



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.

This is a COPY of the bill introduced in the 1961 Legislature.

Introduced by Skeate, Luther, Sabo, Klaus, Franke
January 25, 1961
Ref. to Com. on Elections

H. F. No. 283
Companion S.F. 576
Ref. to S. Com.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

RELATING TO ELECTIONS, PROVIDING FOR
DESIGNATION BY PARTY OF CANDIDATES FOR
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE
OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE; AMENDING LAWS
1959, CHAPTER 675, ARTICLE III, SECTION 3,
SUBDIVISION 1.

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

Section 1. Laws 1959, Chapter 675, Article III, Section 3, Subdivision 1 is amended to read:

Subdivision 1. (OFFICES WITHOUT PARTY DESIGNATION) The chief justice and the associate justices of the supreme court, judges of the district and probate courts, ~~all members of the state legislature~~, and all elective county officers shall be nominated upon separate non-partisan ballots, as hereinafter provided. The ballot shall be designated "ballot of candidates to be nominated without party designation."

This is a COPY of the bill introduced in the 1961 Legislature.

A NONPARTISAN PARTISAN LEGISLATURE

(From Politics in Minnesota, by G. Theodore Mitau (1960), pp. 57-58, 72-75.)

With the single exception of Nebraska's unicameral legislature, Minnesota's is presently the only state legislature whose membership is elected on a ballot without designation as to political party. Party designation was dropped in 1913 largely as the result of a parliamentary struggle between the "drys" and the "wets" in which the opponents of prohibition working with liquor interests exploited sentiments within the legislature that were strongly critical of party machines and boss control. One must remember that this was the era of progressivism, when parties were disdained and political independence was extolled, and when it was hoped that direct political action by the people (through such means as the initiative, referendum, recall, and direct primary) would lead to more responsible government. . . .

The debate over the desirability or undesirability of party labels for legislators has since then been one of the constants in Minnesota politics. The problem becomes ever more acute as the increasing power of the modern legislature affects larger numbers of people over wider areas of their lives.

The case against party designation. Certainly the influence of rural interests may be seen in the arguments advanced in support of the tradition of nonpartisanship in the legislature. Such veteran senators as Gordon Rosenmeier and Daniel S. Feidt argue vigorously that a Conservative (they prefer the label Independent) has no responsibility or accountability except that leading directly back to his own constituents. They assert that unlike Congress, a state legislature is concerned mainly with law enforcement, conservation, education, elections, local government, daylight saving time, liquor control, water safety, highway construction, teacher retirement plans, trucking permits, and many other issues on which public opinion is divided not primarily along party lines, but according to geographic--rural vs. urban--or economic interests. In representing his constituents' opinions, then, the legislator may well be forced into deviation from any and all party platforms.

The Independents conceive of a legislative caucus as a voluntary and perhaps temporary collaboration of like-minded persons for parliamentary purposes; by no means is this caucus to be construed as the arm, agent, or creature of a political party. Basically, the position of the supporters of nonpartisanship rests on their suspicion of, if not downright antagonism to, centralized party organizations, which they consider dominated by "bosses" and "machines." Implied here is belief in a disproportionate influence of metropolitan and labor interests on party councils. They fear too that gubernatorial domination of the legislature, as an outgrowth of "party discipline," would jeopardize the traditional separation of powers principle which has made American politics safe and cautious rather than efficient and over-hasty.

Another argument stems from the doctrine of legislative individuality and independence: to some Conservatives any party discipline smacks of a collectivism to which they are philosophically and temperamentally opposed. Their attitude is reminiscent of Edmund Burke's famous speech to his Bristol constituency affirming that "(a legislator's) unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man. . ." This is not to imply, however, that the Independents are unable or unwilling to act in concert or to form cabals to block legislation inimical to them.

Finally, the Independents maintain that public opinion in Minnesota backs them up, and that there is no majority sentiment in favor of party designation or any of the other devices of legislative partisanship. The results of a number of public opinion surveys conducted by the "Minnesota Poll" have generally confirmed this contention.

The Poll posed its questions on this subject in some such form as the following: "Some people think members of the state legislature in Minnesota should be elected under political party labels--that is, as Democrat-Farmer-Laborites or as Republicans--rather than on a no-party basis as they are now. Do you think legislators should be elected under party labels, or should not?" While sentiment for party designation increased threefold between 1945 and 1958, only once (in 1954) did a majority favor it:

Date	For Party Designation
March 1945	14%
February 1946	46
March 1947	39
July 1954	53
February 1955	38
April 1957	36
December 1958	40

It is interesting to note that this sentiment was in every instance less strong in the months following the legislative sessions than in the even-numbered years when the legislature does not ordinarily convene.

In some years the "Minnesota Poll" asked for party identification of the persons interviewed. Although party designation was slightly more popular among DFL interviewees than among Republicans, the difference never exceeded 4 per cent--perhaps a weaker response than might be expected in light of the official DFL position on party-caucus integration. Of the years tested only in 1946 (a period of Republican control of the state) was Republican sentiment for party designation stronger than that of the opposition; since then the GOP attitude seems to have cooled somewhat as the other party rose to power.

Arguments for party designation of the legislature. Despite the lack of strong popular support, a number of groups are currently agitating for a return to party designation of legislators--among them some important Republicans as well as spokesmen for the DFL; the Farmers Union; the League of Women Voters; and a number of labor unions.

They have various reasons for advocating party labels, but their arguments can be summarized as follows: (1) A party designated legislature would be better equipped to resist those special interests and local interests which now influence policy in a disproportionate and often undesirable manner. (2) A modern state government faces tremendous obligations in the fields of social, labor, and welfare legislation; to finance its new operations it must devise adequate but equitable taxation. On issues such as these, which affect all geographical areas and all economic groups, it is unrealistic to maintain that there can be no party position. On the contrary it is only the party system, representing as it does the broader coalitions of sectional and group interests, which can achieve social justice. (3) Reform platforms and proposals have little chance of enactment unless the governor can count on legislative support. The degree of executive-legislative teamwork necessary to implement election promises cannot be obtained without party designation. (4) The absence of party designation has in effect clothed with tremendous power a very small group of very conservative legislators elected from small constituencies or from districts where the voters know little about them. These men have been in a position to thwart Republican and Democratic governors elected by popular mandate, and their "invisible government"--so the argument runs--leads to cynical and irresponsible politics. In dealing with the issue of nonpartisanship in a study of the Minnesota legislature, Charles Adrian concluded that despite the imperfections of the American political party, "it is the best vehicle available for insuring responsibility of the law-maker to the people." (5) If legislators were elected with party labels, the precinct, ward, and county organizations would be revitalized and their work made more meaningful. There would be more interest in recruiting and supporting candidates, and increased participation in primary and general elections would result.

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

February 24, 1961
Additional copies 2¢

FLASH...Chairman Munger of House Committee says hearing will be March 8, so HURRY with your letters and be sure to urge this committee to recommend this bill to pass!

"TIME FOR ACTION *ON* PARTY DESIGNATION"

House File # 283 -- Authors: Skeate (L), Luther (L), Sabo (L), Klaus (C), Franke (C).
Senate File # 576 - Authors: Grittner (L), Butler (C), Bergerud (C).

These two Party Designation bills have not yet been heard in committee, so right now is the time to be writing to the members of the Elections Committee in the House and the Elections and Reapportionment Committee in the Senate. It is very important that they receive such communications before formal hearings take place.

It is our hope that every League member will write at least two letters -- and this will take mobilization and telephoning and encouragement at the local League level.

If your district has a Representative or a Senator on the Elections Committee, write to him.

If your district does not have representation on these committees, write the Chairman.

Leagues which have previously drafted their "League position" letter to their Senator on the Elections Committee should send this to him now, as well.

Basically, the distinction in the approach to the two chambers would be this: to the House members we should urge favorable committee action and indicate our support of Party Designation for state legislators as presented in H.F. 283; to the Senate members support of Party Designation should be linked to the hope that at long last a Senate vote might be taken on the merits of the issue as the individual Senators would judge them, by virtue of the bill being sent to the floor without recommendation.

The Lobbyist will be in a better position to speak effectively to the legislative committee if she has some knowledge of the League's response to this Call for Action. If possible, will you let me know how many letters were sent from your League? and how many others in the community you were able to persuade to write?

For your handy reference, the following committee listings are given.

Senate Elections and Reapportionment (20)

Erickson, Chm.	Jarr	Harren	Larson, N.	Salmore
Kroehler, V-Chm.	Feidt	Holand	O'Laughlin	Sinclair
Benson	Ferrario	Keller	Root	Welch
Bergerud	George	Larson, L.	Rosenmeier	Zwach
<u>House Elections Committee (15)</u>				
Munger, Chm.	Carlson	Kucera	Maruska	Sabo
Fudro, V-Chm.	Klaus	Luther	Mulder	Searle
Beedle	Knudsen	Mahowald	Parish	Wright

(Three copies of this Call to Action are being sent to each LL President, for ease in very quick distribution)

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

February 6, 1961

TO: Local League Public Relations Chairmen
FROM: Mrs. Nicholas E. Duff, Public Relations Chairman, LWV of Minnesota
SUBJECT: PUBLICITY PUSH FOR PARTY DESIGNATION

What to Do

This week the Party Designation bill will be introduced in the Minnesota Senate by Conservatives Senator Gordon Butler, 57th District, and Senator Alf Bergerud, 36th District, and Liberal Senator Karl Grittner, 39th District.

Now is the time to "come to the aid of the party" with your cars blossoming out in bumper signs saying

"Identify Legislators with Party Designation"

Arrange for a newspaper picture as soon as possible -- your President putting a bumper sign on the mayor's car (with him watching), or a group picture with your local Jaycees, GOP or DFL, a newspaper editorial or a letter to the editor.

Who's With Us

Both political parties are most enthusiastic. Party Designation for state legislators has been on their programs for years. GOP state executive secretary, Herbert Johnson, and new state chairwoman, Connie Dillingham, as well as DFL state chairman, Adrian Winkel, are sending bumper signs to their county chairmen. Many local GOP and DFL groups are working with us; the latest order came from the Ramsey County DFL asking for 1,000 more signs.

Many of the Jaycees are active workers in the Party Designation cause by lobbying, letter writing and the buying of signs.

** Now is the time for you to contact your local political party leaders and chambers.

Some ABCs of Party Designation

This has been on League program for 10 years now. You will recall within the last two years the 58 local Leagues in Minnesota re-evaluated their stand. The consensus: party designation for state legislators continues to be of urgent concern. The ladies of the League continue to say, "Let the voters have the right to know what they are voting for, let the legislators be responsible to the people through their stands on issues in the party platforms." Despite the imperfections of the American political party, it is the best vehicle available for insuring responsibility of the lawmaker to the people.

Refresh Yourself on the facts. Look up the party designation sections in Lobby by Letter Kit, Capitol Letter (note particularly the Anatomy of a Committee articles in the issues of January 17 and January 31, 1961), State Board Report, June 1960, p. 8, Party Designation Flyer (February 1956), and the Missing Link in Minnesota Government, November 1959.

Enclosure: "Identify Legislators with Party Designation" bumper sign. More are available at 10¢ each from Mrs. G. M. Stenson, 4811 Bywood West, Minneapolis 24.

WCCO TELEVISION

50 SOUTH NINTH STREET • MINNEAPOLIS 2, MINNESOTA

EDITORIAL
NEWS

JAN 13 1961

File

THIS IS A TRANSCRIPT OF AN EDITORIAL PRESENTED ON WCCO-TV NEWS

1/5/61

Editorial by Geo. Rice

Minnesota is the only state of the 50, except Nebraska that elects its legislators without party designation. Through this legal pretense the people of this state regularly deprive themselves of fair representation.

For many years, despite the non-partisan label, the men and women elected to the legislature regularly have lined up as Conservatives and Liberals -- which is the non-partisan way of saying Republicans and Democrats. They have separate caucuses. They vote along party lines. They have majority leaders and minority leaders and all the rest of the parliamentary paraphernalia. They must. This is the way legislative bodies work.



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

see attached sheet for
names of League

File

P.D.

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

January 4, 1961

MEMORANDUM

To: Local Leagues whose Senators serve on the Senate Elections
and Reapportionment Committee

From: Vi Kanatz, Party Designation Chairman

This is a very special request to the president and board of those local Leagues whose Senators serve on the Elections and Reapportionment Committee.

The bill calling for Party Designation for state legislators will be introduced immediately in the session -- but the major hurdle, of course, is getting the bill out of committee. We cannot expect this legislation to be reported favorably out of the committee, since the greater number of the committee members are opposed to such legislation.

However, I do feel that we may take the approach that we in the LWV -- after working on this issue for ten years -- and after seeing it repeatedly incorporated in the platforms of both political parties -- encourage the committee members to respond to this widespread and bipartisan concern by reporting the bill out of committee without recommendation. We might say that we believe it is time for the bill to stand or fall on its own merits on the Senate floor according to the convictions of the individual Senators.

Would each of you draft a letter -- phrasing these ideas in your own way -- and have it ready to mail upon word that the committee is ready to consider the bill? If you have it all done so that all that is required is the date, our response can be very quick.

This letter, coming from the President, for her Board and League, will not eliminate what we hope may be a flood of letters from individual members when the bill comes to the floor. Let us hope that such action helps get it upon the floor!

Thanks for your cooperation.

Your Senator on this committee is _____

Bloomington
Depphaven
Edina
Excelsior
Hopkins
Minneapolis Village
Mound
Richfield
St. Louis Park
Wayzata
Brooklyn Center
Crystal
Golden Valley
Cottondale

Senator Alf Berglund

Duluth }

Senator Homer Carr
Senator Richard E. Ferrario

Mpls }

Senator Daniel S. Field
Senator Charles W. Root

St. Paul

Senator Harold J. O'Loughlin

Red Wing

Senator Grover C. George

Austin

Senator P. J. Holand

Brainerd

Senator Gordon Rosenmeier

Mahtomedi
St. Croix Valley }

Senator Raphael Salmore

Buffalo

Senator Thomas P. Welch

New Ulm

Senator John M. Zivach

APR 10 1963

LEGISLATIVE REPORT 1961

PARTY DESIGNATION

Some of the observations which I am reporting are very likely personal and might well not apply to anyone else in this same position. However, even as new personnel gets involved during each session, some of these ideas should be reviewed for whatever meaning they might have in the future.

One thing that I would suggest as being vital to the self-confidence of the lobbyist is that there be some initial recognition of the fact that different roles may be played by different lobbyists on different bills. This was readily discernible this past session as the League lobbyists in the ethics field, in reapportionment, in party designation and in constitutional revision and FEPC played very different kinds of roles. If the new person tries to pattern her approach only on the past performance of some lobbyist whose work she understands only vaguely, she will be floundering about more than is necessary - though some floundering is perhaps inevitable.

