15, 11:15, 1:15, 2:15, and 3:15. Tell him how many are coming and on what day. Since the time is short maybe you should send a choice of days. You should probably arrive at 9:30 in order to get to the senate on time.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

Doris
100 South Broadway
New Ulm, Minnesota
February 13, 1957

League of Women Voters
15 and Washington S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Dear Madam:

Our League would like to take a group of 11th and 12th grade students to St. Paul to visit the Capital and to observe our State Legislature in action. We are hoping to take a bus load of approximately 35 students.

Would you please inform us as to possible dates that we might attend? We would like information on time of sessions and when we should arrive. I understand that League members are present to direct tours and aid visiting groups such as this.

Any information you can provide will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,
Mr. Kermit H. Kleene

Claesen

E.W.

Ca 25471

Pro Log Twin
+ Eng.

Report on Legislative Tours

| | |
|-------------|----|
| Roseville | 32 |
| ● Rochester | 15 |
| Austin | 24 |
| Wells | 6 |
| Edina | 50 |
| Anoka | 3 |

Alexandria 1/18/57, LEGISLATIVE

Units have set up relay system of writing to legislators. Each member will write her letter and pass on list to next name on the list, so next girl can write a letter.

Bemidji, 4/25/57, LEGISLATION

Strong editorial favoring C.C., 4/4/57 at request of legislative chm., also news articles and letter to editor, 4/2/57

Cass Lake, 4/4/57, CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Detailed article reporting why Representative Renner voted against C. Convention. Includes cost (millions), best qualified men may not run, no serious objection to present c., except reapportionment, which easily may be taken care of by amendment, has stood test of time, field day for lawyers, amended more cheaply, safer, easier.

MINNAPOLIS April 1957

Circle Pines, 4/17/57, LEGISLATION

Suggested by president that we immediately contact members of the state legislative subcommittee in charge of school construction aid to support the bill to aid distressed school districts.!!!!

Fergus Falls, 4/30/57, LEGISLATION

Forum discussion on Constitutional Rev., for public, Senators and representatives on panel, as well as Dr. Kise of Moorhead State Teachers College,...

Fergus Falls, 4/30/57, LEGISLATION

After LNV had meeting on State Constitution the Chamber of Commerce held a similar discussion.

Red Wing, 3/57 BUL Legislative Report of LL activity good.

LEGIS.

St. Paul, 11/56

Coffee Time presentation on Reapportionment,

LEGIS.

2/14/56

Home Rule

4/10/56

Judiciary Article

1/11/57

Integrated, flexible tax article

3/27/57

Questions on Minn. Tax Structure

4/57

Ramsey County State Delegation, and map

Book 17, Table 10, Column 10
Page 10, and Page 11, Column 10
Page 12, Column 10 — 10/10/10

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

84 SOUTH TENTH STREET, ROOM 406

MINNEAPOLIS 3, MINNESOTA

Atlantic 0941

NEW ADDRESS: Washington and 15th Ave., S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

May 23, 1956

Dear Legislator:

Governor Freeman has declared May 25 Minnesota Constitution Day.

Just 100 years ago Territorial Governor Gorman signed into law a bill to call a Constitutional Convention. This is the only Convention we have ever had in Minnesota.

These first framers of our government provided that the people of Minnesota should have the power through their legislature to call a Constitutional Convention whenever they felt the need. One hundred years later, there is that need.

The tremendous growth in government services and in population has resulted in the state government becoming one of the largest spending operations in the state. We feel it is time for us to examine our fundamental instrument of government with the idea that a simple, flexible and timeless constitution might be the answer to meeting more adequately the present needs of the people.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is therefore working for revision of our state constitution through the convention method.

In recognition of Minnesota Constitution Day, we are sending you a small "Price Tag" which we are distributing all over the state to sell the people on the idea that they deserve a better constitution. These tags also have state-wide coverage through the media of radio, television programs and newspaper releases.

From time to time we will send you further material that you might find useful in promoting the convention method of constitutional revision in your district.

We hope you will wear your "Price Tag" on Constitution Day, and help publicize the need for community understanding of our basic law.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Basil Young
President

D. Guthrie
Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

WILLIAM'S LOG

WFL- Asked Dick O'Ben if he thought it would be possible for our essay winners to read their essays before the House and Senate. He said "yes" where would be nothing to it. Just call him after election, and he would take care of it.

Jan. 15 Overton gave his message to the combined House and Senate. Afterward Dick O'Ben took me and introduced me to Speaker Johnson. He told him about our essay contest and asked him if he thought it possible for one of the girls to read her essay before the House. He thought it a good idea- fine -said to come back and give him the details later.

We went to meet Sen. Salazar. Told him of our plans. He said I could have to go -participation from Archie Miller, because he was chairman of the Rules Comm. in the Senate. I shook from the thought of asking him, because of all the unfavorable comments about his opposition to us and our program. We went up. I told him about the contest and our plans. I said the contest was on Constitutional Revision. He thought it would be quite an award for the winner to have this honor. He thought it an excellent plan. He said since he was chairman of the rules comm. he would have to recess the Senate. He said shortly after the Senate convened he would move for a recess, she could read her essay. I assured him she wouldn't take more than five minutes.

We went ahead with the plans.

Mon. Jan. 21- Went to check details with Sen. Miller and he was in the hospital.

Wednesday Jan. 23- We sent out news release with all the plans in.

Sent letters with detailed plans in, to Miller and Johnson.

Friday Jan. 25 Met Sen Anderson by chance and he told me that the Rules Comm. had met and discussed the essay reading. Sen Miller had gone to the hospital without telling anyone about the plan. So it was quite a blow for Sen. Welch to have an essay on Constitutional Revision read esp. before the Senate, and one sponsored by the League of Women Voters. Sen Anderson reported that the decision to hold over until Mon. After all she was just a high school student and couldn't do too much harm. He alerted Mary

Evenson and she made plans to change the news release should our request be turned down. She would go down to the State office at noon and wait for me to call. Rules Comm. meets from 11:30- 12:30. Called Betty Kane and asked her to meet me in Mon. so she could help me decide what to do next.

Mon. Jan. 28 Rules Comm. met nothing until 1:30. Betty and I waited in the Hall. After it was over I went to Archie Miller's office. The secretary was writing a letter and I should go down to Sen. Welch's office to get it. I did. I said he hadn't met for the Senate to break a rule for the essay to be read. We assumed it would be before a recessed session. He said you he knows what we want. But neither could she read it before a recessed session too because it discussed a controversial issue and legislation on that issue was pending in the Senate. He said he would introduce her and distribute copies of the essays to the Senators. We said that was fine. We would change our plans accordingly. So Mary and Grace worked like the diabolists to get the news release corrections out that night. Telegraphed the girl etc.

replied

FEB 27 1956

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
University of Minnesota, 15th & Washington Ave. S. E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Immediate Release

Constitution Contest Sponsored for Students

Minnesota high school students from grades 9 to 12 inclusive are eligible to enter an essay contest on "Our Minnesota Constitution" sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota to encourage young people to acquaint themselves with the state constitution. Superintendents of public, private and parochial schools have been sent information on the contest, which begins March 19 and closes at noon April 30.