I should think we might be able to spell out some of these possible differences for the next session and help the lobbyists work through them in advance. I do think that the legislative chairman should take a fairly direct hand in gathering together the present lobbyists, very possibly along with the previous lobbyists, in spelling out some of these distinctions. I might use Betty Kane as an example. She is the "expert" in the field of reapportionment and is treated as such by the legislators. She is also the best known to our League members as a possible pattern for lobbying. But neither the subject matter field, nor the limitations of some other individual, make it possible for some new person to appear at the Capitol and step into the kind of role which she has filled in the past. Since we know this - let us be sure that we help a new person on the scene in viewing the distinctions both in program area and personnel.

Perhaps I felt greener than most in assuming some of these functions - but I doubt it. I felt I had to operate by the seat of my pants a bit more than was absolutely necessary. And yet having to play the fairly aggressive role of getting authors for the party designation bill was good experience which I feel should be passed on to future lobbyists in other areas where we may well feel that we want to do essentially the same thing - get our bill sponsored and introduced and carried for us. This may be even more critical as we tackle some things which will have a less predictable form than the party designation legislation.

One thing that must be considered, and particularly in the Senate, is the esteem in which a Senator is held - not only in his own caucus, but on the other side of the aisle. As one example - since Karl Grittnar had carried the party designation bill in the previous session, and since we felt rather sure that it should be in the hands of a liberal, it seemed the most natural thing in the world to ask him to be lead author. It was only after this that I found out how much he was resented by some of the other Senators, and what a difference this could make in their attitudes. I do not, I hasten to add, feel that the bill would have had a chance of passage if he were not an author - but many of the Senators close their ears when certain other Senators start to talk, and we would do well to be more aware of this fact.

We might even want to play around with the possibility of trying to get three Conservative Senators in the next session. Senator Bergerud seemed to be willing to really stick his neck out on this issue, but he was not willing

to carry the bill as lead author because of his heavy suburban load. This will, of course, be lessened in the next session with the addition of three more rural Hennepin Senators, and he might be willing to take an even more active role. He doesn't carry a lot of weight in the inner circles of the Senate, however, so we should be thinking of the possibility of some who would be more effective in the in-fighting, if any such persons exist.

It should also be kept in mind that seniority is of tremendous importance in the Senate and newer Senators are very reluctant to get themselves out in front on critical issues. There were a couple of surprises on the vote to call this bill out of committee which might be kept in mind for the next session. Both Law Larson and Dosland were complete surprises to me on this vote. Both of them had been asked previously to be authors since they were on record as being in favor of party designation, and both had turned me down because they said it would be politically unwise for them. Apparently, they didn't feel that they couldn't register a rollcall vote in favor of bringing the issue to the floor of the Senate, however, and if they return after the next election either one or both might not be so concerned in their second terms to be involved in this issue.

Simply having the caucus label is meaningless, however, as the experience with Gordon Butler shows. His addition as an author was pure speculative wishing for he added not a thing to the strength of the bill. The only function that he served was to keep Senator Bergerud from being the only Conservative with his name on the measure, a position he would not have relished.

Another area where we were very weak in this past legislative session was in any kind of organization beyond the scope of the League. A number of groups were approached about participation in a Citizen's Committee kind of approach, and it became apparent that they had written off party designation as having any chance in 1961, and consequently didn't intend to exert any great strength in this area. In a completely political sense, this was understandable - and these groups were saving their strength for the areas in which they felt a big push would have some effect.

John Mooty, who had been the representative of the Republican party on the Citizen's Committee during the previous session, made it quite clear that they would cooperate on such a committee only if we took up the issue of a "revision" of Amendment 2 as the first order of business. This was certainly a politically astute idea, but it was also political blackmail of a sort, and any cooperation in the area of party designation would have hinged upon whether or not the LNW and the Republican party could have agreed to the same legislative reapportionment amendment. Actually, neither party used their big guns for testifying before the committees in either House or Senate, and Adrian Winkel made it clear to me that the DFL had no intention of trying to bring any pressure to bear during the session, particularly in terms of the House members where they had done so previously. Committee testimony in both cases consisted of mentioning briefly that this issue had been part of the party platform for a number of years - and I felt had more of a negative effect than anything else.

In the next session, where I can't help feeling that our chances on this issue will be very much better, undoubtedly both political parties, as well as the Farmers' Union, AFL-CIO, Jaycees, etc. can be welded into a more

effective working body.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce in Minneapolis was a new organization in this area. I talked to their legislative committee which forwarded their recommendation for support to the Executive Committee, and their representative was present at both committee hearings to testify for the bill, and also to indicate that this was a new area of support. It is certainly worth trying to get the entire Minnesota Jaycees organization backing this before the next session.

Another group which indicated it wanted to study this issue was somewhat of a surprise. Senator Feidt, Bob Foreythe and I talked to a group of the Mpls. Chamber of Commerce. Some gains were made in discussing the issue with them, I think, though they came to no final decision. They tended to feel that if Otto Christanson opposed this issue they should too - and yet in view of their interest I would think this group would be worthy of a follow-up before the next session.

The League of Women Voters keeps feeling rather wistfully that if the people of the state could only be aroused about this issue - and express their concern that they are being cheated - that they would somehow convey this feeling to the legislature with such vehemence that something would happen. With this kind of idea in mind we mused over the ideas of publicity which would somehow capture the public's imagination.

The problem with almost all such ideas is that they are exceedingly costly and there was no budget for such an expenditure for state program promotion. I for one, was extremely leery of getting the state board involved in a large expenditure which it might be impossible to replace in the budget. The idea was tossed out to the local Leagues that they might do something on their own in a way that was imaginative and also particularly appropriate to their own communities. Lawn signs, posters, bumper stickers - were all mentioned as ideas. The idea of bumper stickers was caught up by the state item chairmen of Edina and Minneapolis and they checked with me about the possibility and about distribution. Jane Stansen of the Edina LWV was willing to handle the financing personally, and through the Capitol Letter and the Legislative Observers' Program the bumper stickers were publicized. A large number were sold, but it would be hard to judge the effectiveness of them appearing on bumpers throughout the state. They did, however, have the great value of providing an excellent gimmick for publicity pictures throughout the state - and we have clippings which indicate that they were used in this way on a widespread basis. The local Leagues tend to follow through when specific ideas are suggested.

Despite the fact that a good deal of mileage was obtained with this approach, I am more and more convinced that party designation cannot be exploited with any real excitement as a separate issue. The major obstacles lie within the legislature itself, and the reasons for voting against it can be made to sound very persuasive, as Senator Feidt has managed to do, for example. Since the League sees this issue as basic to so many other legislative concerns we are interested in - I feel that more and more we should exploit this approach. We should tie party designation in with all the other issues and votes where we feel it is justified to point out that lack of party designation is a factor.

It is probably too early to determine at this point what course of action the League will want to follow in the next session - but there are some things which might prove fruitful. An analysis of the votes on several issues with a specific concern for party designation in mind might point up some facts to which we could call attention through news releases, workshops, etc. under the program promotion budget well in advance of the next session.

Despite the dismal picture of the past, I am convinced that party designation is a distinct possibility in the 1963 session. Presumably, we will be better able to gauge the new strength after the November 1962 elections - but we know that the new legislative districts are very likely to elect persons with a commitment to party designation.

Some of the ideas which were impossible to carry out during this session, then, may be very definite possibilities in the next. Attention must be given to obtaining a commitment on this issue before elections as has been our idea in the past. If there seems to be any chance of success, we will undoubtedly find far more aggressive allies in those groups which made the decision during this session not to waste their time on a lost cause. If it becomes politically feasible to get the votes, a joint committee of the several organizations long interested will be easier by far to initiate.

One issue which will need some attention by the state board is that of the voluntary party designation concept raised during this past session. It may well be that there will be no enthusiasm or support for such a concept in future legislatures, and will not necessitate any stand from the LWV. On the other hand, I hate to think of the possibility of the League being unable to take a definitive stand on any phase of this issue which has been so vital a part of the program for so many years.

I do feel that the review of the possibilities of county level designation kept the issue very much alive in League members minds, and it is within the realm of possibility that another review would keep us in fighting trim for the next session. On the other hand, we might become embroiled in a kind of discussion which would serve no useful function. Our members will certainly maintain their interest and concern with so much attention given so recently to this issue. I do feel, though, that the Board will have to make some decision for the sake of the 1963 lobbyist.

This step-by-step review of the party designation lobbying should be read in conjunction with the Capitol Letter articles in issues 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8.

The legislative plans formulated in the program area of party designation for state legislators took into account several factors.

In the course of the decade during which the LWV had been particularly interested in the legislation, it had had an up and down hill road in the House - alternately meeting with success and failure. And during this time, the bill had not once come out of the Senate Committee on Elections for a vote on the floor of the Senate. Hence, it seemed legitimate to decide upon a kind of do or die approach to the Senate. If there were some way we could get the bill out of the Senate Committee without jeopardy, it would be possible to use this as pressure in the House. If the bill couldn't be jarred loose from the Senate Committee, it was dead at any rate. This decision had the effect of narrowing down the area within which we would attempt to utilize the strength of the League.

It has also been clear that although the caucus line in the House is rather fuzzy on the issue of party designation, in the Senate the Liberals have definitely tended to favor it, and most of the Conservatives to be opposed. Considering the fact that this bill had been carried in the Senate during the 1959 session by three Liberals, we decided that if it were remotely possible we would attempt to get one, and possibly two, Conservative Senators as authors. We wondered if breaking through caucus lines on authorship might not have some effect on the progress of the bill. We did feel, however, that the lead author should be a Liberal, insuring staunch support at this point.

This approach also necessitated, rather obviously, that the League lobbyist get the bill underway, and find the authors - taking a rather aggressive role in determining the course of "our bill". That this approach is in no way unusual became more and more clear to the somewhat reluctant and shy lobbyist - no one questioned this approach, and this bears some reiteration in future sessions. Since the party designation bill involves the removal of certain language from the present statute, it was not necessary to actually have a bill drawn up. The problem which arises is the introduction of amendments during the course of the session - the party designation legislation which interests the LWV is in a cut and dried form.

Representatives of the local Leagues throughout the state were brought up to date on the background information in this area of program during the fall Legislative Workshops. The fate of the bill during previous sessions, the manner in which we were planning to approach the legislation on 1961, the encouragement to work within the context of their own communities in building support outside the League, and the idea of planning in advance so that the response to the calls for action we knew would be forthcoming - all these were discussed with the local Leagues so that we would have the feeling that we were starting with a unified and a well-informed front throughout the state.

At the time of the 1959 session, the League had asked the Legislators for their stand on a number of issues - but a great many of them had not replied. Consequently, the Party Designation Chairman, working with a couple of Senators who were particularly interested in the issue attempted to work out a tentative rollcall. We arrived at 30 Senators who could be counted upon to vote in favor of the measure if the vote was on the issue of party designation alone. 30 who were unalterably opposed no matter what, and 7 Senators who were

question marks and perhaps could be swayed in favor of party designation.

We had local Leagues in the districts represented by 4 of these Senators, and the Leagues were asked to do what they were able to assess the possibility of a favorable vote. The responses from them indicated that these Senators were not so committed either way that change wasn't possible - but in general wanted to "see how things went" during the session. In two of the districts where we had no local Leagues, I asked Clint Hess of the Farmers' Union if he could find some way of getting a local assessment through his membership. Four more votes that we felt we could count upon would of course have been enough for a majority of 34 on a floor vote. However, these votes were reasonably solid only if the bill would come to the floor through Committee channels. The concern for upholding the committee structure would change this lineup if the vote were an attempt to pull the bill out of Committee, as had been tried two sessions previously.

We wanted someone in the capacity of lead author in the Senate who wouldn't crumple under pressure. Karl Gritter had carried the bill in the previous session, and had also carried it through successfully in the House when he served in that body. He seemed to be the logical choice, and when he was asked to serve in this capacity he accepted. Alf Bergerud seemed to be a "natural" as a Conservative author. He accepted when he was asked, saying at that time also, that he wouldn't want to be lead author because of his heavy load with rural Hennepin legislation, and with the coming Congressional Reapportionment. Both Gritter and Bergerud thought the third author should be a Conservative if at all possible - the one because it was better political strategy for the bill and the other because of a reluctance to be the only Conservative connected with it.

Thus began the immensely time-consuming and discouraging task of finding a second Conservative. Lew Larson was asked first because he had put himself on record as being in favor of the issue, and also because he was a member of the critical committee. He refused because he felt it would be politically unwise, which is undoubtedly true. Dosland was then asked, and he also replied in the negative couching his reply in very careful language that indicated that such a move would be unwise for him. Senator Bergerud and I talked to Holmquist together, and although he made his affirmative position perfectly clear, he didn't feel he would be able to be an author because of heavy commitments on other legislation. It was certainly plain as the session progressed that he had his hands full - and it was also clear that getting involved with party designation legislation could not have seemed to him a particularly astute move.

I waited around in the corridors corraling several other Senators - even some of those whom we had considered questionable like Rudy Hanson - and finally had come to the conclusion that the third author would have to be a Liberal. This dismayed Bergerud to the point that he took it upon himself to get Gordon Butler, and thus we did have our second Conservative. Butler posed for publicity pictures - but I heard second and third hand (as one so often does operating during a legislative session) that he was taking some heat from his fellow Conservatives - and he added no strength to the bill and eventually voted against pulling it out of Committee.

While this time-consuming task was being complete, things were not standing still in the House. H.F. 283 was introduced on January 25th by three Liberals - Skeate, Luther and Sabo. It was evidence of the greenness of the lobbyist - and of the total control we seemed to have of this bill in the Senate - that this move came as a surprise. Though the party lines were certainly less critical in the House - I talked to Skeate about the importance in my mind, at least, of adding two Conservatives to the measure immediately. Another Liberal, Enebo, was added to the bill as this was going on - but he was very gracious about being removed as an author so that Klaus and Franke, both Conservatives could be added. This accomplished the end of at least having both caucuses represented - though it didn't satisfy C. Donald Peterson, who was in a pique about the introduction and refused to have anything to do with the bill. (This upset me greatly at the time - but he seemed to operate with this edge to his temper during the whole session. Things like this can be terribly disquieting to the lobbyist, however, since you begin to get the feeling that the whole world is riding on your shoulders - or in this case the whole issue of party designation - and failure through faux pas is simply too terrible to contemplate when you are representing 5000 women. This is one reason that our League lobbyists should be utilized a second and a third session if at all possible - since even by the end of one's first experience it becomes easier to roll with the punches.)