All four prize winners will receive an expense-paid conducted visit to the 1957 Minnesota Legislature. In addition, the first prize winner will be awarded a 30-volume set of Encyclopedia Americana, 1955 edition, and the second prize winner will be given a \$25 Oxford dictionary.

Judges are Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves of Rochester, past president of the state League and a former national League director; Ralph W. Keller of Minneapolis, manager of the Minnesota Editorial Association; and Leroy E. Matson of Minneapolis, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Minnesota. All three have testified on the need for constitutional revision at various legislative hearings.

Lists of suggested topics, bibliography and complete rules may be obtained from local and county school superintendents' offices, local Leagues of Women Voters or the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 15th and Washington Avenue S.E., Minneapolis 14, Minnesota.

#####

To the Editor: The following is suitable for a filler:

The State You're In - Which Is the Constitution?

Anyone who delves into the history of Minnesota's only constitutional convention in 1857 soon stumbles on a real puzzler - which of two constitutions is the real one? The convention was split in two by bitter partisan strife, with the result that a conference committee of 10 men wrote the state constitution in 10 days, driven by haste so that Minnesota might achieve statehood. Because Republicans and Democrats would not even sign the same document, two copies had to be made. There were 300 differences in the two versions. No one today knows which is the correct, original constitution of Minnesota!

#####

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota TSMC, 15th and Washington Ave. S.E., Minneapolis 14, Minnesota
Federal 8-8791 February, 1956

"OUR MINNESOTA CONSTITUTION"

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is sponsoring an ESSAY CONTEST in order to encourage students at the high school level to acquaint themselves with the MINNESOTA CONSTITUTION.

1ST PRIZE

2ND PRIZE

3RD and 4TH PRIZES

- 30 VOLUME SET of ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA, new 1955 edition. Approved by: Subscription Books Committee, American Library Association. Used by: United States Government Agencies, Leading Universities, Schools Libraries, and Industrialists throughout America.

AND.....A DAY AT THE LEGISLATURE

- A \$25 OXFORD DICTIONARY

AND.....A DAY AT THE LEGISLATURE

- A DAY AT THE LEGISLATURE

This all-expense paid, personally conducted visit to the 1957 Minnesota Legislature is offered to ALL WINNERS!

SUGGESTED TOPICS

1. Should There Be a Convention to Revise Minnesota's Constitution?

Reasons for or against revision. Suggested methods of revision. Advantages of the amendment process and of the convention process. Experience in other states. The right of the people to decide the method.

2. Minnesota's Only Constitutional Convention.

Its historical background. What were the peculiar circumstances of the convention? Do any present-day problems stem from this haste and confusion?

3. How Minnesota's Constitution Compares with the Federal Constitution.

Compare the two constitutions as to length of time in writing, ratifying and discussing the provisions. How do the documents compare in length, clarity, frequency of amendments and practical enforcement?

4. Amending the Minnesota Constitution.

History of and changes in amending process. Number and subjects of amendments. What does an amendment cost? Is extensive revision by amendment practical?

5. The Changes I would make in the State Constitution.

If a constitutional convention were called and you were a delegate, what revisions would you suggest? Why?

Suggested Bibliography: Report of Constitutional Commission of Minnesota, 1947; Constitution of Minnesota, Legislative Manual (available from your legislator); A History of the Constitution of Minnesota, Anderson and Lobb, University of Minnesota Press, 1921 -- ask at your library for these. A 25¢ Packet of League Material - available from your local League, or LNV of Minnesota, address above.

CONTEST RULES

1. The contest opens March 19 and will close at 12 noon April 30. All papers must be in the office of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota (address above) by the closing date in order to be considered or judged for the awards.
2. Only Minnesota high school students (grade 9 to 12 inclusive) will be eligible to enter the contest.
3. The completed essay is not to exceed 1,500 words. Use one side of the paper, write legibly, or if possible, typewrite with double spacing.
4. The full name of the contestant, grade, age, address, telephone number, name of high school, county, city or town must be written on upper left hand corner of each page.
5. No papers will be returned and the decision of the judges will be final.

MINNESOTA'S FUTURE IS IN YOUR HANDS

Memo: To Mrs. Evenson, Mrs. Springborg, Miss Gerling & Mrs. Goergen, Mrs. Outhrie
Mrs. Huston & Office
From: State Office, G. Wilson
Re: ESSAY WINNERS (on Constitutional Convention) WHO WILL SPEAK AT LEGISLATURE

1st Prize - Miss Patricia Graf, of Lismore ~~11/11/1954~~ Minnesota, a town of 317 people, in Nobles County, District 11, about 20 miles from Worthington, Minnesota, daughter of Mr. & Mrs. Melvin Lismore.

Was student at St. Anthony High School, and 17 years old when won, graduated last June.

Now working in Worthington, as bookkeeper, at Farmers Elevator, likes it, hopes to continue there, staying at home of G. Holles, 1310 7 Ave. Worthington

Hobbies - bowling, dancing.

Why entered contest? Sister at school encouraged her to.

Enjoyed the Encyclopaedia prize, it is at her home in Lismore.

2nd Prize - Miss Judith Keltgen, of St. Peter, Minnesota, living on a farm, now w Senior at Good Counsel Academy in Mankato, was 16 when entered last May, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Keltgen.

She hopes to go to college next year, perhaps at Mankato State Teachers College. ~~7~~ 4 H Club activities.

Last summer worked on farm at home, and did income tax work for her uncle who is a farmer, also.

Is School Co-editor of paper, the "Echo". Likes journalism and other writing. She was so busy at her school extracurricular activities, for the paper etc., that she didn't have as much time as she needed to write essay, so was surprised and pleased to win.

She is getting help from her school speech teacher, so that she can read well to the legislators.

She has 4 sisters, 1 a nun, 1 married with family, 1 college student, 1 in grade school.

She drives 8 or 9 miles to ~~11/11~~ school each day.

Enjoyed the dictionary prize, and excited, a bit scared about trip to legislature.

Both girls will arrive in Mpls. by bus 10:25 P.M., Wednesday, Jan. 30, their (1/31) hospitality in charge of Mrs. G. E. Springborg, of Roseville LNW, will visit Senate and House and Committees and meet own legislators, and lunch in Capitol, then tape an interview with KUOM at 4 P.M., after their visit, on Jan. 31, 1957

File

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

84 SOUTH TENTH STREET, ROOM 406

MINNEAPOLIS 3, MINNESOTA

Atlantic 0941

NEW ADDRESS: 15th and Washington Ave., S.E., Minneapolis 14, Minnesota
Federal 8-8791

June 1, 1956

Jan. 31, 1956

a:

The board of directors of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota wishes to thank you most sincerely for your efforts in bringing to the attention of your students our recent essay contest on subjects relating to the present Minnesota Constitution. We realize that such a contest would not be successful without the interest and encouragement of the school faculty and officials.