On February 9th, S.F. 576 was introduced - and at this time all League members were asked to respond with letters to members of both the House and Senate Committees. The Capitol Letter of February 14th was followed with a Call to Action indicating that the House Committee should be asked to recommend the party designation bill for passage - and the Senate Committee members should be encouraged to send the bill out of Committee without recommendation so that the full Senate could vote on the merits of the issue for the first time.

The proponents of H.F. 283 were heard by the House Elections Committee on March 8 (see Capitol Letter No. 6 for names) and the opponents were scheduled for March 15. Rep. Carl Iverson took so much time on this date, however, that Rep. Popovich could not be heard. A special Elections Committee meeting was held on March 17 for his testimony - at which time the bill came out of committee recommended to pass. Skeate and I talked over strategy - and we felt that the bill should not come to a vote in the House before the Senate Elections Committee had taken some action. Failure of the bill to pass would take the Senate Committee off the hook - and favorable action in the Senate might be critical to getting favorable action in the House. The bill still remained on General Orders in the House at the close of the session where it had been left to languish after the unfavorable Senate action made it both unimportant and unwise to attempt to bring it to a vote.

Because we had asked those League members whose Senators did not sit on the Senate Elections Committee to write to the chairman, Chris Erickson, he received a flood of letters on this issue. Again, second and third hand reports indicated that this was one of the reasons this bill got a hearing at all, since the issue was cut and dried in the minds of all the members. Authors Grittner and Bergerud, and representatives from the LEW, DFL, Republican party and the Mpls. Jaycees were heard on the morning of March 27. Questions directed to the League lobbyist suggested that the request to send the bill out without recommendation was novel enough to elicit comments, but scarcely within the framework of what the committee was likely to do.

The initial vote was taken on Senator Bergerud's motion to recommend the bill

for passage. A roll call was asked on his motion to send the bill out of Committee without recommendation and it failed 13-5 (see Capitol Letter No.8).

Two weeks later an attempt was made by Earl Crittner to force the bill out of Committee and bring it to the floor of the Senate, but this move was defeated by a vote of 36-30. This was amazingly close - a couple of the affirmative votes were surprising and cannot perhaps be counted upon as solid for a future session, but the vote indicated nonetheless that we are moving in the right direction on this issue.

Even in the failure of this legislation in the 1961 session, it would seem to me that there is some glimmer of hope for the next session.

On Meeting with Political Party Leaders. Mrs. George Farr and Mr. Clyne Olson (DFL) and Mr. Robert Forsythe, (Republican)

and League Leaders. Mrs. O.H. Anderson, Mrs. N.E. Duff, Mrs. David Kanatz, Mrs. E. Jensen, Miss Hazel Shimmin, Mrs. Al Richter, Mrs. S. C. Davidson, Mrs. Leonard Harkness,

and Staff, Mrs. Harold Wilson, Mrs. E. C. Williams

On Subject of: How can LNV and parties cooperate, work together better in fields of

- a) Voters Service Candidates Meetings
- b) Achieving Party Designation
- axxx

The problem was posed to political leaders by DA, namely, the interest the LNV has in good candidates meetings, and the difficulty we have in getting candidates to appear, and the problem we know candidates have in being expected at so many meetings. Is there something we can do about it?

The large candidates meetings, such as was held by 6 Leagues last year, were very valued by the candidates. It is of greater value, than a TV appearance. You can't decide to have either/or live candidates meetings and TV candidates meetings, but both/and, if you want to serve the candidate and the voter in the best way. The more combined meetings there are, the better for candidates, of course. The large, combined meetings have the problem of too many candidates, too little time for each to speak, but so do all smaller, non-combined meetings.

Advice to League -

Have, continue to have, live candidates meetings. Do more combining, if can.

TV Candidates meeting, with prime time, is worth \$9,000 a half hour - decidedly valuable, but is not substitute for live candidates meeting.

Problem of too little time for each speaker to be heard - can this be remedied?

Question to Parties - Can Parties guarantee attendance of candidates at our meetings, whether on TV or in live candidates meetings? The answer is, "would like to, but no." Why?

Candidate and his campaign manager are sort of free-wheelers, party headquarters don't have power to enforce a plan.

Campaign manager and Party Headquarters make a general plan and schedule early, but last two weeks of campaign, the schedule is relaxed and uncommitted - takes best invitation, for his purposes.

If national political figure comes on short notice to town, all previous plans are upset.

Governor, Congressman, Senators get 90% of invitations; minor statewide offices yearn for audience; also, in past LNVs have not let him speak if his opposite number was not also present, seemed unfair.

Parties proposed solution to this problem -- let 1 candidate speak for rest of slate. LNV reaction, "No."

Problem of scheduling LNV type meetings is this: Each headquarters plans a circuit through state, and DFL and REP are not on same circuit, so don't appear in same town, same night. However, Mr. Farr says maybe we can plan that they would be.

Time is so short. Plans can't be made till after primary. Best times to plan are: Pre-primary - after convention and before close of filings

Pre-general - right after general election

Shall we meet again, and if so, when?

Today - we explored ideas; Feb.-broad plans discussed; June 1-schedules worked out. After primary-schedules mailed down as far as possible.

On subject of PARTY DESIGNATION: both men were asked...

How can we (L&V and parties and others who care) get P.D.?
How much do parties have to do with what candidates run?
Do parties insist on P.D. devotion from their party's candidates?
Do you seek out candidates?
Do you endorse candidates?

(DFL Caucuses,
March 17th
(REP, March 3?)

Both parties seek out candidates.

Endorsing: DEL endorses on county level, all over the state for all offices. Uses sample ballot, mails it to most areas before primary, to all the state before general, omits name from sample ballot on request of candidate, sentiment in party is to deny place on ballot to candidate against P.D. but this is not official position, as yet.

REP will do more endorsing at county level than in the past. Do not approve of ~~having a place on ballot~~ denying endorsement to candidate not for P.D. (consider other factors, as well).

What wants Party Designation?

Both Farr and Forsythe want it down to courthouse level.
Precinct Caucuses of party for it 95%, but public doesn't care, though.
Poll indicate more of those who are informed want it than in past.
P.D. is on platforms of both parties, or has been, and most county resolutions include P.D., but what difference has that made?
New candidates in both parties are coming from ranks of party workers, and they are apt to be P.D. supporters.
If enough new Senators are for it, and then can pass Senate (get 10 more votes), P.D. will pass House, says Mr. Farr.
Need to arouse voters emotionally about P.D. - hard to do.

A double problem

Where party support is tantamount to victory, then P.D. is strong, valued. Therefore party strength leads to possibility of getting P.D.

Where party support is not necessary to man's election, man says, what can party do for me that I don't already have?
Therefore party needs to gain strength, members, program, research, so that candidates see value they get from party.

Pockets of resistance getting fewer.

Areas where Liberals wouldn't be elected, if known, because it is really a conservative minded district, so candidate doesn't like PD.
Opposite is true of Conservatives.
Both parties have worked in these areas, are smoking them out.

Tailored approach, not mass approach, is perhaps the answer, if there is an answer.

Labor, Chambers, Jaycees, perhaps Farm groups -- energize, make militant the groups that already approve placidly. This in answer to question on use of a citizens committee.

Can you prove that with P.D. you can do something you couldn't do before?
Groups with other legislative programs, if they could see that with P.D., their program would be more apt to pass, would be for P.D.
This would take 25 tailored speeches, much research.
Organizations who have their program on both party platforms don't need P.D.

File - P.D. - 196162

October 23, 1961

Memo to Hazel Shissin, From G. Wilson, re P.D. campaign.

Sorry to have been slow...but we concentrated last week on President's Letter.

About your suggested letter to legislative chairmen....I would add a question, that says frankly we feel that P.D. lack is the reason for some of our failures, do you think this is the case with your failures? If so, let's work together on this.

I can't reach Ann to ask her what she has sent you. So in case she didn't find her clipping on lobbyists, I am sending you our copy. I didn't copy it, because it wouldn't reproduce very well, we think. So, would you take good care of it, and return someday?

This would be one good way of starting, I would think. Pick from this list the most important organizations.. Or should you send it to all? It would be interesting information to gather. As you see by the article, names were still being registered, so we would need to get names of those not registered later, for you.

Another way to start might be to build on the good relations we developed at our Political Effectiveness Conferences, in the fall of 1960. As you remember, we had representatives of labor, business, farm and political groups meet with us to tell us their legislative aims. I will list those persons for you.

Mr. John Mooney, 6013 Wing Ave., Mpls. (Republican leader)
Mr. Robert Hess, V.P. AFL-CIO State Council, Hamm Building, St. Paul, Minn. (Union) / (Farm)
Mr. Clarence Myers, President, Minn. Farm Bureau, 405 Commerce Bldg., 4th Wabasha, St. Paul
Mr. Otto Christenson, Minn. Employers Association, Pioneer Bldg., St. Paul (Business)
Mr. Clinton Hess, Farmers Union, 2470 University Ave., St. Paul (Farm)
Mr. Vernon Welch, Minn. Farm Bureau Federation, Commerce Bldg., 4th Wabasha, St. Paul (Farm)
Mr. Julius Kubier, Exec. Assistant, Minn. Employers Assoc. 1500 Pioneer Bldg., St. Paul (Bus)
Mr. Neil Sherburne, 1757 Barclay, St. Paul, Minn. (AFL-CIO)
Mr. John Schwartz, President, Goodhue County Farm Bureau, Rt. 2, Red Wing, Minn. (Farm)
Mr. George Farrar, DFL Central Committee, 6 East Franklin, Minneapolis (DFL)
Mr. Howard Smith, Crosby, Minn. (DFL)
Mr. John P. Sullivan, Crow Wing County Republican Committee, Baxter, Minn. (Rep.)
Mr. Lester McBride, Minn. State Federation of Labor, 47 West 9th St., St. Paul (Labor)
Mr. Chas. Bannister, VP AFL-CIO, Labor Temple, Duluth (Labor)
Mr. Gerald Heaney, 700 Prov. Building, Duluth (Labor)
Mr. H. E. Westmoreland, 614 Comstock, Duluth, (Business)

Others on our list whom we did not need to use were:

J. Cameron Thomson, business
Gerald L. Moore, Exec. VP Mpls. Chamber
Carl Winn, Reg. Dir. AFL-CIO, St. Paul
Gerry Morse, VP, Mpls. Honeywell
Lou Regan, Gen'l Mgr. Sears Roebuck
Ralph Rothstein, Minn. Mining
Earl Bestor, Steel Union, Duluth
Thos. McCabe, lawyer, Duluth, business
Don Summit, his assistant

Others on our list whom we did not need to use, continued:
 George Birgwald, Shoe Company, Red Wing, business
 Mr. Kennedy, RR Union, Minneapolis
 Mr. Wm. Pearson, President Grange, Ogilvie
 Ed Christianson, Minn. Farmers Union, St. Paul
 Mr. Stone, Land O' Lakes, Mpls.
 George Peterson, Twin City Milk Producers Assoc., St. Paul
 Ed Flettum, Minn. Assoc. of Coops, St. Paul
 Ed Tom O'Brien, Brainerd, DFL, business
 Richard Ebert, lawyer, Brainerd,
 Mr. McCullough, Jr., publisher paper, Brainerd
 Eleanor Nolan, Attorney, Brainerd
 Robert Morris, Exec. Sec'y. Chamber Commerce, Duluth
 Kenneth Duncan, was mining engineer, leading citizen, Duluth
 Donald Harries, formerly general counsel, steel corp., Duluth
 Mr. MWD Wyard, Pres. 1st Am. Exchange Natl. Bank, Duluth
 Mr. Nick Ampotich, Leg. Repr. of Steelworkers, Duluth
 Curtis Miller, Editor, Labor World, Duluth
 Clark Kennedy, Pres. Labor World, Duluth
 Bestor, Labor Temple, Duluth
 Royal Alworth, ~~xxxxxxx~~, business, Duluth, New City Natl Bank
 Mr. Griggs, son of regent, banker, Duluth
 Gerald Regnier, Dul. Port Authority, Duluth
 Mundt, bd. of education, Duluth, lawyer
 Van Evers, lawyer, Duluth

Hazel, the reason these people are concentrated in about 5 towns, is because that was where these workshops were to be held. Don't know how much good this information is to you. I'll send a copy to A. Duff, so she can react.

STATE CONTINUING RESPONSIBILITIES

7 D full
[Sept. 1961]

1961 - 1963

1. Ethics in government (conflict of interest and lobby regulation).
2. Election laws, party designation, and corrupt practices.
3. Home rule.
4. Constitutional revision by convention.

What CR's are State Continuing Responsibilities are state governmental issues which League members have studied and on which positions have been established by consensus. They are "unfinished business" on which the LW may continue to act using the same kinds of action as are used for Current Agenda items. The positions, however, cannot be changed while the issues remain on the CR's of State Program. The range of a CR may be narrowed by the membership, but never expanded.

Responsibility of State Board The state Board has a responsibility for the CR's. It must assume leadership in providing up-to-date information to the local Leagues. Using the League position determined by the members as a yardstick, it must evaluate proposed legislation to decide on support or opposition of specific bills. At times, particularly in a legislative session, the state Board may need to organize a "Time for Action" to alert local Leagues and members to action.

Responsibility of the Member The individual League member, whether new or old, has her responsibility for the Continuing Responsibilities. She is invaluable in the development of public support for the League's position. She can participate as an individual in a concerted effort of League members if a "Time for Action" is deemed necessary by the state Board to secure passage of legislation, or protect legislation, on which the LW has a position. To be effective in her role, the member must know the League's positions on the CR's. The member with several years' League experience needs to review the positions we have taken; the new member needs to become familiar with the issues and the League of Women Voters' positions on them.

This material is a summary of our 1961-1963 Continuing Responsibilities. Use it as a handy reference.

Ethics in Government* (Conflict of Interest and Lobby Regulation)

Current
Agenda
in
1959-61

LWV delegates at the 1959 convention put ethics in government on the Current Agenda as an area related to our support of improvements in Minnesota election laws. Study was focused on lobby regulation in the state legislature and on conflict of interest on the part of legislators and of other state officials and employees. By the fall of 1960, local leagues indicated that legislative action was needed in these two areas. Agreement was reached among members on specific items to be included in any laws enacted. These items were:

Consensus
of members
determines
LWV
positions

Lobby regulation: disclosure of name and address of lobbyist; name of his employer; nature of legislation with which he is concerned; nature of activities in which he engages; amount of money contributed to his lobbying action and by whom; and terms of his employment.