We know it will be of interest to you to know that prizes are being presented to the following students:

- Dist. 11*
1. Patricia Graf, St. Anthony High School, Nobles County, *Sen. A. G. Anderson*
Lismore, Minnesota *Rep. Don Mitchell*
Rep. Roy Cummings
- Dist. 15*
2. Judith Keltgen, RR # 1, St. Peter, Minnesota *Sen. Franklin P. Klockner*
Our Lady of Good Counsel Academy, Blue Earth County, *Rep. Harold R. Anderson*
Mankato, Minnesota *August A. Mueller*
Home - Nicollet County
- 12.*
3. Patricia Ann Skildum, 3419 Glenarden Road, St. Paul 13, *Sen. Elmer Anderson*
Minnesota *Rep. John Tracy Anderson*
Mounds View High School, New Brighton, Minnesota
4. Mary Ann Jordan, 2252 Folwell Street, St. Paul, Minnesota
Alexander Ramsey High School, Ramsey County

Again, may we express our appreciation for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Basil Young
President

Nov. 1- Asked Dick O'Dea if he thought it would be possible for our essay winners to read their essays before the House and Senate. He said "yes" if there would be nothing to it. Just call him after election, and he would take care of it.

Jan. 15 Governor gave his message to the combined House and Senate. Afterward Dick O'Dea took me and introduced me to Speaker Johnson. I told him about our essay contest and asked him if he thought it possible for one of the girls to read her essay before the House. He thought it a good idea- fine -said to come back and give him the details later.

We went to meet Sen. Salmore. Told him of our plans. He said I would have to get permission from Archie Miller, because he was chairman of the Rules Comm. in the Senate. I shook from the thought of asking him, because of all the unfavorable comments about his opposition to us and our program. We went up. I told him about the contest and our plans. I said the contest was on Constitutional Revision. We thought it would be quite an award for the winner to have this honor. He thought it an excellent plan. He said since he was chairman of the rules comm. he would have to recess the Senate. He said shortly after the Senate convened he would move for a recess, she could read her essay. I assured him she wouldn't take more than five minutes.

so went ahead with the plans.

Mon. Jan. 21- Went to check details with Sen. Miller and he was in the hospital.

Wednesday Jan. 23- We sent out news release with all the plans in.

Sent letters with detailed plans in to Miller and Johnson.

Friday Jan. 25 Met Sen Anderson by chance and he told me that the Rules Comm. he met and discussed the essay reading. Sen Miller had gone to the hospital without telling anyone about the plan. So it was quite a blow for Sen. Welch to have an essay on Constitutional Revision read ~~and~~ before the Senate, and one sponsored by the League of Women Voters. Sen Anderson requested that the decision be held over until Mon. After all she was just a high school student and couldnt do too much harm. We alerted Mary

Anderson and she made plans to change the news release should our request be turned down. She would go down to the State office at noon and wait for me to call. Rules Comm. meets from 11:30- 12:30. Called Betty Kane and asked her to meet me on Mon. so she could help me decide what to do next.

Mon. Jan. 26 Rules Comm. met starting until 1:30. Betty and I waited in the hall. After it was over I went to Archie Miller's office. The secretary was writing a letter and I should go down to Sen. Welch's office to get it. I did. I said we hadn't met for the Senate to break a rule for the essay to be read. we assumed it would be before a recessed session. He said yes he knew what we meant. But neither could she read it before a recessed session too because it discussed a controversial issue and legislation on that issue was pending in the senate. He said he would introduce her and distribute copies of the essays to the Senators. We said that was fine. We would change our plans accordingly. So Mary and Grace worked like the dickens to get the news release corrections out that night. telegraphed the girl etc.

replied

Guthrie

January 24, 1957

The Honorable A. Il Johnson
Speaker of the House
House of Representatives
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Here are the names of the winners of the State Essay Contest on Constitutional revision, conducted by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota for high school students last spring:

- 1st prize: Miss Patricia Graf, of Lismore, student at St. Anthony High School, Lismore, Nobles County
2nd prize: Miss Judith Keltgen of St. Peter, student at Good Counsel Academy, Mankato
3rd prize: Miss Patricia Ann Skildum of Arden Hills, student at Mounds View High School, New Brighton Ramsey County
4th prize: Miss Mary Ann Jordan, of Falcon Heights, student at Alexander Ramsey High School in Roseville, Ramsey County.

We are making our plans in line with permission you have previously granted to us.

Miss Patricia Graf, first prize winner, will read her essay before the Senate shortly after it convenes at 10 A.M., January 31st.

Miss Judith Keltgen, second prize winner, will read her essay before the House of Representatives shortly after it convenes at 2 P.M., January 31st.

The third and fourth prize winners will accompany them on their visit to the Legislature that day. This visit to the Legislature is part of the award to all the Essay Contest winners.

Sincerely,

Donna Guthrie

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

Guthrie

January 24, 1957

The Honorable Archie Miller
Minnesota Senate
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Senator Miller:

Here are the names of the winners of the State Essay Contest on Constitutional revision, conducted by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota last spring:

- 1st prize: Miss Patricia Graf of Lismore, Minnesota, student at St. Anthony High School, Lismore, in Nobles County.
2nd prize: Miss Judith Keltgen of St. Peter, Minnesota, student at Good Counsel Academy, Mankato.
3rd prize: Miss Patricia Ann Skildum of Arden Hills, student at Mounds View High School, New Brighton, Ramsey County.
4th prize: Miss Mary Ann Jordan, of Roseville Heights, student at Alexander Ramsey High School in Roseville, Ramsey County.

We are making our plans in line with permission we have previously granted to us.

Miss Patricia Graf, first prize winner, will read her essay before the Senate shortly after it convenes at 10 A.M., January 31st.

Miss Judith Keltgen, second prize winner, will read her essay before the House of Representatives shortly after it convenes at 2 P.M., January 31st.

The third and fourth prize winners will accompany them on their visit to the Legislature that day. This visit to the Legislature is part of the award to all the Essay Contest winners.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie,
Legislative Chairman

Guthrie

January 24, 1957

Mr. Frank Leahy
Chief Clerk of the House
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Leahy:

Here are the names of the winners of the State Essay Contest on Constitutional revision, conducted by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota last spring:

- 1st prize: Miss Patricia Graf, of Lismore, student at St. Anthony High School, Lismore, Nobles County
- 2nd prize: Miss Judith Keltgen, of St. Peter, student at Good Counsel Academy, Mankato
- 3rd prize: Miss Patricia Ann Skildum, of Arden Hills, student at Mounds View High School, New Brighton Ramsey County
- 4th prize: Miss Mary Ann Jordan, of Falcon Heights, student at Alexander Ramsey High School, in Roseville, Ramsey County.

We are making our plans in line with permission you have previously granted to us.

Miss Patricia Graf, first prize winner, will read her essay before the Senate shortly after it convenes at 10 A.M., January 31st.

Miss Judith Keltgen, second prize winner, will read her essay before the House of Representatives shortly after it convenes at 2 P.M. January 31st.

The third and fourth prize winners will accompany them on their visit to the Legislature that day. This visit to the Legislature is part of the award to all the Essay Contest winners.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

January 28, 1957

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
15th and Washington Ave. S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Guthrie:

I have your letter of January 24, 1957, advising among other things that Miss Patricia Graf of Lismore is the first prize winner of the essay contest on Constitutional Revision conducted by your League, and will read her essay shortly after the Senate convenes on Thursday, January 31st.

I have referred your matter to the Committee on Rules and Legislative Expense, and after consideration they have instructed me to advise you that the long standing rule of the Senate is that no persons other than a Senator may address the Senate while in Session.

Many requests of this kind are received and unless a positive rule is adopted and adhered to the Senate Chamber would be turned into a public debating forum.