Conflict of interest: financial disclosure of sources and amounts of income related to his public service; on the spot disclosure of personal interest in legislation; prohibition against any public official representing a private interest before a state agency or representing a private interest against the state in any action in which the state or state agency is the complainant; prohibition against disclosure of confidential information; prohibition against private employment of public official where activity would be incompatible with proper discharge of public duties; and prohibition for two years against former official representing private interest against the state in any matter for which he was responsible during state service.

Bills
introduced
in 1961
Legislature

LWV hopes were cautiously high when ethics in government bills including much of what League members wanted were introduced into the 1961 Legislature.

The lobby regulation bill required a lobbyist to register with the chief clerk of the House and the secretary of the Senate; each legislative agent and each principal who received or paid more than \$100 lobby expenses in any calendar quarter would have to file a statement of expenses; no criminal penalties for violations were provided. The bill omitted other League-supported items.

The conflict of interest bill in the main met the criteria set in the League's consensus. It did not, however, prohibit legislators from practicing before state agencies, nor did it provide criminal penalties for violation. An Ethics in Government Commission was proposed which would give advisory opinions, receive complaints, make investigations and determinations of violations, and might request the attorney general to institute action for an injunction.

Lobby
regulation
killed

House passage of the lobby regulation bill by a 121-2 vote, but Senate burial of the bill in the civil administration committee, ended the League hopes in this area for the 1961 session.

Weakened
version
of conflict
of interest
passed

A small measure of success was achieved in the conflict of interest area when a "watered-down" version of the bill was passed by the Senate with the House later concurring in the rewritten bill. It provides separate commissions for executive officers and legislators. Each agency head is directed to issue a code of public service ethics. In the legislature permanent ethics committees are to be established in each house to hear charges, hold hearings, issue advisory opinions; they may recommend disciplinary action. If there appear to have been violations of any statutes, they may turn the information over to the attorney general. Most serious from the League standpoint was the omission of any requirement for disclosure of personal interest and the "should not" rather than the "shall not" approach to activities involving conflict of interest.

Serious
omission

Though the lobby regulation bill failed to pass and the conflict of interest law is a weakened version of the original bill, a beginning has been made. League delegates at the 1961 convention voted to include ethics in government on the CR's in order that we may continue to work for our positions in this area.

*Loony Definition from LWV Capitol Letter, Vol. II, No. 8: Ethics in government means rules of conduct already observed by all officials, but which it is insulting to speak of or to define.

Election Laws, Party Designation,* and Corrupt Practices

Current Agenda 1957-61	A "dark horse" at the 1957 LWV convention, the evaluation of election laws and procedures with support of improvements, has been the source of some of the League's successes in both the 1959 and the 1961 Legislatures. On the LWV Current Agenda from 1957-61, election laws this year became a part of a three-forked, interwoven Continuing Responsibility.
LWV positions determined by 1959	<p>Study by local Leagues brought consensus by February of 1959 in time for action during the legislative session. Consensus showed support for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">...centralized responsibility in the state government for achieving uniform election procedures and for training officials, but reservations on adding to bureaucracy and increasing costs were expressed;...changing the 30-day residence requirement;...some provision to allow an otherwise qualified voter to vote for president and vice-president before he meets residence requirements;...extending registration to smaller municipalities, counties, or state;...giving more latitude to councils in determining qualifications and number of election judges;...open primary. <p>Lowering voting age was opposed in consensus; raising filing fees was opposed.</p>
Interim Commission	The 1957 Legislature had appointed an interim commission on election laws. Using the League consensus positions as a yardstick, the state Board decided to support the bill proposed by the Commission, revising seven of the thirteen chapters of Minnesota election laws. The bill was passed; changes made were mainly for clarification and codification.
30-day Residence Requirement	An unexpected League success in this field was the passage by the 1959 Legislature of a bill proposing a constitutional amendment permitting the legislature to specify where a person may vote if he moves 30 days prior to an election and removing the obsolete provision regarding the Indian's right to vote. This was amendment #4 in the 1960 general election. Supported by the LWV--in fact, inspired by the LWV--the amendment passed.

30-day
statute
passed
in 1961
Legislature

Follow-up legislation in the 1961 Legislature eased the 30-day residence requirement. If a voter moves within his municipality within 30 days of an election, he votes in his old precinct; if he moves to a new municipality, he gets a certificate of eligibility from his former precinct which enables him to vote, for that election only, in his new precinct.

Corrupt
practices
consensus

The second biennium on election laws brought LWV consensus on changes in the corrupt practices laws. League members called for complete reporting of all money actually spent in elections, bringing the volunteer committee under more control, and raising obsolete limits on campaign spending.

Failure
in the
1961
Legislature

No success was achieved in the 1961 Legislature, where bills were introduced from both the 1959 Interim Election Commission and the Governor's Committee on Ethics. The corrupt practices bill of the Ethics committee was supported by the LWV. It was passed by the House in revised form, but killed in the Senate Elections and Reapportionment committee. The Interim Commission bill which raised campaign spending limits died in the House.

With clear positions on CR 2, election laws and corrupt practices, we are ready to support or oppose legislation in the 1963 Legislature.

*Party Designation is summarized in a separate section.

Party Designation

Need seen by LNW lobbyists	League lobbyists' observations of the legislature in action raised questions about the effectiveness of the election of legislators without party designation. In 1951 the LNW convention voted to add to the Current Agenda, "The League of Women Voters will study the present method of electing state legislators with a view to supporting party designation." After a year of study, the 1952 convention voted to accept "Party Designation for Legislators" as an action item on the Current Agenda.
On Current Agenda	
On CRs	In 1955, party designation was moved to the CRs. There it remained until the 1959 convention. Meanwhile, League lobbyists had grown in their appreciation of the need for party designation if other legislative reforms were to be accomplished. Their beliefs were reflected in the overwhelming support the 1959 convention gave to restoring party designation to the Current Agenda as part of the 1959-61 one-item CA, "The LNW of Minnesota will support improvements in Minnesota election laws and in the related area of ethics in government, and will promote party designation."
Back to Current Agenda	
Reaffirmation of Consensus	One reason for this decision to return party designation to the Current Agenda was to provide an opportunity for reassessing the League position in the light of persistent questions about party designation for county officials. Local Leagues again studied pros and cons of party designation including election of county officials on a party ballot and arrived at the following consensus: The League of Women Voters of Minnesota reaffirms its endorsement of party designation for state legislators. The LNW is not in a position to support actively a separate bill for party designation for county officials; however, inclusion of county officials in a party designation bill for state legislators would be acceptable to the League.
1961-- Still Failure	In the 1961 Legislature the LNW did intensive lobbying both at home and at the Capitol to secure passage of the party designation bill. Again there was no success.
1963--What?	Delegates at the 1961 LNW convention, in including party designation on the CRs for 1961-63, indicated they wanted to continue to work on this issue.

Home Rule

Definition	Home rule is a political term used to indicate local self-government, granted either by placing constitutional limitations upon state legislatures in favor of local governments or by authorizing citizens of a local government unit to frame their own charter of government.
Current Agenda	League interest in home rule began in 1948 when we had constitutional revision as a Current Agenda item. "Strengthened home rule" was first specifically mentioned in the League's 1950-51 Current Agenda and continued to be a CA item in some form until 1957. By 1955 League members had agreed that the Minnesota constitutional provisions on home rule should be strengthened by (1) realistic restrictions on special legislation and (2) broader provisions for adoption and amendment of home rule charters. League convention delegates in 1957 included "increased home rule for local government" in the constitutional revision CR. In 1959 and again in 1961, delegates retained home rule, now as a separate CR.
LWV consensus	
Becomes a CR item	
Successful Amendment passed	The 1957 Legislature proposed an amendment revising and consolidating the sections of the Constitution relating to local government. This amendment, known as the Home Rule Amendment, was supported by the LWV and was passed by the voters in the 1958 election, another success for the League. Implementing legislation was, and still is, needed to put control of local matters into the hands of local citizens. In 1959 a law was passed by the Legislature changing the vote necessary to adopt a home rule charter from 4/7 of those voting <u>in the election</u> to 55% of those voting <u>on the question</u> . To amend a charter the vote necessary was changed from 3/5 of those voting <u>in the election</u> to 55% of those voting <u>on the question</u> .
1959 legislation	
1961 legislation	Only a part of additional implementation was accomplished in the 1961 legislative session: amendments may now be initiated not only by charter commissions or citizen petitions, but also by local governing bodies; improvements in procedures for publication of proposed charter changes--two weeks necessary for both amendments and charters instead of four weeks for amendments and none for charters; and reasonable and necessary funds can now be provided for charter commissions.

Deleted from the original bill, fathered by the League of Minnesota Municipalities and supported by the LWV, were provisions which would have (1) allowed governing bodies to update noncontroversial charter provisions and to clear out dead wood without submitting such changes to the people; and (2) allowed charters to provide for election of charter commission members by the people (at present they are appointed by the district court). Added to the bill was a section making it mandatory for a charter commission member to be a freeholder.

Special
legislation

"Special legislation" means a law passed by the entire legislature directed at only one community. Until the 1958 Amendment legalized special legislation, it was passed under the guise of general law; that is, the community was not named. Now the community involved is named in the law and local approval is required before the law goes into effect. This is an improvement, the LWV believes, if we are to continue to have special legislation. Generally, however, there is agreement that special legislation is bad for the independence of local units and bad because it uses the legislator's time to solve local problems.

The special legislation area of home rule is a complex one, made more complex by the emergency of groups of local government units seeking special legislation with modified local consent: e.g., the Metropolitan Sanitary District bill introduced but not passed in the 1961 session. The LWV is strongly in favor of local approval, but there are those in the legislature who believe legislative action on special laws should be final.

Constitutional Revision by Convention

Convention
the best
method

The LWV by its adoption of item I of the 1961-63 Current Agenda officially recognized that for the present the most practical method of constitutional revision is by amendment. The same League convention voted, as a CR, endorsement of the convention principle as the best way of securing orderly, complete revision of Minnesota's Constitution.

Current
Agenda
for eleven
years

From 1948 through 1959 the calling of a constitutional convention was on our Current Agenda; in 1959 we moved it to the CR's. During these years we have worked long and hard, but unsuccessfully, to persuade legislators to take the first step toward a convention. Revision by convention requires the following:

No success
with
legislators

- 1) a proposal for calling a constitutional convention must be approved by 2/3 of the legislators;
- 2) this proposal must be voted on at the next general election and be approved by a majority of all votes cast at the election;
- 3) next session of the legislature must provide for the convention and for the election of delegates to it (legislators may serve as delegates);
- 4) the constitution adopted by the convention must be submitted to the voters at the next general election held not less than 90 days after its adoption by the convention;
- 5) if, in this election, 3/5 of the voters voting on the question approve the constitution, the constitution is accepted.

An amendment adopted in 1954, with concerted action by the League, provided some of the features above: (1) legislators allowed to be delegates and (2) ratification by 3/5 of the voters voting on the question. Despite the large vote approving this amendment in 1954, the legislators have not considered it a mandate to submit the constitutional convention question to the voters.

By keeping this item on our CR's, we are prepared for and we may encourage any change in legislative attitude toward the method of revising the Constitution.

FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO KNOW MORE

Since CR's are issues we have studied in previous years, this publication gives background, statements of positions, and legislative action, but does not give the arguments on the issues. For material used during the study of these items, there were the following League publications. You may want to review them, or study them if you are new in League.* If you do not have them in your local League files, consult with the State League office. Though the publication may be out of print, we can probably find a copy for you.

CR 1	Ethics and the Public Servant	1960
	Report of the Governor's Committee on Ethics	1959
	Ethics in Government Studied	1958
CR 2	Minnesota Election Laws	1958
	Party-Designation for Legislators	1956
	The Missing Link in Minnesota Government	1959
	Folder and Fact Sheet on Party Designation	1958
	Money in Elections	1960
CR 3	The State You're In--Chap. VIII	1958
CR 4	The State You're In	1958
	Folder and Fact Sheet on Const. Convention	1958
	The 4 F's of a Constitutional Convention	1956

Some non-League sources give valuable material on the Continuing Responsibilities:

Politics in Minnesota, by G. Theodore Mitau, University of Minnesota Press, 1960
(an excellent, easy-to-read book available at most bookstores for \$1.95)
League of Minnesota Municipalities Information Service
15 University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis 14, Minnesota
(ask for up-to-date material on laws pertaining to elections,
ethics, home rule)
County Auditors have books on election laws.
1961 Minnesota Legislative Session Laws
(available at most newspaper offices)

*CAUTION: Though we in the League often think governmental reforms come slowly, government is constantly changing--what was true in 1958 may have been changed by 1959 or 1961 laws or by amendments adopted since the publication was written.

Recent Developments on the Continuing Responsibilities

What's new on the CRs? Though we don't expect that any of the CR positions will be legislative issues to outshine taconite, taxes, and oleo, we do foresee some proposals being made in the legislature on the issues on which we have positions in our State Continuing Responsibilities.

If bills on these issues are actually introduced in the next legislature, the state Board will interpret as accurately as possible whether the proposed measures further or oppose the positions taken by the membership of the LWV of Minnesota. What kind of action the League should take will then be considered and decided. Communications from local Leagues and members are valuable in this process.

Home Rule - CR 3

The League of Minnesota Municipalities will recommend that the 1963 legislature enact legislation to permit adoption of charter amendments by a simplified procedure in restricted instances.

This procedure would allow a council by a two-thirds vote of all its members to approve a charter amendment by ordinance after its proposal by the charter commission. The ordinance would be adopted only after a public hearing, after duly published notice, and would be subject to the right of referendum on petition of five per cent of the voters filed within a prescribed period after the adoption of the ordinance during which the amendment would not go into operation. If the petition is filed, the charter amendment may not become effective until approval by 55% of the voters voting on the question as in the present method.

This additional method of amending charters would not apply to any amendments which would:

- a. change the city's basic form of government;
- b. increase the tax levy limit in the aggregate or with respect to any particular levy or authorize any new taxes;
- c. deprive the people of an existing right to vote on a proposition or office or change the majority required for approval;
- d. change charter provisions relating to liquor patrol limits or the legal status of the city for purposes of the sale of liquor;
- e. authorize the city to issue general obligations of the city in an amount or of a kind then not authorized in the city;
- f. increase the salary of any elective officer during his term or provide for a pension to any officer or employee;
- g. authorize the city to acquire a public utility or other business affected with a public interest.

This alternative procedure would simplify and encourage modernization of lengthy and antiquated charter provisions. The LMM recommends that provisions should be included in the legislation for a summary judicial determination of a contest to decide whether a particular amendment is within the stated exceptions.

Ethics in government - CR 1

No developments that we know of.

Election laws, party designation, and corrupt practices - CR 2

Here also the League of Minnesota Municipalities will offer the 1963 legislature a recommendation. It calls for provisions, including a constitutional amendment if necessary, to permit persons living in Minnesota to vote for president and vice president if they lack only the residence requirements necessary to vote for state and local offices.

The 1962 Republican party platform urges that the governor and lieutenant governor be elected as one on the state's ballot in the same manner as the president and vice president are elected on the national ballot.

The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party at its 1962 convention adopted a platform statement urging the elimination of the present six-month and thirty-day residence requirements as a condition for voting.

Party designation for legislators received a stronger endorsement in the 1962 Republican platform than in earlier platforms. The statement reads, "We advocate party designation for members of the state legislature."

After the November election, we will be able to get a better picture of the prospects for a party designation bill. From the legislative candidates questionnaires we will study the answers to the party designation question to determine where support and opposition exist among the candidates who have been elected.

Our latest information from the Governor's Committee on Fair Campaign Practices indicates that it will not have any proposals to offer on corrupt practices legislation.

Constitutional revision by convention - CR 4

Though the Governor's Committee on Constitutional Revision is working on needed changes, it is not discussing the convention approach to revision.

NOT A PART OF OUR LNW POSITION ON ELECTION LAW CHANGES, but interesting to know, is a federal election law development this summer which may provoke legislative discussion. This is the proposed United States constitutional amendment banning poll taxes in federal elections. The Congressional action is confined to the governors of the 50 states. If three-fourths of the state legislatures ratify the proposed amendment within seven years, it will become the law of the land. The proposal does not affect elections for state and local officials; it applies only to presidential and vice presidential electors and to United States senators and representatives.

Minnesota does not have the poll tax and the issue was not included in our 1959 consensus on election law changes.

Suggestion to State CR chairmen on Local League Boards: CRs can't be filed and forgotten. There must be someone in your League who likes to "clip" and who reads several newspapers. Get her on your committee. As news appears relating to the CR areas of League, see that it is mentioned at unit meetings and in your bulletin. It doesn't need to take a lot of time or space and will keep members alert to the issues.

File P.D

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

18TH AND WASHINGTON AVENUES S.E., MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA FE 8-8791

December 14, 1962

Dear Senator Walz:

We wish to congratulate you and to express our appreciation for your willingness to serve the people of Minnesota as a member of their state legislature. We recognize the sacrifices in time, effort, and money which you and your family are making.

Enclosed are two folders on the League's legislative program and party designation. We are working for:

- . party designation for state legislators;
- . constitutional improvement, particularly in the amending process;
- . effective administration of laws against discrimination;
- . changes in voting requirements, and fuller reporting of campaign expenditures;
- . lobby regulation, and a stronger "conflict of interest" law;
- . further improvements in "home rule."

If your district is one of the 58 communities in Minnesota where we have a local League of Women Voters, they will be in touch with you.

Please call on us if we can be of help. We would be glad to share any of our research material which you might find useful.

The League of Women Voters is not a special interest group. Our goal--like yours, we hope--is to achieve what is best for the state as a whole and for all of its citizens. Forty-three years of work on various aspects of government--local, state, and federal--is evidence of our earnest and continuing endeavor to serve the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

Mrs. Nicholas E. Duff
Legislative Chairman

~~The Honorable Norman J. Walz~~
~~Norman, Minnesota~~



M INNESOTA'S GOVERNORS ARE ELECTED ON PARTY DESIGNATION AS ARE THE OTHER EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF THE STATE

Minnesota's governor campaigns on a political party platform. The people show their approval of the candidate's program by electing him. Then, they hold him to the program he has pledged. But the governor frequently finds his program blocked to a standstill by legislators who do not commit themselves to the party platform.

M INNESOTA'S NONPARTISAN POLICY FOR LEGISLATORS SHORT CIRCUITS THE OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT

M INNESOTA CITIZENS ARE DENIED A DIRECT VOICE IN THEIR OWN MINNESOTA STATE GOVERNMENT BY THE NONPARTISAN POLICY OF ELECTING LEGISLATORS

There is a basic cynicism in a law which denies the people this right. The legislators who favor the present method claim that they know what their people need and want. The critics assert that the party platform springs from the people and that legislators who commit themselves to it are more likely to be truly representative of the whole state.

M INNESOTA'S NONPARTISAN METHOD THWARTS THE GOVERNOR, THE PARTY AND THE CITIZEN

M INNESOTA NEEDS PARTY DESIGNATION FOR LEGISLATORS. SO SAY THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR PARTIES AND THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

- If you think so too, you can do something about it:
- 1) Join the party of your choice, work steadily to improve it.
 - 2) Have a voice in your party's platform beginning at the precinct caucus.
 - 3) Endorse and elect candidates who are for PARTY DESIGNATION.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota, 15 & Washington Aves. S. E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota - 2 for 5¢ - Revised 1962.

MINNESOTA NEEDS
PARTY DESIGNATION
FOR LEGISLATORS

M INNESOTA CITIZENS NOW ELECT THE MEMBERS OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE WITHOUT PARTY DESIGNATION

In other words, on a nonpartisan basis. Yet a body of 202 members finds it cannot function effectively without the machinery of party disciplines. Therefore, the Minnesota legislature organizes itself into 2 factions, corresponding roughly to the 2 political parties.

M INNESOTA'S LEGISLATURE THUS IS NOT NONPARTISAN EXCEPT IN NAME

M INNESOTA VOTERS DO NOT KNOW THE POLITICAL PARTY OF THE CANDIDATES FOR THE LEGISLATURE

Yet, each legislator may choose the faction that he favors, Conservative if he is a Republican, Liberal if he is a Democrat-Farmer-Labor, without accounting for his choice in any way to the people who have elected him, and, the choice is generally for keeps.

M INNESOTA LEGISLATORS DO FORM "PARTIES" AND SO HAVE THE ADVANTAGE OF PARTISANSHIP WITHOUT RESPONSIBILITY

M INNESOTA VOTERS BELIEVE THAT THE STATE LEGISLATURE FUNCTIONS ON A NON PARTISAN BASIS

Yet, the two factions caucus before each session convenes to decide upon the men who will hold important positions, such as the speaker of the House and the president pro tem of the Senate. They also decide what position their faction will take on the controversial legislation which will be introduced during the coming session.

M INNESOTA LEGISLATIVE LEADERS ARE NOT SELECTED ON A NONPARTISAN BASIS

M INNESOTANS GENERALLY THINK THE HOUSE AND SENATE COMMITTEES ARE SET UP IN A NONPARTISAN WAY

Yet, the faction which holds the majority in either house always fills all chairmanships and vice chairmanships of all standing committees and appoints a controlling number of members of these committees from its faction, regardless of the ability or experience of the members of the minority faction.

M INNESOTA'S METHOD OF ORGANIZING THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES IS NOT NONPARTISAN

May 1962

TIPS ON PRE-ELECTION LOBBYING

(using the issue Party Designation)

KNOW THE ISSUE

Read again State Continuing Responsibilities 1961-63 and the folder,
Minnesota Needs Party Designation for Legislators.

KNOW THE CANDIDATES, and Reach Them

All Minnesota House and Senate candidates face the voters this fall. Many districts are changed from the last election - check yours. Know the candidate's views on issues, who his supporters are, what groups have the most influence with him and how you can reach them. Work with the opinion builders in your community - leaders in their fields, active in other organizations and the public media, press, radio, TV.

KNOW THE OPPOSITION

What kinds of arguments will you meet? See "Some Say" Tip Sheet. Expect to be called all manner of things. Remember, the rougher it gets, the more effective you are being. Let the opponents have their say, and continue to respect them as people at the same time you are opposing their ideas. As Gordon Baker said of the Washington state League in the middle of battle, "The feminine and non partisan qualities of the organization created an image of political purity which placed opponents of their enterprise in a difficult position."

HAVE SOME FUN

Summer is the time for Fairs, festivals, large picnics, political gatherings. Have some fun visually - large signs on cars or floats, a booth at the fair, a banner at the political picnic. Some slogan thoughts:

Minnesota's Magna Charta
Let the People Know
Party Designation for Legislators

Put the Label on the Man
Party Designation for Legislators

Governor and Legislators
Working Together on Issues
Party Designation for Legislators

Letters to the editor are very good. Watch the political campaign as it progresses. When you spot a "Some Say" comment, take advantage of the opportunity to point out publically what you and "Others Say." And let us know what you're doing to share with other Leagues.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota
will work for
PARTY DESIGNATION FOR LEGISLATORS

BECAUSE it would strengthen the two-party system. (At present only Minnesota and Nebraska, which has a unicameral legislature, elect their legislators on a non-party ticket).

BECAUSE the present non-partisan system does not mean that a legislator has no party. It only means that he doesn't have to tell his party affiliation on the ballot.

BECAUSE it would simplify the voter's choice, letting him know by party label which issues he is supporting when he votes for a candidate. As it is, the party to which the legislator belongs is known only to those who visit the legislature.

BECAUSE government should seek the solutions to problems which represent the will of most of the people. As it is many pressure groups, representing special and sectional interests, vie for the vote of legislators and exercise a disproportionate amount of influence for lack of any political party organization. The party should weigh these competing interests and decide which is the fair decision for most people. Then legislators should support that compromise as stated in the party platform.

BECAUSE it would force legislators to accept the responsibilities of party membership (such as working for the platform) along with the privileges which they now enjoy (such as the caucus, committee appointments, support for bills, party endorsement).

BECAUSE it would make the elected legislator as responsible for enacting into law the measures stated in his party platform as the Governor and other executive officers are now since they run with party labels.

PARTY DESIGNATION FOR LEGISLATORS

Party Designation

SOME SAY

OTHERS SAY ...

Party Designation? Nonpartisan legislature? What's that?

I'm against party designation. We should elect good people, not beholden to any party, able to carefully legislate in the interests of all people.

Sure we caucus in the legislature but we don't get into politics. We respect a man's individual integrity. I'm against party designation because it would not strengthen the parties and would harden the lines of opposition. Some issues would become partisan that are not now. I feel I'm representing only my constituents - my economic, social and business groups.

Political parties somehow can not be trusted. We in Minnesota are proud of our independent heritage. I can be served best by a legislator who is concerned with the issues here in Minnesota - not in Washington - the issues of greatest concern to me.

When you go to the polls this fall, you vote for Minnesota state senators and representatives without knowing which political party they belong to. If we had party designation, the name of the party would be listed with the candidate.

"Legislatures -- aren't like a judge waiting for disputes to come to him and then passing on them fairly. Legislatures require an action program to produce good government, and political parties are the instruments for forging an action program on which governor and legislators can work together. Two parties compete in putting rival programs into action, and voters choose between them." Red Wing Daily Republican Eagle

"Minnesotans should take a close look at legislators who vote consistently against party designation. What these legislators are voting against, to put it bluntly, is a system of legislative responsibility. And what they often fear, more than anything else, is any change in the status quo which might weigh against their re-election." Minneapolis Star

"What does this mean? It means that the voter has no ties upon the legislator for the legislator is not on record supporting or opposing any formal legislative program and thus need not be responsive to the wishes of the electorate which put him into office. This, we contend, is government at its most irresponsible." Park Region Echo, Alexandria

"People whom I regard with loathing
Are uncitizens in citizens clothing."

Ogden Nash

(more on other side)

SOME SAY

OTHERS SAY ...

"Why don't they ask my crown at once? Do they want to make me their slave?"
King John of England at Runnymede
1215 AD signing the Magna Charta

The League of Women Voters is just a big city outfit. They are hoodwinking you ladies outstate.

Under party designation the labor bosses would run the state.

If you say political parties are so wonderful, why aren't you people joining them?

If we get party designation, you in the LWV will lose some of your effectiveness.

Keep politics out of the legislature.

"Like King John of old, they (the legislators) are representing themselves. At the next election the voters should demand beforehand how a lawmaker is going to vote. Minnesota needs a modern magna charta." Edward E. Barsness, May 1959, Glenwood, Minnesota

Of course, we would like more outstate Leagues. Any towns to suggest? Names of interested individuals? Now we have 28 outstate Leagues, 28 suburban and 3 big city (Duluth, Minneapolis, St. Paul) Leagues.

The Republican Party and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune have supported party designation for many years. Are they labor dominated?

Our members are. Our Board members and the League organization remain independent in order to concentrate on issues. "I am convinced," said George Romney, GOP candidate for Governor of Michigan, this month in Minneapolis, "we need two strong political parties, and -- we still need an organized means by which citizens can be effective on a basis above party. Only in this way can we inform sufficient citizens to enable the parties and candidates to compete for leadership on the basis of the real issues because there is sufficient public understanding of them."

Perhaps. Lack of party designation has strengthened special interest groups, the lobbyists. The LWV is an unpaid lobby working for all the citizens of Minnesota. We are not after glory - just good government. Our concern is for the voter to be informed.

Party designation will not solve all our problems but it will surely help. Government is run by the people, for the people through political parties. This is our government. We're for even better government.

LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS OF LOCAL LEAGUES IN MINNESOTA

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>LEAGUE</u>	<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>LEAGUE</u>
4	Rochester	34-42	Minneapolis
5	Austin	41	*St. Anthony
6	Red Wing	43S-49	St. Paul (except 48N)
7	Faribault	43N	Arden Hills
8	New Richland		Falcon Heights
	Owatonna		Roseville
9	Albert Lea		Shoreview
10	Wells	48N	Maplewood
13	South St. Paul		North St. Paul
	West St. Paul		White Bear Lake
14	Hutchinson	50	Mahtomedi
17	New Ulm		St. Croix Valley
18	Jackson	51	Anoka
19	Worthington		Columbia Heights
22	Granite Falls		Fridley
23	Willmar	53	Brainerd
25	Alexandria	55	Battle Lake
27	St. Cloud		Fergus Falls
29	Buffalo	56	Moorhead
30	Brooklyn Center	58	Cass Lake
	Crystal	59-61	Duluth
	Golden Valley	61	Silver Bay
	Robbinsdale	62	Virginia
31	Deephaven	63	Hibbing
	Excelsior	64	Bemidji
	Mnetonka Village		
	Mound		
	Wayzata		
32	Bloomington		
	Richfield		
33	Edina		
	Hopkins		
	St. Louis Park		

(18 Legislative Districts with no Leagues - 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 52, 54, 57, 65, 66, 67)

*The question of whether the portion of St. Anthony that is in Ramsey County should be in Legislative District #43N or not is in dispute in the courts.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF LOCAL LEAGUES IN MINNESOTA

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>LEAGUE</u>	<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>LEAGUE</u>
I	Albert Lea Austin Faribault Owatonna Red Wing Rochester South St. Paul West St. Paul	IV	Arden Hills Falcon Heights Mahtomedi Maplewood North St. Paul Roseville St. Anthony St. Croix Valley St. Paul Shoreview White Bear Lake
II	Hutchinson Jackson New Richland New Ulm Wells Worthington	V	Minneapolis
III	Anoka Bloomington Brooklyn Center Columbia Heights Crystal Deephaven Edina Excelsior Fridley Golden Valley Hopkins Minnetonka Village Mound Richfield Robbinsdale St. Anthony St. Louis Park Wayzata	VI	Brainerd Buffalo Granite Falls St. Cloud Willmar
		VII	Alexandria Battle Lake Bemidji Cass Lake Fergus Falls Moorhead
		VIII	Duluth Hibbing Silver Bay Virginia

WCCO TELEVISION

50 SOUTH BIRTH STREET • MINNEAPOLIS • MINN. 55402

NEWS
EDITORIAL

APR 15 1963

There is no chance that this session of the legislature will do anything about party designation for its members. Even those most faithful to the cause have conceded this. What hurts them most, now, is not the defeat of their measure, but the manner in which it has been defeated.