As you know, properly accredited representatives of the League of Women Voters will be given an opportunity to express the views of the League before the Committee which will consider legislation relating to Constitutional Revision.

Occasionally the Senate has recessed to hear distinguished visitors address them on non-controversial subjects. If you wish, I shall be glad to discuss this matter with you further at any time.

I am

Very respectfully yours,

Thos. P. Welch, Acting Chairman
Committee on Rules and Legislative Expense

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
University of Minnesota
15th & Washington Aves. S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Release: Wednesday, January 30,
or thereafter

Teen-Agers to Address Legislature

Two rural Minnesota girls will have an experience unusual for teen-agers Thursday, January 31, when they will address the Legislature, St. Paul, on the need for a convention to revise the state constitution. Winners of a high school essay contest sponsored last spring by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, Miss Patricia Graf of Lismore, who placed first, and Miss Judith Keltgen of St. Peter, second, are spending the day at the Legislature as guests of the League. The trip is part of their award.

Miss Graf has been invited to read her winning essay, "Minnesota's Only Constitutional Convention," to the Senate at 10 a.m., pointing out some of the oddities and illegalities of the 1857 convention. In "A Teacher's Plea," to be presented in the House of Representatives at 2 p.m., Miss Keltgen will ask legislators to consider the embarrassment of history teachers who must admit to students that many provisions of the Minnesota constitution are not enforced.

George H. Leahy, Chief Clerk of the House, said "It's the first time in my memory, and I have been working for the Legislature for 22 years, that a high school student has been invited to address either the House or the Senate."

Since graduating from St. Anthony High School, Lismore, in June, Miss Graf, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Graf of Lismore, has been living in Worthington, where she is employed as a bookkeeper by the Farmers Elevator. A prospective teacher, Miss Keltgen, a senior at Good Counsel Academy, Mankato, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Keltgen. She is a 4-H Clubber and she worked last summer on her father's farm. She is co-editor of her school paper.

Also visiting the Capitol will be the runners-up in the contest, Miss Patricia Ann Skildum of Arden Hills, 10th grade at Mounds View High School, New Brighton, and Miss Mary Ann Jordan, Falcon Heights, 11th grade at Alexander Ramsey High School, Roseville. The group will visit both houses, attend committee meetings and lunch with some of the legislators from their districts. Their League escorts will be Mrs. George E. Springborg of Roseville, member of the state League legislative committee, and Mrs. Earl Wornor, also of Roseville.

Miss Betty Girling of Station KUOM will tape an interview with Miss Graf and Miss Keltgen to be played on a "Current Events" program sometime during the first week in February.

In addition to the trip, Miss Graf won a 30-volume set of Encyclopedia Americana and Miss Keltgen, an Oxford dictionary.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
University of Minnesota
15th & Washington Aves. S. E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

CORRECTION

CORRECTION

CORRECTION

In our MRA story marked for release Wednesday, January 30, or thereafter, and headed "Teen-Agers to Address Legislature", please correct as follows:

Kill paragraphs one and two, beginning "Two rural Minnesota girls..." and concluding "...constitution are not enforced."

Please substitute the following:

Two rural Minnesota girls will have an experience unusual for teen-agers Thursday, January 31, when they will be honored by the Legislature, St. Paul. Winners of a high school essay contest on "Our Minnesota Constitution" sponsored last spring by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, Miss Patricia Graf of Lismore, who placed first, and Miss Judith Keltgen of St. Peter, second, are spending the day at the Capitol as guests of the League. The trip is part of their award.

Miss Graf will be introduced to the Senate at 11 a.m. A copy of her essay, "Minnesota's Only Constitutional Convention," which points out some of the illegalities of the 1857 convention, will be distributed to each Senator. Miss Keltgen has been invited to read her essay, "A Teacher's Plea," in the House of Representatives at 2 p.m. She will ask legislators to consider the embarrassment of history teachers who must admit to students that many provisions of the Minnesota constitution are not enforced.

Now pick up the third paragraph of the MRA release beginning ...
"George H. Leahy, Chief Clerk of the House..."

The remainder is correct as written.

Patricia Graf, Grade 12
Age: 17
St. Anthony High School
Lawrence, Nobles County

First Prize in the Essay Contest on
"Our Minnesota Constitution"
sponsored in the spring of 1956 by
the League of Women Voters of Minn.
presented to Minnesota Senators,
January 31, 1957

MINNESOTA'S ONLY CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

1857! A Constitutional Convention, consisting of 108 members, was authorized to meet at the state capitol to write a constitution and submit it to the people of the territory of Minnesota. At that time, however, Minnesota was having party trouble. The Republican Party was just emerging; the Democrats were in power. The two parties were on the "outs". The Republicans came to the capitol and tried to find out when the Democrats wanted to start. The Democrats wouldn't talk to the Republicans but finally sent a note saying, "To meet at the usual hour for the assembling of parliamentary bodies of the United States." The Republicans did not know when this was, so they stayed up all night and waited. The next day at 11:43 AM the Democrats marched in, called the convention to order, adjourned and marched out.

This was the only time the convention met as a whole. After this the Republicans and Democrats organized separately, each claiming to be the legal Constitutional Convention. Finally, it was decided to appoint a Conference Committee of five from each side. This Conference Committee of ten was the Constitutional Convention of 1857.

For six days the committee tried to piece the two constitutions together, using the one made by the Republicans and the other by the Democrats, favoring, however, the Democratic version. No settlement could be made on Negro suffrage and it seemed that two constitutions would have to be submitted to the people after all. But then the Republicans gave in and the committee finished on August 28. The Democratic leader would not sign with the Republicans so two copies had to be made. The delegates went home, most of them disgusted. The sixteen copyists who worked on the two documents made so many differences in the two constitutions that it is difficult to print an absolutely correct text.

The question now was, would the people approve the Constitution? The majority of the people were for it but mostly because Minnesota would now be a state and that is what everyone wanted. And so, on May 11, 1858, Minnesota was admitted into the Union. The birth of our State and of our State Constitution became a reality as the result of our first and last Constitutional Convention.

The changes or amendments which have been made in our Constitution date back to four weeks before Minnesota was even officially made a state. Since then there have been eighty-three amendments made to our Constitution, but never a revising convention.

The cause for delay in this much-needed revision is controversy in the legislature. According to Article I of the Constitution, the people are to decide whether or not to have a Constitutional Convention. They can only do this when the question is submitted to them at the polls, but the legislature has so far refused to allow this.

Some reasons for the revision of our Constitution are: (1) a constitution should be clear and brief. The more words, the greater the need for interpretation. Our state Constitution has 20,000 words. (2) It has inflexible language which means that it cannot be stretched to interpret certain situations. (3) There are 83 amendments, most of them concerning matters which should not have required an amendment. (4) The Constitution restricts home rule, making it necessary for the communities to go the legislature for special legislation. Special legislation is prohibited by the Constitution, so this makes little sense. (5) Obsolete provisions of the Constitution are ignored and not enforced by law. (6) The state finances have been dealt with in over half of the amendments; Article IX alone has been amended nineteen times.

Patricia Graf

-3-

The Minnesota Constitution is a confusing document because it was drawn up in a hurry and patched up inefficiently. Some of the provisions are exceedingly lengthy. The Sixteenth Amendment, adopted in 1920 authorizing the state highway system, contributed one-fourth of the total.