Never has the committee system seemed to work more ruthlessly, or so at least it appears to those who have seen it demolish party designation. In operation in the senate, for example, it has worked to silence majority members who pledged in their campaigns last fall that party designation would be closest to their hearts and uppermost in their minds -- or words to that general effect. So far, scarcely a single one of these (mostly freshmen from new suburban districts) has uttered a word on the floor of the senate in support of party designation.



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

— St. Anthony Crier —
Masters of Double Talk

4/11/63

Efforts to secure passage of a party designation measure for elective state representatives appears doomed in this session of the legislature. Every parliamentary trick in the book has been used to outmaneuver proponents of the bill, even to reversing a ruling by Lt. Governor Keith in the senate.

In simple terms it sums up to the fact that our state legislators refuse to stand up and be counted. They scamper like scared rabbits when an attempt is made to pin a party label on them and yet they turn Heaven and earth to secure party endorsement during a political campaign.

The terms "Liberal" or "Conservative" are misnomers. In the majority of instances funds to finance the elec-

tion of these representatives came from the coffers of the state DFL or GOP parties, and strangely enough, the central committees of both groups worked with the League of Women Voters to secure passage of the party designation bill.

One cannot help but draw the conclusion that a majority of our legislators prefer to be governed by a tight-knit group of bosses ostensibly answerable to a party organization, rather than to stand on a party platform which was hammered out from the precinct level up through the state convention.

Voters elected them on those platforms. They have the right to expect them to serve on the same basis.

League Loses a Battle

An indignant "Capitol Letter" mailed out this week by the League of Women Voters of Minnesota reports in detail the Senate actions which killed the bill providing for party designation of senators and representatives in the Minnesota Legislature. The proposal has long had the strong support of the League, in addition to the support of both of Minnesota's political parties.

With the legislature's position established, it seems the effort to obtain party designation will have to be undertaken outside the legislature. (The lawmakers have had their chance.)

If the League will continue to keep this issue in the public spotlight, and if the two parties will lend endorsement to lawmakers who will run under their banners, it will only be a matter of time until a legislature already clearly labeled will take its seat and quickly approve this effort to achieve legislative responsibility to replace high-handed legislative independence.

H & S Comm. April 9

S. Coleman May I ask the chairs permission? Would like to ask a question
S. Thust is here today one of the authors and would like to
discuss this bill.

S. Kroehler have many bills but I guess we could discuss it.

S. Goldman Did not want to adjourn again

S. Rosenfeld Should be the policy of the committee that a notice be
given a day in advance so to know what would take place the
public is entitled to know.

With the consensus of this committee I move that the chairman
be authorized to do so.

S. Kroehler But we were getting things done but if the committee wishes
motion passed

Undices No power to any member of this committee. We should be heard

Spencer Closing weeks of the session and have responsibility--and the
public should know.

Coleman I move that this matter be brought the following Tues. provided
of course, the author could be present.

Motion defeated by loud NO.

Coleman No doubt the nays have it.

Three weeks in succession

1. quick motion to adjourn

2. Attempt rejected because the author was absent

3. No notice was given

4. Motion to be heard next Tues. was defeated

Star 4/26/83

Party Designation

Hits Another Delay

Star Statehouse Bureau

For the second week in a row the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee today adjourned in a dispute over a bill for party designation of legislators.

Sen. Nicholas D. Coleman, St. Paul Liberal, moved that the bill "be taken from the table" and brought before the committee for discussion.

He was challenged by Sen. Gordon Rosenmeier, Little Falls Conservative and a strong opponent of party designation. Rosenmeier maintained that a bill never is discussed in the absence of the author, in this case Sen. Lew Larson, Mahel Conservative.

"No one tries to play with someone else's bill in committee," Rosenmeier, a 22-year senate veteran, told Coleman, a freshman. "A bill is not raised without a request of the author."

Coleman said he did have the permission of another author of the bill, Sen. Paul A. Thuet, South St. Paul, Liberal minority leader.

Adjournment

Rosenmeier then moved that the committee adjourn.

It did, 15 minutes before normal adjournment and before other bills that had been scheduled were heard.

The party designation bill was virtually killed earlier in the session when the committee voted to lay it on the table.

Two efforts on the floor of the senate failed to dislodge Coleman's bill from the committee, but a motion to adjourn held precedence.

In other action today, a committee approved, 7 to 4, a bill providing an additional team of election judges to count votes in an election. It would apply to paper ballot precincts in which at least 300 persons voted at the last general election. Machine precincts would not be affected.

Author Objects

Sen. J. A. Josefson, Minnesota Conservative, one of the senate authors, voted against his own bill.

"Because of the closeness of the election last November, I'd expected a rash of bills to tighten up our system," Josefson said. "I didn't think we should move too fast in this area. I authored the bill because I was going to ride herd on it, but it got away from me."

The committee also recommended to pass a bill clarifying the boundaries of the 41st Legislative District in Hennepin County. Only that part of St. Anthony in Hennepin County will be included in the district, according to the bill.

Editorials

Why Shouldn't Voters Know?

Sen. Clarence Langley made a brave assault in St. Paul Tuesday on one of the "vested interests" in the Minnesota legislature, which has withstood reform for many sessions and appears likely to do so again this year.

Langley's appeal was on behalf of a bill to restore party labels in the election of state legislators. He recalled that a former state house county senator—Zumbrota's A. J. Rocker—offered the 1912 amendment which forbade legislative candidates to run on party tickets. Rocker intended no such thing, offering his amendment only to kill the bill to which it became attached. But national maneuvering on other matters brought the bill to passage anyway. Through this legislative "accident," the lawmakers of 1912 created a legally non-partisan legislature when they really had no intention of doing so.

Now there is widespread agreement that party labels should be restored. Both political parties see eye to eye on this point. Authors of the party labels bill include Sen. Langley, an avowed Republican, and Dakota county's Sen. Paul Thuet, a devoted Democrat. Both Republican and DFL state conventions have endorsed party designation repeatedly, and both GOP and DFL state chairmen made vigorous arguments for the Langley-Thuet bill at Tuesday's committee hearing. Non-partisan, "good government" groups like the League of Women Voters have urged party designation for years.

But key legislators continue to oppose it, and the apparent reason is that they have a "vested interest" in a legally non-partisan legislature. Either because their names are now so well known in their districts, or because they are men of outstanding ability, or because they have unusual voter magnetism of some other sort, these incumbents have been re-elected repeatedly on non-party tickets. Thus successful, they don't want to jeopardize their positions by running as Republicans or DFLers "compulsively" in future other to run. These veteran incumbents want to keep election in the legislature a personal rather than a party affair because they've mastered the personal system. They want voters to choose between two individuals for senator or representative just as they choose between two individuals for county sheriff or county auditor. They don't want to encourage voters to choose between legislative candidates with reference to the state political issues that divide our two parties even though those are the issues that are really significant for Minnesota's future and the issues that successful legislators will decide in St. Paul. In a word, these incumbents find it more comfortable not to take a political stand.

The essence of this issue, however, is John Q. Voter's right to know. Does he have a right to know from reading his ballot whether candidates for state representative and state senators consider themselves Republicans, DFLers, or Independents? We think he does, and we think the rights of the voter ought to take precedence over what is politically convenient for entrenched incumbents, however able and high minded.

One influential member of the Senate committee to which Langley addressed his appeal on Tuesday is Wabasha county's Sen. Robert Dunlap. He has stated his opposition to party labels and will undoubtedly help kill the bill. And he's a first-class senator generally. But DFL readers who live in Wabasha county might ask him why he is so unwilling to let them know, through identification on the ballot, of a central persuasion of legislative candidates.



Partially Scanned Material

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/library/.

L.S.U. Legislative Committee
m. 5

December 1962

League began to make plans for P.D. Bill
League legislative committee meetings
telephone calls to legislators inviting them to be authors

January 1963

Political parties were informed of our plans, sought their support and both parties were willing to assist us in every way possible.

State of authors was selected in the house
Unable to secure authors in the senate

Foraythe cautions the League not to work too early to build support, wait for the proper time
Jan. 18 memo

Analysis of E. and R. comm. members made by Ann ^v_Auff

Minneapolis Tribune Jan. 26

Republican Central Com. Meeting

"Minnesota Republican leaders voted to make Party Designation their key objective in the 1963 State Legislature."

A long letter to George Farr, on P.D. from Ann Duff.

Jan. 31

Letters were mailed to many organizations soliciting their help on P.D.
Patty Wash and Ann Duff

February

Republican Central Comm. was able to secure 2 authors

Bill was introduced Feb. 11

Feb. 11. Mr. Farr, Mr. Foraythe and the L.L.C. met in the Capitol to discuss plans for a hearing Feb. 26 in the E. and R. comm.

Local Leagues were urged to write to their senators asking them to support this measure on the E. and R. comm. Republicans ^Y_Y party also worked with their own members.

Authors and supporters of this measure spoke at the hearing. The comm. was to vote the following Thes. Mar. 5.

Many phone calls to the Republican C. C. and conferences with authors from the Senate and Rep. Klaus from the House.

DFL

news

BUREAU

For Immediate Release:
March 23, 1963

1637 HENNEPIN AVENUE • MINNEAPOLIS 3, MINNESOTA • 335-9421
In a special statement prepared for release today, George Farr, Minnesota DFL Chairman, said, "State Senator _____ helped defeat party designation last week in the Minnesota legislature."

"The League of Women Voters-sponsored bill providing for party designation for legislators was killed in the Minnesota state senate last week. Senator _____ and 9 other Conservative senators could have kept the measure alive.

"The Republican party was not able to deliver a single vote for party designation at the crucial time. Republican-Conservative senators may offer parliamentary excuses for not voting for the bill but the fact of the matter is that the Republican party was a part of the discussion with the League of Women Voters and the DFL on how best to proceed to pass party designation. They knew the plan. They helped develop the strategy. They voiced their approval and support and then did not deliver one single vote on the floor of the Minnesota senate.

"Everyone of the 24 DFL Liberal senators supported the party designation bill.

"The Republican party platform claims to support this item. Most Republican senators during the course of the campaign pledged themselves to support this measure. Many of them answered League of Women Voters questionnaires pledging their support. None of them kept their promise or lived up to their pledge.

"With the 24 liberals supporting the bill any 10 Conservative senators who had the courage of their conviction could have provided the necessary margin for passage. Unfortunately, none of them exhibited this courage.

"The bill originally had been buried in the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee. Unless the bill could be removed from the committee it could not be acted upon during this session of the legislature. The motion was made on the floor of the senate by Senator Paul Thuest of Dakota county to take the bill from the committee. Every Liberal senator supported the motion; no Republican Conservative did.

"This is an unique contrast to the multiple ownership bill pertaining to the liquor stores in the 1959 legislative session. In that session, Conservatives found that they could support a motion to withdraw a bill from the Committee. They cannot now plead senate tradition as an excuse for their failure to act. Party designation is dead -- Senator _____ and his colleagues helped to kill it.

November 4, 1963

Mr. George A. Farr, Chairman
DFL State Central Committee
1637 Hennepin Avenue

Minneapolis 3, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Farr:

Thank you for your letter of October 9th regarding party designation. This came to the office while I was out of town.

We will be calling you soon to make an appointment for a meeting to discuss plans.

Sincerely,

Mrs. William W. Whiting
President

AW:rw

NOT 1 1963

Office

10/10/63

TO: Marj. Johnson
FROM: Ann Duff
SUBJECT: Party Designation contacts that need charging up for '65.
(It's moments like this that I miss so badly a P.R. chairman)

GOP -

Bob Forsythe & Dave Krogseng (sp?) want P.D. in worst way but are not able to overpower Conservative leadership (Rosenmeier) in Senate. In 1965 session, we're dead in the Senate. Will have to rely on GOP to get, if possible, Senate authorship. When they fail, we'll face unhappy decision of whether to drop it or carry on a newspaper campaign. Regardless of what we do the DFL leadership in both Houses & outside too will embarrass the daylights out of us. Happy day! We're in good shape in the House and may get better if a few more GOP-oriented Conservatives get elected (so they can replace Duxbury as Speaker) or if DFL should take over.

Peg Spoo, Rochester, becoming active in southern Minn. GOP

Doris Guthrie, state Workshop Pres., former LNW state leg. chairman

Mrs. M. J. Gjertson - county chairwoman, Worthington

D. J. Black, McLeod County chairman - 920 2nd Ave. S.W., Hutchinson

Connie Dillingham - St. Paul - former state chairwoman

Mrs. Albert Marshall (Bets) - past First Congressional District chairwoman (I think she

DFL - favors P.D. but not sure)
Solid support everywhere. George Parr is very knowing and wise on this issue. The 1963 DFL caucus vote in the legislature looked better than it really is. They had lots of fun showing a united front (except for a few lost souls in the House) and embarrassing the Conservatives.

PRESS

Phil Duff - Red Wing Republican Eagle

D. C. Townsend - Belle Plaine Herald

Arthur J. Suel (just finished term as Pres. MNA) - New Prague Times

Robert C. King - Fergus Falls Daily Journal

Mpls. Star & Trib - longtime supporters. I'm disappointed to see this past year the wishy-washy editorials on this front. We have work to do here

Jim Vance - Worthington Globe

Curt Miller - The Labor World, Duluth

Charles Withers - Rochester Post Bulletin - lukewarm support after major LL effort

John Tilton - suburban newspapers Inc., Hopkins - strongly favors. He's a fascinating crusty old very conservative Republican from the east who thinks among other things that the LNW has gone out of date and should be buried!

Minneapolis Labor /Review

St. Paul Union Advocate

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS -

Mrs. Victor Cohn, chm. Minn. Committee on State Legislation, Nat'l Council of Jewish Women - 4845 Irving Ave. S., Mpls. 9

Clint Hess - Minn. Farmers' Union - executive secretary I think

GOP Workshop - Doris Guthrie, past pres. & formerly LNW state legislative chm.

Robert E. Hess, executive v.p., Minn. Federation of Labor

George Rice - WCCO-TV editorialist - thinks we're splendid too!

American Assn. of University Women - taken Party Designation as study topic this year

Mrs. Wray Hiller (Dort) - Marshall, Minn. former Board member with me in Deephaven - she's definitely for it and currently acting as AAUW area study chm, I guess also writing in asking for information:

Mrs. Harris Gausman - pres. I think, Route 2, Morris, Minn. and

Mrs. Ronald Kennedy, 5513 Chantrey Rd., Edina 24

Mrs. Robert Maze, State legislative chm, I think, 3312 Skycroft Drive, Mpls 18

see copy of my Sept. 20, 1963 letter to her and accompanying note

P.S. I found my copy of that Trib article - want a copy? Quite different from Bob

INDIVIDUALS -

Dr. Charles Backstrom - Social Science Tower, U. of M. these 2 are currently think-
Dr. Ralph Fjelstad - Carleton College, Northfield in other issues may
Dr. G. Theodore Mitau - Macalester College, St. Paul perhaps be more im-
Dr. Harold Chase - U. of M. - "put the label on the man" portant
Edwin C. Range - Coon Rapids - I know nothing about him except a
lengthly editorial in Mpls. Sunday Trib 1/13/63
James Levy - St. Paul attorney & active DFL
Bill Carlson - insurance & former DFL legislator - St. Paul
(names given to me as possibles for appearing before 1965 legislature with us -
Dr. John Neumaier, Pres. Moorhead State College, wife former State Board member,
and Dr. W. E. Lillo, head of Sociology Dept. Concordia College, Moorhead). I
can't imagine either of these people taking an active role - the appropriations
for their colleges would suffer terribly - but who knows?
Suggested to me for testimony by Hutchinson LNW (Ruth Frieve):
Mrs. Ed Kraemer, Winsted (DFL Distric chairwoman, also a LNW member)
Miss June Otterness, 338 Lake, Hutchinson - elementary school principal, former
LNW member and state pres. Minn. Education Assn.
Delwin Derfield, Route 2, RR. depot employee, wife's a LNW member
Jack Cahpman, R.F.D. 3, Shady Didge, Hutchinson, (O. of C. Pres.)
Helmuth Kurth, Citizens Bank, Hutchinson (president & LNW contributor)
Bev Valvolis - St. Paul League member & mayor's wife - worked with Mary Mantis at
Capitol and suggested for testimony:
Reuel D. Harmon, St. Paul Chamber of Commerce Board - 1999 Shepard Rd., or
residence - No. 1 Sunfish Lake
Philip Nason - First National Bank St. Paul, pres. - 1373 Summit Ave.
Wm William Blake - Northwestern National Bank, St. Paul

Minnesota Bar Assn. - we should do some looking around here. I don't know how
they feel - Cyrus A. Field, President, Fergus Falls (ask Lois Mann)

Saycees too

M TO: Dort Hiller, Marshall
E
M FROM: Roberta Williams
O SUBJECT Party Designation

Letter + copy of memo
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

to Annally
STATE ORGANIZATION SERVICE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS 4, MINNESOTA
PHONE: 373-2959

DATE 9/10/63

Yes, I do know that the branches of the AAUW are studying Party Designation - we all hope they will decide to support it. I have previously sent material to a couple of the state officers - forget their names.

Enclosed are a couple PB folders - they sell 2/5¢ - and a sheet done a year ago called "Some Say-Others Say" - these are in limited supply and sell for 2¢ each. We have practically an unlimited supply of the folders.

Got rather a shock at your note addressed to Grace and then realized there was no way for you to know (probably) that she had retired the last of March this year. See her quite often but certainly miss her here in the office. I forget whether or not you knew her family - her husband had a stroke and has been in the hospital for the past 2½ months but is expected to make a complete recovery in time.

Do let me know if either of these pieces on PD will be helpful to you. Your program for the 21st sounds exciting. Oh, yes, note new address - we're now on the west bank of the campus.

17/10
Mrs. Robert Maze
American Assn. of University Women
5512 Skycroft Drive
Minneapolis 18, Minn.

September 20, 1965

Dear Mrs. Maze:

I'm delighted to hear the AAUW may wish to study and perhaps take a position on the issue of Party Designation. As you know, it's a basic governmental reform in the election laws field - comparable in its importance to the issue of Reapportionment which we fought and bled so long and hard for. To us it was very satisfying to see the major contributions made in this past Legislative session by the new legislators many of course who came from these newly reapportioned districts. Any major governmental reform is extremely hard to come by as you know and it looks as if Party Designation will take about as long to achieve as did Reapportionment.

I'm inclosing an extra copy of Bob Forsythe's statement on Party Designation to the Senate Elections & Reapportionment Committee Feb. 26, 1965. It's yours to keep. Also inclosed is our folder Minnesota Needs Party Designation for Legislators. I have misplaced a newspaper article which points up the 1915 importance of the Wet-Dry issue and mentions that the state lost Party Designation as a rider on a liquor bill.

Good luck to you in your workshops and do let me know what you decide!

Cordially,

Mrs. Nicholas E. Duff
Legislative Chairman
League of Women Voters of Minnesota

M TO: Annette & Marj

E FROM: Ann

M
O SUBJECT thoughts on the get-together
with the Gov. & George Farr

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

STATE ORGANIZATION SERVICE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS 4, MINNESOTA
PHONE: 373-2959

NOV 26 1963

DATE 11/22/63

The Governor - main purpose to lay a cordial channel of communication with him. Commend him on fine job of building community support for problems of government (tour of institutions with citizens & legislators in last night's Star, SCAD appointments), that we recognize & appreciate this. The real nuts and bolts of your meeting will be before hand with Sally Luther (I have more respect for her ability, knowledge, kindness & concern than almost anyone else I can think of in women in public life - equal to Betty Kane and National Committee Woman Mrs. Joseph and of course Eugenie Anderson. Equalled only by my respect a few years ago for Marj Howard, Maybeth Hurd Paige, May Slocum and Ma Duff on the other side of the political fence - Wish they had people like that today leading the GOP on the female side - Connie Billingham was good and maybe hersuccessor is too; I don't know her.) Save lots of time to talk to Sally - excellent League contact - before Gov. Try out lots of our program items on her & if she nibbles at any of them jump in on it with both feet the the Governor. Particularly productive may be our election laws and Constitution thoughts. Contact Sally again 6 months from now on Home Rule - when we know a little bit more about where we're going on it. Polution and Water Resources development are of particular importance to him - lots of room here for future cooperation but not yet. Opinion must crystallize in LAs and the desire to do something should come from some of them (watershed get-togethers, Miss. etc. the national hearings)- first.
George Farr - He's pulling our leg of course on P.D. Let him know kindly and jokingly

that we are aware of this. Let him know that right off the bat in the '65 session (first day or 2 on floor, but we'll carefully lay it ahead with both caucuses) we shall be working hand in glove with Fred Cina on our Ethics item (read the legislative report again on this to see the whats and hows but bear in mind that until after the election we do not know which caucus will be controlling the House and it's possible that some of our supporters on this issue may not get re-elected but Cina's safe.) I think the purpose of George Farr's luncheon from his point of view is to lay it on the line with us (and I think Betty Kane shall be following up on this a few months from now) that if we want our program adopted, we'd jolly well better tell our members who votes for ~~for~~ our items in the Legislature. If the Liberals had controlled both Houses last session most of our program items would now be law - they do not have the seniority problem of the GCF & Conservatives; the DFL simply lays down the law and the Liberals hop. But of course we can not admit any of this - that bossism is one thing (plus free spending ~~and~~ and later domination) which so many of our members object to in the DFL. What we must say again and again of course is that we work for issues, not personalities or political parties (we're having our peak of troubles right now with Democratic committee chairmen in Congress on the foreign aid mess). To which George Farr will say, "O.K. lets settle for your publishing voting records on Party Designation next summer." This is possible and the Board may wish to consider it at a later date.

Mention to both the Gov. & Farr that we are about to come out with a factual plus carefully pre-con piece on taconite. And we haven't any idea what our membership will decide on it. They will be suffering through the economic growth vs. constitutional sanctity - a very tough decision for them and heaven help us all. Be sure that none of us admits to any possible conclusion one way or the other on this. Both of them are on record in support but there are wide cleavages in the party on the range as well as in the legislature among Liberals on this but nobody is admitting to any of it because they are on record in support.

PARTY DESIGNATION in 1953 SESSION

This received prime emphasis by the LNV. At the state Council Meeting in May 1952, Miss Shimmin and Mrs. Duff held legislative workshops using Party Designation as an example. (See accompanying workshop material.)

In December of 1952, planning began for the Party Designation bill with Mrs. Mantis, our superb lobbyist, starting her telephone calls to legislators inviting them to be authors.

January 1953: Political parties were informed of our plans, sought their support and both parties were willing to assist us in every way possible. Slate of authors selected in the House; unable to secure authors in Senate. Forsythe cautions the League not to work too early to build support, wait for proper time. (Jan. 18 memo). Analysis of House and Senate Committees made by Mrs. Duff. January 26 statewide GOP meeting; Minneapolis Tribune: "Minnesota Republican leaders voted to make Party Designation their key objective in the 1953 State Legislature." Letters mailed to many organizations soliciting their help on Party Designation by Mrs. Wash (turned up almost nothing - so skip for the future.)

February: Republican Central Committee secures 2 Senate Conservative authors and bill was introduced Feb. 11. That noon Mr. Farr, Mr. Forsythe, Mrs. Mantis, Anderson and Duff met in the Capitol to discuss plans for a hearing Feb. 26th in the Senate E. & R. Committee. (Late January a most fascinating committee meeting, chaired by our chief author in the House, Mr. Klaus where he brought together all the elements of support in both caucuses, hashed out their differences in approach and decided on a unified front of action. Mrs. Mantis, Duff and Wright attended. Almost everybody there had his own Party Designation bill sticking out his back pocket. Much fascinating discussion of where to place names on machine or paper ballots, how about at large districts, independent category??? etc. etc.) Letters flying back and forth between authors, League committee, political parties. Local Leagues were urged to write to their senators asking them to support this measure on E. & R. committee. Republican party also worked with their own members. Action in House and Senate were timed to coincide. This involved a surprise maneuver mid-Feb. in the House where because of an impossible committee Mr. Klaus planned to get the bill directly on the floor by amending it to an innocuous election law. As luck would have it, that particular law (one of Forrest Talbot's but only the author, not Talbot, knew about the plan) got hung up in committee and in the meantime one of the Liberals not in the know threw in his Party Designation bill so that ended the surprise maneuver. Meanwhile things moved onward in the Senate where authors and supporters spoke at the committee hearing. Endless phone calls, conferences etc. etc.

March: Senate committee defeats bill 10-7 (all the Liberals plus Ogdahl and Bergerud voted yes). Senator Morn Larson moves to table the bill. March 7: Bipartisan committee met and decided on the strategy of the bill in the Senate. We were assured of 12 to 14 votes from the Conservatives and 22-24 from the Liberals. Kept in constant touch with political leaders in regards to when it could be called on the floor under Rule 71. March 8, Rep. Klaus introduces bill into House. March 13 urged legislative observers to write to their members. March 15 another meeting with all 5 Senate authors plus Mr. Klaus and Republican Central Committee. Final arrangements were discussed, L. Larson was to request the bill out and Thust and Langley to support this motion. Republicans were to interview each of the yes Senate Conservatives to be sure of that vote margin. Call to Action to the Leagues from these areas to mail letters special delivery to arrive in Senate chambers Monday March 16.

March 16 Minneapolis reporter called Mrs. Mantis about an article he was writing on Party Designation after talking with Lew Larson. Asked Mrs. M. all kinds of questions and said L. Larson made his position clear that he is planning to bring this bill out. Thought it could help the cause. Mrs. Mantis called Mrs. Duff because she was skeptical about his reasoning since we were trying hard to keep it quiet. Mrs. D. got reporter to remove part but city editor put it back in. March 17 long article appeared in Sunday's Tribune. "It's going to be close" said Larson "and it's going to be interesting." March 18 noon, Mrs. Mantis called Republican Central Committee; they had not completed their survey. 5 PM still working on the senators. I was to call back at 5 PM. Things look pretty good said David Krogneng, "we're having a few problems but it looks O.K.". Mr. Johnson (exec. sec.) talked with Senator Zwach about this matter. We have good relations there and did not want to put anything over him." March 19, Senator Thust's office calls Mrs. Mantis informing her the Conservative authors will not be able to bring the bill out. That's all she knew.

The rest of the ins and outs in both Houses are reported at length in the issues of Capitol Letter.

April: See inclosed copy of Minnesota Newspaper Assn. release sent to all papers in the state giving details of Senate action March 27. See also inclosed copy of letter sent by Mrs. Duff to the local Leagues which received the Call to Action March 16th. There was wide coverage in the local Leagues and in the press around the state giving many details of what happened. Repressions everywhere. George Farr took to the air and press blasting the Senate Conservatives for "betraying the LNV" etc. etc. In Red Wing, Rochester, Edina and perhaps others we have not heard directly about, the fur flew. The Conservative Legislators really got blasted via the press and their party and the League too for being publically in favor of an issue but then not voting for it. See press clippings, ~~local~~ local League letters etc.

Over in the House the committee was clobbering the bill (see Capitol Letter) but through the brilliance of our authors Bassett and Klaus a way was figured out - filing formal notice under Rule 56 a week in advance and then calling that Rule before 2 & R subcommittee got to the chair with their amended, slaughtered bill - to get the original Party Designation bill directly onto General Orders. But 2 days earlier the House had started using Special Orders. So the authors pushed for a roll call to move the bill from General to Special Orders. There were 70 yes votes, 7 short of the necessary 2/3rds. According to our calculations we had only a bare majority and are still trying to figure out where all those extra votes came from.