A constitution is supposed to be a system of law -- but how can the constitution be a law when so many of the provisions are ignored? The "State Constitution" should be revised so as to give Minnesota a real, a working constitution!

Office File - F2 D2 D
1957

February 13, 1957

Speaker A. I. Johnson,
House of Representatives
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Speaker Johnson,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota wishes to thank you for the great honor you bestowed on Miss Judith Keltgen in permitting her to read her essay before a recessed session of the House of Representatives. I'm sure she was well rewarded for her interest in state constitutions and that she had an experience she will always remember.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

Guthrie
Legis. File

February 13, 1958

Senator Kroehler
State Senate
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Senator Kroehler,

The League of Women Voters wishes to thank you for your hospitality to our essay winners. The trip through the capitol was made most interesting by the many sidelights that you and Senator Anderson gave to us. The young ladies enjoyed the day very much, and we ladies from the League enjoyed it, too.

The two girls who read their essays had an experience that I'm sure they will always remember. Thank you, again, for making their day at the Legislature interesting and enjoyable.

Enclosed is a copy of Judith's essay.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

Yellin F2 D2 D 1957

February 13, 1957

Senator A. A. Anderson
State Capitol
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Senator Anderson,

The League of Women Voters wishes to thank you for your hospitality to our essay winners. The trip through the capitol was made most interesting by the many sidelights that you and Senator Kroehler gave to us. The young ladies enjoyed the day very much, and we ladies from the League enjoyed it, too.

The two girls who read their essays had an experience that I'm sure they will always remember. Thank you again for making their day at the Legislature interesting and enjoyable.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

Office File - F2D2D
W. Guthrie
1957

February 13, 1957

Senator Thomas A. Welch
State Senate
St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Dear Senator Welch,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota wishes to thank you for the courtesy and great honor that you bestowed upon Miss Patricia Graf in permitting her to read her essay to the Minnesota Senators. I'm sure she was well rewarded for her interest in state constitutions and had an experience that she will always remember.

We also want you to know that although Senator Miller had indicated to me that the essay reading was permissible, we accepted without question the decision of the Senate Rules Committee and changed all of our plans accordingly. The incident would have passed unnoticed had not the press developed a story from it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donald Guthrie
Legislative Chairman

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
University of Minnesota
15th & Washington Ave. S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Release: Wednesday, January 30,
or thereafter

Teen-Agers to Address Legislature

Two rural Minnesota girls will have an experience unusual for teen-agers Thursday, January 31, when they will address the Legislature, St. Paul, on the need for a convention to revise the state constitution. Winners of a high school essay contest sponsored last spring by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, Miss Patricia Graf of Lismore, who placed first, and Miss Judith Keltgen of St. Peter, second, are spending the day at the Legislature as guests of the League. The trip is part of their award.

Miss Graf has been invited to read her winning essay, "Minnesota's Only Constitutional Convention," to the Senate at 10 a.m., pointing out some of the oddities and illegalities of the 1857 convention. In "A Teacher's Plea," to be presented in the House of Representatives at 2 p.m., Miss Keltgen will ask legislators to consider the embarrassment of history teachers who must admit to students that many provisions of the Minnesota constitution are not enforced.

George H. Leahy, Chief Clerk of the House, said "It's the first time in my memory, and I have been working for the Legislature for 22 years, that a high school student has been invited to address either the House or the Senate."

Since graduating from St. Anthony High School, Lismore, in June, Miss Graf, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Graf of Lismore, has been living in Worthington, where she is employed as a bookkeeper by the Farmers Elevator. A prospective teacher, Miss Keltgen, a senior at Good Counsel Academy, Mankato, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Keltgen. She is a 4-H Clubber and she worked last summer on her father's farm. She is co-editor of her school paper.

Also visiting the Capitol will be the runners-up in the contest, Miss Patricia Ann Skildum of Arden Hills, 10th grade at Mounds View High School, New Brighton, and Miss Mary Ann Jordan, Falcon Heights, 11th grade at Alexander Ramsey High School, Roseville. The group will visit both houses, attend committee meetings and lunch with some of the legislators from their districts. Their League escorts will be Mrs. George R. Springborg of Roseville, member of the state League legislative committee, and Mrs. Earl Worner, also of Roseville.

Miss Betty Girling of Station KUOM will tape an interview with Miss Graf and Miss Keltgen to be played on a "Current Events" program sometime during the first week in February.

In addition to the trip, Miss Graf won a 30-volume set of Encyclopedia Americana and Miss Keltgen, an Oxford dictionary.

File

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and Washington Avenue S.E. Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Federal 8-8791

October 15, 1956

Dear Minnesota Citizen:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is launching a fall campaign to build public opinion for the calling of a constitutional convention. We have just published three publications to use as tools to spread citizen understanding of our program. Since you are one especially interested in Minnesota government, we wish to make these publications available to you.

Well, What D'ya Know...Minnesota Has A CONSTITUTION!

This is a popular type booklet--professionally written and cleverly illustrated. We plan to distribute it widely throughout the state to acquaint all Minnesotans with the need for constitutional revision. A copy is enclosed.

The State You're In

This is an 83 page research work on Constitutional Revision. It contains chapters on the making of Minnesota's Constitution, and the ways of improving it. Additional chapters are on The Executive, The Legislature, The Judiciary, Finance and Home-Rule.

You may have a copy by returning the enclosed card.

Legislative Program

This publication explains the program of the League of Women Voters for the 1957 legislative session.

We are hopeful that the information in these publications will be of value to you in your work for a responsible and responsive government for Minnesota citizens.

Echyl Young

Mrs. Basil Young, President
League of Women Voters of Minnesota



Affiliated with the
League of Women Voters of the U.S.

Doris

January 15, 1957

To: Mariel Grunditz
From: Mildred Bargraves
Re: Legislative Committee Meeting

Here is Tuesday after a lost long weekend (lost only to the Minnesota LWF in behalf of another state) and the report of the visit not yet completed. I have a trip to make on a private (imagine!) matter this week and, therefore, hope I may be excused from the Legislative Committee meeting on Thursday. As I look over the tentative agenda, I doubt that I have anything to contribute which we have not outlined at previous committee meetings, or discussed at the Legislative Workers Training Day.

The matter which is most important to us at the moment is the introduction of a constitutional convention bill. Because the Governor recommended it in his first message to the Legislature and wrote that he would cooperate with us in its passage in any way he could, we have assumed that it would thus become an administration bill and be sponsored by Ginn and Johnson. I think we ought to assure ourselves of this. We cannot tell them what their strategy ought to be, but we can ask whether they think that passage first by the House will influence the Senate. As soon as the bill is introduced we should begin planning for the hearing with advice from the authors as to what kind of testimony from whom would be most effective. I will come up at whatever juncture you and Doris think it most desirable.

NEA releases. In addition to the essay winners and Legislative Day there should be releases on the three program items at the time during their legislative travels when they most need support.

cc: Guthrie and State office

Rochester, Minnesota
April 4, 1957

Memorandum: Elmer Young, Arthur, Barb and Sis
From: Mildred Hargreaves
Subject: "How the Constitution Hurts Me" letter to the Senate

I think this letter will have more influence on the Senators if it is signed by the MOCC. The names should be followed by, or grouped under, Congressional districts. If permissible, list the Advisory Council, also, with their legislative districts. Only thoughts of the next election, it seems to me, will move the opponents of CC now and even that is dubious. The entire Legislature is so well aware what the League thinks and wants that the only effect a communication of this kind is apt to have at this time is one of irritation. It does not, however, know much about the Citizens Committee, nor what the geographic extent of its representation is.

Point #4 is an important matter, but were the League to sign the letter I would hesitate to use it. We haven't committed ourselves on this specific point, have we, and there is controversy about it. It could lead to the kind of thing Christenson did in the M.E.A. booklet about appointed executive officers.

Point #7 - the phrasing should be changed, because the constitution does not set the rate (it was done by statute) of taxation, but the form and states that if either the form or the rate is changed, the change must be submitted to the people. The reading might be:

"For example, the constitutional provision requiring a vote of the people before the form or the rate of taxation on railroads may be changed. This requirement does not exist in any other state, nor on any other industry in this state."

Dear Donis,
You have done everything possible at this time - accolades to you. Jerry Mullin deserves an ignoble re-election, unless he puts CC bill out of committee. Archie Miller, apparently, never intended to vote for it. He will just not be present to vote against it. If the bill clears the committee today, then this letter will be useful in Senate. If it does not, yet keeps present 5 states, then this can be the last attempt.
M.H.

Dear Mr. Holmes:

The League of Women Voters appreciates the testimony you presented on Monday in behalf of the constitutional convention bill. I want to tell you personally how effective I thought it was. There could have been no substitute, in the particular matters you discussed, for the authority of a ~~practical~~ conservative, practical, practicing lawyer. The Committee was impressed. I wish you might have heard the remainder of the testimony, because it was the best hearing the subject has had in my experience.

We will let you know when the Senate Judiciary Committee will hear the proponents. It meets on Tuesday and Thursday at nine o'clock. Be sure to use the identifications which you mentioned in speaking before the House Committee: that is, associate yourself with other than the Citizens Committee. I could feel the weight that the Bar Association etceteras carried. The weight that the Senate needs to feel is more than I can carry!

Doris - This is the body of Mr. Holmes' letter, a carbon. Gail and I beat this out without typewriter etc. I sent a note to Barbara asking whether Holmes and/or Mrs. Bidder can give someone impressive and strong for the Senate hearing in addition. I expressed hope also that Bill Carlson will repeat for anti Bi-Partisan com. He was more effective, I thought than Mrs. Green. Of course L. J. Borden, very of Rep. might be preferable.

Sept. 1956 - to Senators
Candidates for
Representative

Dear Sir:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is launching a fall campaign to build public opinion for the calling of a constitutional convention. We have just published three publications to use as tools to spread citizen understanding of our program. Since you are one especially interested in Minnesota government, we wish to make these publications available to you.

Well, what d'ya know...Minnesota has a constitution!

This is a popular type booklet--professionally written and cleverly illustrated. We plan to distribute it widely throughout the state to acquaint all Minnesotans with the need for constitutional revision.

The State You're In

This is an 8 page research work on the Constitutional Revision. It contains chapters on the making of Minnesota's Constitution, and the ways of improving it. Additional chapters are on the Executive, The Legislature, The Judiciary, Finance and Home-Rule.

You may have a copy by returning the enclosed card.

Legislative Program

This publication explains the program of the League of Women Voters for the 1957 legislative session.

We are hopeful that the information in these publications will be of value to you in your work for a responsible and responsive government for Minnesota citizens.

The League of Women Voters of Minn.

February 3, 1957

Mr. Vernon Welch, Legislative Director
Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation
Commerce Building
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Welch:

I wonder whether we have made clear in telephone conversations with you through our Legislative Chairman, Mrs. Guthrie, the issue involved in the two bills, S.F. 135 and H.F. 2099 now in committees? The League of Women Voters does not expect any group to speak in behalf of an issue which it does not support. The issue, however, is the right of the people to vote on how the Constitution should be revised. The Constitution provided a hundred years ago for the people to decide whether a convention should be held to revise it. There seems to be no dimension about the fact that revision is needed. The amendments which confront the voter at each general election are proof of that. Nine bills to amend the constitution were introduced in the Senate in one day and the end is not yet.

The Secretary of State estimates that one fifth to one quarter of election costs are due to amendments. If one averages the state and local costs of amendments, using the conservative one-fifth figure, in the last four elections, he comes up with approximately \$108,962 for each. The highway amendment which was of concern to rural and urban people alike, had been submitted in one form or another four times. In addition there had been the time and expense of interim committees to study the problems involved. Amendments do not come cheaply.

Reapportionment of legislative districts would be only one matter scrutinized by a convention. Those who think that a reapportionment formula should rest on area as well as population, should be the more anxious for a constitutional change, because the present provision provides, as you know, for apportionment of representation "equally throughout the state in proportion to the population".

The entire population, rural, urban, suburban, is affected by constitutional changes. There is statewide agreement that changes are needed. There are those who think that a convention is a more thorough, orderly, effective and, in the long-run, cheaper ~~way than amendments~~ way to bring about changes and they would like an opportunity to submit their view to the judgment of the electorate. Does not this right of representative government come within the scope of the Farm Bureau's concern?

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Malcolm Bargraves, Chairman
Constitutional Revision

March 27, 1967

Mr. Ray Hemmenway
Chairman DFL State Central Committee
2641 University Ave.
St. Paul 14, Minn.

Dear Mr. Hemmenway:

Thank you for your letter, and suggestion that the League appoint a committee to work with the Bipartisan committee in the Legislature for passage of Constitutional Convention, Reapportionment and Party Designation.

I am appointing the following league members for this purpose:
Mrs. Donald Guthrie, 4000 El County Line, White Bear Lake, Legislative Chairman, Miss Barbara Stahler, 134 Verwick S. E., or World Affairs Center, U. of Minn., League representative on the Minnesota Citizens Constitutional Committee, Mrs. Stanley Kane, 701 Parkview Terrace, Reapportionment, Mrs. Gordon Grunditz, 6716 Elliott Ave., Minneapolis, Constitutional Convention, and Mrs. Albert J. Richter, 3038 Gladstone Ave., Minneapolis, Party Designation for Legislators.

I am asking Miss Stahler to contact you to see if this meets with your approval, and discuss the next steps.

I have also written Mr. John Hooty, Chairman of the Republican Group of the Bipartisan Committee, who wrote me asking for suggestions, and am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. William Carlson.

Again, thank you, and good luck to us all.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Basil Young
President

February 23, 1957

Mr. William Pearson
Master of the Grange
Oglvie, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Pearson:

I want to express to you the appreciation of the League of Women Voters for your testimony on Monday in behalf of the constitutional convention bill. The fact that you are a practising farmer and have for so long been associated with an old, conservative farm organization had effect beyond your spoken testimony. I was glad that a question from a committee member brought out the fact that the Grange is the oldest farm organization in Minnesota and the nation. Make the facts of its age and organization a part of your introductory remarks when you next appear before a committee.

We hope, of course, that will be when the Senate Judiciary Committee schedules a hearing for the proponents of the convention bill. This Committee meets on Tuesday and Thursday at nine o'clock. We will inform you of the date as soon as we know.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves, Chairman
Constitutional Revision

Doris

February 23, 1957

Professor William Anderson
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dear Professor Anderson:

I want to express to you the appreciation of the League of Women Voters for your testimony on Monday in behalf of the constitutional convention bill. You have a combination of knowledge, experience and disinterestedness, which even a legislative committee cannot resist.

We know that a legislative hearing requires time and energy and is one thing more on your busy schedule, yet we hope that you will consent to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee when it holds a hearing for the companion bill, S.F.135. The Senate defeated a convention bill in 1955 and the same men are still there, alas, and with the same viewpoint, unless authority such as yours can be brought to bear. Please repeat the story about you and President Folwell wanting to rewrite the Constitution; it was delightful.

The Judiciary Committee meets on Tuesdays and Thursdays at nine o'clock. As yet we do not know when the proponents for the bill will be heard, but we shall inform you as soon as we do.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Malcolm M. Hargraves
Chairman
CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

copy: State office
Bois du Maine ✓
2 asked Grace to duplicate this for Mr. Lawson
whose address I do not have — et al. rest
in red parenthesis M.H.

March 27, 1957

Mr. John Mooty
Chairman of the Republican
Group of the Bi-partisan Committee
685 Endicott-on-Robert
St. Paul 1, Minn.

Dear Mr. Mooty:

Thank you for your letter, and request for suggestions as to how we can coordinate our efforts toward passage of Constitutional Convention, Party Designation and Reapportionment by the current Minnesota Legislature.

Perhaps if the members of our Legislative Committee working on these issues could work with the members of the Bipartisan Committee, duplication of effort would be avoided and the position of both committees strengthened.

If agreeable to you, I will appoint the following League members to work with this committee in the Legislature: Mrs. Donald Guthrie, 4000 E. County Line, White Bear Lake, Legislative Chairman, Miss Barbara Stuhler, 134 Warwick S.E., or World Affairs Center, U. of Minn., League representative on the Minnesota Citizens Constitutional Committee, Mrs. Stanley Kane, 701 Parkview Terrace, Reapportionment, Mrs. Gordon Grunditz, 6715 Elliott Ave., Minneapolis, Constitutional Convention, and Mrs. Albert J. Richter, 5038 Gladstone Ave., Minneapolis, Party Designation for Legislators.

I am asking Mrs. Guthrie to contact you to see if this meets with your approval, and discuss the next steps, and have written the DFL group.

Our most immediate concern of course is getting the constitutional convention bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Your representatives attended the committee meeting yesterday and witnessed the deadlock there. I am enclosing a list of the members of this committee showing the 1955 votes, and additional information we have been able to obtain as to their individual positions.

Again, thank you, and good luck to us all.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Basil Young
President

Tentative Outline for Council Talk - ABCs of Current Agenda
(Jean Chesley)

I. League history of constitutional revision study

How long - current agenda items since 1947

Subject matter studied

1955 convention - one item agenda with three parts -
first time League has taken stand on
specific items in constitution

II. Legislative history of constitutional revision from
League standpoint

History of bills - to place question on ballot

Amendments supported (No. 2 on 1951-52, No. 3 in 1953-54)

Reasons for defeat of bills

Main arguments of opponents

III. Accomplishments of past year

At this point I plan to introduce the constitutional
revision committee members, telling special field
of each.

Tell how this committee has worked with p.r. committees
and publications committee

Preparation of basic material and brief description of
what is covered (history, b and c items of our agenda)

How this basic material has been used prior to
publication: As source material for articles of
popular nature

For suggested speeches

For Voter articles

For newspaper articles in specific areas

For house organ articles

For MEA releases

Use of condensed version: To local Leagues

To persons and groups who have
requested it

Legislators

(details on p.r. left to Alene - main point above -
is to show that we have made use of this basic
material even though we have not been successful
so far in publishing promised booklet)

Feel that League support of c.r. rests on stronger
foundation now than ever before:

- 1) Fast League work has been compiled and condensed
- 2) New knowledge in some areas such as judicial and
exec. branches, history of the constitution, etc.
has been added
- 3) League lobbyists will have definite and specific
answers to give to the question "What's wrong
with our old constitution?" (b items of agenda)

IV. Coming year - plans?

Will address some specific questions to the delegates to
open up the discussion: How they feel the material
should be used? How can the board help them carry
out a and b - discussion outlines? Could units do
more under a instead of just studying? How do they
feel about c ? etc.

Bank. Shellen will give brief resume' of HCCC at this time, also

April 23, 1936

Mrs. Basil Young, President
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
117 West Howard St.
Hibbing, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Young:

C
O
P
Y
Mrs. Jensen, Mrs. Duncan, and Miss Salisbury had a conversation last week at the state office during which a number of things were discussed, among them what seems to the State Board as our lack of attention to state program. For clarification on several points, I would like to pursue some of them a bit further.

As Mrs. Grossman no doubt has reported to you, at the last two Unit Chairmen's meetings she gave suggestions from the state public relations and legislation committees in regard to promoting constitutional revision. At her first visit, because we were also covering state continuing responsibilities, there was no time for questions from the chairmen. The suggestions which came out of the second meeting were typed and sent to Miss Burton, Miss Burnham, and Mrs. Bruce (our state legislative, voters service, and public relations chairmen).

We are glad to have the "tag" idea and feel that it is a new approach to promote constitutional revision. New material is what we have wanted and needed. Miss Burton is now busy contacting the units which indicated interest in working on this idea. We consider the response very good. In talking with Miss Burton, she says she is planning at this time to use 10,000 tags.

There were those in the units, however, who did not believe that "gimmicks" were the complete answer to educating the voters to constitutional revision. Mrs. Grossman seemed to stress the idea that we promote a new constitution by comparing "the old" and "the new" style shows depicting the costumes of earlier days along with the simplicity of the new the old car as compared with the efficiency of the new, etc. Mrs. Richter, a unit chairman, noted that this was actually our weakest sales talk. She pointed out that compared to our federal constitution our state one isn't old. "Are we in favor of changing the federal constitution simply because it, too, is old?"

Mrs. Miller, also a unit chairman, said that she was of the opinion that business men were not impressed with gimmicks and ballyhoo but would prefer a serious piece of literature with reasons why we feel Minnesota needs a new constitution.

Maybe the ideas of Mrs. Evenson, Mrs. Indice, et al, including new babies (I'm not clear on this one), calypso music, fashion shows, parades, etc., might possibly be of some worth in certain areas, but it is likely that in Minneapolis we should concentrate our woman power and time on such ideas as tags, radio, and distribution of new material as the state prepares it.

Mrs. Young - 3

All in all, the purpose of the meeting with the unit chairman was to get their ideas, stimulate interest, and quite generally get it all talked over. Miss Burton was ill and was sorry that she could not attend, but I have talked to her at length about the suggestions made and she is considering them all and will present further plans at the May board meeting.

C
O
P
Y

You probably already know from minutes of our board meetings and from the League-Gleaner that seven of our KUOM radio programs for this year are on state program, five of these on constitutional revision. Mrs. Baloon, our television chairman, has told me and the board that on September 27 she offered to meet with people in this area to discuss possible television programs on constitutional revision. We understood that Mrs. Grossman was to set up this meeting, but nothing developed on it. Mrs. Baloon was of the opinion, and said so at that time, that there is only so much available TV time and it should have been asked for during the fall or early winter months so as not to jeopardize our chances for time for candidates' interviews prior to elections.

During the year Miss Burton and her committee have made a number of speeches on the subject of constitutional revision and have encouraged it as a topic whenever the League was asked for a speaker. Right now she is trying to line up League members to talk to their legislators about wearing tags May 26.

For the benefit of the units and to create conversation and interest, we sent each unit a "Do It Yourself" kit.

I know you would be interested in being brought up to date with what the Minneapolis League is doing and planning on the state item. We will be eager to hear about the booklet which has been mentioned to us. And speaking of booklets, I am sure you are rejoicing with us in the tremendous response we have had in the sale of "Minneapolis Is Your Business" it has been a big job and kept many League women busy.

I look forward to seeing you at the convention and the state council meeting. Mrs. Edgar Raderling is to be our state resource person next year and will be one of our council delegates.

Cordially,

Mrs. Frederick E. King
President

ME:j

cc:
Mrs. Duncan
Mrs. Chealey
Mrs. Grossman
Miss Salisbury
✓ Mrs. Guthrie
State office

2334 Como Avenue
St. Paul 8, Minn.
August 8, 1956

copy
Mrs. Malcolm Hargraves
716 S.W. Fourth St.
Rochester, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Hargraves:

Your becoming our new state leader for constitutional revision on the state board of our L. of W. V. makes me very happy. and I think we are so fortunate to have your leadership.

At the request of our St. Paul League's committee chairman for "State Item" (Mrs. Lonnie Adkins), I was trying to dig up arguments against constitutional conventions, so I studied carefully the letter from Mike Galvan to the state senators which he gave them shortly before S. F. 23 was to reach the senate floor. Mr. Galvan cites as horrible examples the revisions accomplished in other states, namely Missouri, New Jersey, and New York. I believe Mr. Galvan is misinforming our senators and that he is slanting the facts to the point of untruthfulness, but I haven't the facts to prove it.

Perhaps what I am about to suggest has already been done, or perhaps the information is already available. If not, we may be able to obtain it in time to use it this year. I am sure Mr. Galvan will be as active as ever and sing the same tunes over.

This is my suggestion: write the state leagues of those three states and ask them some questions. I submit a few and I hope others can improve on them or substitute better ones if you think this idea has any merit.

Did you have a Constitutional Convention? If not, please explain how you did accomplish revision.

How long did it last?

Who were delegates? Your legislators? How selected?

How costly was the convention?

Was the finished product submitted to the people and what majority was required and how large a vote did it get?

What type of opposition did you face?

What groups backed the drive for a convention and how many years did it take to get results? (Mr. Galvan make a statement that the Hague and Fendergast machines were successful in putting over constitutional revision in Missouri and New Jersey.)

Have the new constitutions needed amendments and how serious were the needs for amendment? (Mr. Galvan states that New York had to amend over 50 times and Missouri 5 times.) Did the new constitutions tend to concentrate more power in the governor's hands, and if so was that good or bad?

Carbon copy.

Were the changes very drastic or was it mostly a matter of streamlining and bringing basic law into accord with actual practice?

Have the courts found great difficulty in the loss of precedents through the changes and great difficulty in interpretation of the new constitution? (Mr. Galvan says he believes this is so serious.)

Did you previously have preferential tax treatment and were such preferential taxes avoided? (Mr. Galvan defends the preferential taxes for our railroads as good and says that the Const. Comm. of 1947 recommended preferential taxes for taxonite).

Do you have "trust funds" or what in general is the provision for finances in your constitution?

Were polls taken in advance to ask people if they wanted changes in their constitution? If so, were they of much value?

Are you satisfied that your new constitution is an improvement over what you had? (Mr. Galvan: "never see any advocates point out that any new constitutions recently adopted are better than the ones they already had.")

Mr. Galvan's letter is in possession of the state league and you may have it already. The league received it from Senator Norman Hansen of Cromwell, Minn.

perhaps we will see you at the StateFair?

Sincerely,

Hazel Swanson

at Grace Wilson's request
I'm sending you this
copy

December 15, 1958

Mrs. Donald W. Doll
President, League of Women
Voters of Jackson
124 Sverdrup Ave.
Jackson, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Doll:

I was pleased to hear of your plans to entertain your legislators and use the film "A Very Humorous Story".

In answer to your questions, Mrs. Donald Guthrie, 4000 E. County Line, White Bear Lake 10, is State Legislative Chairman. I don't have a complete list of her committee before me, but I believe I can remember most of them: Mrs. Stanley Kane of Golden Valley, Mrs. Gordon Grundits of Richfield, Mrs. Edgar Kuderling of Minneapolis and Mrs. Homer Mantis of St. Paul. There are others who have special background in each of our continuing responsibilities such as Mrs. John Gruner for FEPC, Mrs. T. O. Everson, Civil Service, etc., who are called upon when their particular item comes up in the Legislature, for material and for testifying.

They are all volunteer League members and are not paid. We have no paid lobbyists. Unfortunately, we cannot, under our present budget, even pay their expenses, and some of them practically live at the Capitol during the legislative session, and have considerable expense for carfare, baby-sitters etc. The Board is proposing an item in the next year's budget for such expense, but of course that will have to be decided at our convention next May.

In addition to testifying at hearings, these women watch all legislation in which we are interested, report to the Board and to the Leagues on its progress, changes in bills, amendments, issue calls for action. They are of course thoroughly familiar with the background position and interests of each legislator, use every opportunity to discuss our program with them personally, and mail them material all year long. We do not make a practice of taking legislators out for meals, etc. We have in the past had coffee parties at the beginning of the session for all legislators, which were held in a league member's home in St. Paul, but do not plan one for this year. We entertained the authors of the Constitutional Convention bill at a recent board meeting luncheon and presented them with a copy of "What Do You Know", and that has been the extent of it.

Of course long before the legislative session starts, this committee has been busy making plans, compiling statistics and sending material to the legislators, as you will see from the material Mrs.

Guthrie has sent and will send to you. I hope this answers your questions, and that you have a successful meeting. Good luck and Merry Christmas!

Sincerely,

Mrs. Basil Young, President

Mrs. Guthrie could probably give you more details, but there is no time to send this to her.

(OVER)

P.S.

The function of the State Board and Legislative committee is to make the general plans, help the Leagues in every way, give them information, and do everything it can in lobbying the legislators personally and by mail, but the real work must be done at home in the local leagues. As we know so well, and have been told so often by the legislators themselves, they would much rather be approached by individual constituents in their own district, and anything league members can do to influence others to talk to them will be of immeasurable help and value.

"THE CONSTITUENTS HOLD THE KEY TO THEIR LEGISLATORS' VOTE"- is our theme.

Jackson, Minnesota
December 11, 1956

Dear Mrs. Young:

December 18 at our regular League meeting we will be entertaining Senator Walter Franz and Representative George Olson and their wives.

We are using this evening to discuss the state League program and are using the film "A Very Humorous Story".

I would like the following information before this meeting:

1. Who will be lobbying for the League this year?
2. Do we pay our women who lobby?
3. Just what procedure do these women use in lobbying other than testifying for the League at public hearing on bills? (Do we make a practice of taking legislators out for banquet meals etc.?)

I thought perhaps this information on League lobbying will give us a better picture of how the League works when the legislature is in session.

Yours truly,
Mrs. Donald W. Doll
Pres. Jackson LMV