April 30; Mrs. Mantis lunches with Rep. Klaus and he toys with the thought of doing something. Senator Lew Larson's much-loved gas bill (up 1¢ for more roads money) has passed the House and has final vote in Senate this week. The LNV legislative Committee toys with the thought of approaching Sen. Larson next week. Hanging like a dark cloud over the horizon the entire month of April is a little bit of blackmail. Rumor has it that the opponents of Party Designation in the Legislature are saying to those Conservatives who want to vote for the bill, "You vote yes and we'll make the GOP pay for the recount of the Governor's race." Your choice - the bill and bankruptcy or no bill and solvency. Mr. Klaus is very anxious that this information be kept confidential and we are abiding by his wishes. Peg Spoo from Rochester called Ann Duff the third week in April with this tidbit and somehow - not the LNV - a Rochester reporter picked it up and printed an article about it. Mrs. Spoo is sending a copy to Mr. Klaus (he gently and kindly acknowledges it but does not want even to talk about it) and Mrs. Mantis.

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Mrs. Allan J. Nash, Public Relations
14th and Washington Aves. S. E.
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

February 17, 1963

FOR RELEASE

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota has announced its support of two bills now before the legislature: a bill to provide party designation for state legislators and a bill to provide that the governor and lieutenant governor run jointly and be elected from the same political party. According to Mrs. O. H. Anderson, president of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, both of these bills will tend to strengthen the responsibility of elected officials and make them more responsive to the will of the voter. Both major political parties favor party labels for legislators. This bill will also provide that legislators will automatically become members of their county party committee and thereby will have an opportunity to make platform policy.

Some conservative members of the committees who will hear this bill during the week of February 28 state that the "average voter has no interest in party designation"--this may be true, but if it is, the League of Women Voters feels that it is up to the "average voter" to become aware that his elected representative in St. Paul is not merely "liberal" or "conservative" but is in fact, DFL or Republican and should be willing to stand up and be so counted. At least the Minnesota voter should be given an opportunity to decide on the ballot whether or not he wishes to have his representatives designated by party. This bill would give the voter this opportunity.

The bill to provide that the governor and lieutenant governor shall both be of the same party would make the office of lieutenant governor, now merely titular, with no real duties or responsibilities assigned to it by the governor, a real assistant's job. Under the present arrangement it would indeed be unusual for a governor to delegate important duties to his possible successor if he were of the opposite party. Certainly it is only sensible that the person who would succeed to the governorship in case of death or emergency would be of the same political philosophy as the elected governor. The governor now holds office for a 4-year term and now more than ever before it is important to have both men of the same party. This is a bill on which both Governor Anderson and Lt. Governor Keith agree.

M TO: office, Mary, D.A., Rhea, Hazel

E FROM: Ann

M SUBJECT Party Designation

O DATE 3/22/63

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and WASHINGTON AVES. S.E.

MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

Mary and Rhea are double checking the inclosed report on Senate floor debate on Party Designation. Then Monday AM (please call in early gals with changes) Roberta is stensling it and mailing special - first class that is - direct to the 11 local League legislative chairman who worked so hard last week-end with those "13 definitely yes Conservatives." We think they should know immediately (before George Farr's newspaper ads show up all over the state blasting the GOP) exactly what happened and in a completely factually way. *may require printing extra ones for Wednesday.*

Then Wednesday report to Observer's course: I'm strongly in favor of D.A., Mary Mantis and me putting on a panel bringing out our two separate (and completely different) interpretations of why it happened and what might happen next. I think it's vital in the LWV that we stress the value of divergent opinions and the three of us can do it in a fine way because we all are so fond of one another and admire so much each other's complete devotion to LWV, knowledge of the facts and joint participation in the events of the past 3 months. (Hazel, Dorothy and Mary are convinced the GOP was kidding us all along, never intended to really apply the pressure and produce. They are mad at the 13 GOP-conservative Senate defectors from the cause of Party Designation. I disagree and work from the political premise that now for the first time the votes are there for

passage on the floor of both houses and for that simple reason (not our personal charms, charming as we are) they really threw all they had into it, worked extremely hard and effectively and then ran head-on into that same old stone wall - a "small band of willful men" on the far right fringe of the Conservative caucus. Since the votes are there to over-run Rosenmaier etc. they decided to go ahead and really try it. I feel they are annoyed to their ears with that do-nothing far right handful which insists on calling the tune in Minn. government today. What happened? They lost. But the future is not lost - I think the bill is dead but would not be a bit surprised to see it later on pick up once more Senate Conservative authors (as Klaus carries on his battle in the House) and then we'd pick up the GOP - gratefully for them I'm sure - and be in business.

I'm glad George Farr is coming out with newspaper ads all over the state blasting the GOP - think this might expedite matters. And if Governor Andersen can just hang on another month or so, the problems within that Conservative caucus will really come into focus and it's only a matter of time before the Republican-Conservatives who now ~~will~~ have the votes will decide to use them. And they may very well realize that Party Designation is the vehicle to get that ball rolling.

Office

To Mary Mantis from Ann Duff. Rhea and I are sending you our notes on the Party Designation Hearing on Senate floor 3/21/63. I'm also slipping a copy to Lil - we've got another Capitol Letter deadline staring at ~~us~~ us next week, and Hazel, D.A. etc. And Annette because she called from the airport this afternoon dying to know all.

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF PARTY DESIGNATION 3/21/63

In the car en route to the Capitol, thoughts came to mind:
What a beautiful day -- warm, shiny -- first day of spring. Big snow drifts everywhere. Wouldn't it be fun to have skis underfoot instead of tires? Much too beautiful a day to go to a funeral - Party Designation's funeral. Things were in such good shape until just three days ago; all the pieces of an intricate puzzle falling into place. And then Boom! Monday afternoon the Senate Conservative authors were forced to back out and gone! gone! were all these lovely 13 votes.

But maybe something has happened. Any changes yesterday? This morning?

The Senate Chaplain opens the session: God's inner peace --- never in a hurry even under pressure --- That this may be a good day and much done well.

Lt. Gov. Keith on two parliamentary matters of yesterday's session. Then the endless droning of the clerk reading numbers and titles of bills, bills, bills going into the legislative hopper. I see on the floor

long conference between Senators Thuet and Langley - then nods - Oh, for a long range hearing aid!

Senator Langley strolls down the aisle and stands some while next to the desk where Senator Lew Larson is sitting - no conversation - Mr. Langley picks up Senator Rudy Hanson's newspaper and stands there reading it. Mr. Larson is busy with a note on his desk.

Thuet to Grittner - nod yes

Thuet to Lew Larson - shaking of head

Rudy Hanson to Thuet's desk. Then Thuet to Lew Larson and lots of nods yes!!!

My heart's in my throat - don't think I can stand this suspense. Thuet keeps staring up here in the balcony - where's Mary Mantis?? There she comes in way across in the other balcony with Bev Valvois and Rhea Wright.

avoids
Here we go -- Senator Thuet is on his feet. "Two days ago I gave notice that under Rule 71 I would request that S.F. 514, the Party Designation bill, be withdrawn from the Elections and Reapportionment committee and placed on General Orders -- I request a call of the Senate -- Roll call requested on this motion."

Senator Thuet reviewed the committee hearing mentioning the fair hearing given to the many different segments of the population interested in passage - the two political parties, "the League of Women Voters who actually had this bill prepared for introduction into both House and Senate. . . The committee's action to lay this bill on the table is in effect an attempt to defeat the purpose and function of the committee system. The purpose of committee system is to recommend for passage or defeat. This action to table places the bill in limbo so to speak - neither majority nor minority report is possible... Senate floor is powerless to act. This is an important piece of legislation. Another practical matter - probably only 30 days left in this session Rule 71 requires 21 (~~check this with Rhea~~) days, in the House it's 14 -- if action is to be taken -- all testimony by either side has been produced, nothing the committee wants to do via amendment, so it should now be returned to this body whence it came --- the committee is an arm of this body, to act, ~~not, had~~ to take testimony, to give an opinion to present to this body. Motion to table defeats purpose of committee system. This is not only an author's right but the Senate's right to hear a bill of great consequence. I feel it is important, many members of this Senate feel it is important -- both political forces, League of Women Voters of Minnesita who represent

Thuet quote continued:

both political forces --- "

Senator Zwach: "Point of order!" ~~(Rhea & Mary check me -- I could not see him but thought I recognized the voice)~~ "We're not discussing the merits of this bill -- just the motion."

Thuet: "I have not discussed what's in the bill"

Lt. Gov. Keith: Senator Thuet is in order.

Thuet: "I'll not name other groups -- Some may speak of the sanctity of the committee system -- it's because they are opponents of this bill and do not want it on this floor -- do not want to have to punch that green or red button. I am not opposing the functioning of the committee system - obviously this (rule 71) could not be done with all bills -- committee system must make decisions."

Senator Kroehler: "As chairman of the Elections & Reapportionment Committee, I'm glad to hear the Senator from Dakota County say the bill had a fair hearing -- yesterday you supported committee action (on oleo) -- I hope you uphold the committee system today too ----"

Senator Zwach: "We must look to the purpose of this motion -- that's the point -- aimed at the very heart beat of every legislative body, the committee system -- we work hard, function properly and better, never more representative -- we protect the integrity of the Senate -- purpose of this motion to withdraw is to upset this system -- all the work this committee has done on this bill has not been gone into here -- no one was denied anything -- this bill's not dead -- any member when he gets recognition of the chair can bring up this bill. I believe in the committee system -- we have 1200 some bills. If we yield to one bill how can we deny all of them? We must expedite the committee system. This is not a question of the merits or demerits of this bill -- it is a question of should we break down completely the order of the Senate? We have enough confusion already -- if we do this we'll break down nad confusion will reign supreme."

Senator Salmore: "As a member of the elections committee I know we had a fair hearing -- and nobody in the state of Minnesota appeared in opposition to this bill - nobody - and for this reason it should come to the floor of the Senate."

Senator Bares: "If we say yes to this motion are we for Party Designation?"

Senator Thuet: "I would presume so, yes."

Senator Bergerud: "I favor Party Designation -- was an author in previous session -- I'm going to vote to support the committee action."

Senator Lew Larson: "I'm an author of this bill (chief author) -- I still favor Party Designation -- my party still favors it ---I also believe in the committee system of our legislature -- very basic. I vote against this motion but if it passes I reserve the right to carry on and get this bill passed."

Senator Grittner: --- "fair weather friends for Party Designation --- In Washington the United States Senate took 5 weeks to organize committees because some insisted in going along with old rules -- took so much time because of disagreement over representation on these committees and their outlook on issues -- I'm not particularly proud that we organized so quickly -- got a bill out so soon...Are you for or against Party Designation -- or are you fair weather friends for it at election time only or when you're making speeches before public-spirited bodies where it sounds good -- You'll never get it out of the Elections and Reapportionment committee as presently constituted ---"

League ladies: I'm sending Walter Klaus a copy of this. He was so anxious to know all - conferred at length afterwards with Thuet. xx ANN

Senator Parish: This tabling in committee is a "technical devise to prevent the Senate from coming to grips on this bill -- boggy man -- Senate can't function if we bring this bill out -- House amends it to death --/ The League of Women Voters *shick* will let the people know this is the way it was killed -- this is a *shick* way to kill it -- either you do it today or not -- record vote now -- you support Party Designation or not -- I'll bet you can't duck this."

Senator Rosenmaier: "This is not a matter of the integrity of individuals or a test of a person's feelings on Party Designation -- some say I'm against Party Designation -- this question today transcends the merits of any bill-- The author of this motion is using a parliamentary maneuver to get a roll call vote; he has no thought that this motion goes to the merits of this bill, no thought it's yes or no on Party Designation. That's beneath the intelligence of the mover of this motion -- just a parliamentary trick. When that issue (Party Designation) comes before us properly it'll be voted either up or down -- Committee did not fail not to act -- voted down the bill to pass -- they acted. Committees are set up with care, large enough, diverse enough to be true cross-section of this body itself -- not controlled by mere partisanship -- The issue here now -- we will have now a parliamentary crisis or we will not."

Senators Kalina and Grittner very busy with huge books - rules, statutes??

Senator Thuet: -- "committee has not fulfilled its function -- rule 71 is for people who feel this -- How has the committee acted? If they want a No committee report, fine - it was not an overwhelming vote as previous speaker said, vote was 10-7 against - if the committee votes No, fine, then we can bring it to this floor -- This (tabling) is obviously a parliamentary maneuver to get out of having to vote on Party Designation. .. This bill not dead? What further can be done to bury this corpse? Committee did not want to take action - that's why they tabled-- We have the specter of various groups looking over our shoulder -- the republican (broad sense of the term) view of society. Their wishes should be at least considered.-- The argument evolves to this - don't rock the boat - what General Mills says is good for the country - what the committee says is good for the Senate.--- About the orderly function of committees, you'll recall S.F. 1149 and 1150 (taconite I think-ASD) we heard them even before they were introduced -- millions of dollars, special motion on the floor - boom - then Senate sent it back to Judiciary -- perhaps we were right to ignore the committee system in that case -- perhaps there was need for speed; it comes up for vote ~~the~~ (people ASD) one and one-half years from now! We are not consistent -- The only point I have is that the committee system has not functioned -- it has not brought out a report. Your public statements of support seem to be melting away - ~~what's happened to the support of the committee system?~~ well, this is the first day of spring, maybe things do melt away on this day -- We're sophisticated enough to know what we're voting on and the full ramifications if this entire matter--/ Senator Kroehler says I'm a Conservative causing Liberal - your views are perhaps colored by an aura of friendship. I want your friendship, but I must confess I am a Democrat, always have been and probably always will be -- I hope we can keep our friendship--"

Then the vote on the motion: 24-41 motion defeated. Straight party line - opps - caucus line vote.

Balcony drama: I and dozens add dozens of school children filed in promptly at 10 AM. Then children left and rows and rows of ladies wearing yellow tags. Then part way through floor debate they left and in straggled man after man after man filling first several rows. I spotted Gordon Forbes and would bet my bottom dollar most of the others were special interest lobbyists too. An audible sigh of relief went up after the vote -- many broad smiles, affectionate claps on the backs and in one large body they filed out chatting gaily.

*Officer in the Field
that of this matter*
Corothy - it would be nice if you could drop him a note too. If you are thinking about calling George Farr and urging him to blast the 15 Conservatives - please don't!! The fault lies not with them but with that "small band of willful men". That far right fringe of the Conservative caucus is what should be blasted and their pressures and techniques. xxx Ann

The Honorable Paul Thuest

Senate Chambers

St. Paul 1, Minnesota 55405 March 21, 1963

Dear Senator Thuest:

You were simply magnificent today! Party Designation owes you a deep debt of gratitude. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

After lunch I met Rep. Blane on the stairs and I made some comment about "Well, now we can tend to other matters of business." I was very surprised to hear he's even more determined than ever to get the bill to the floor of the House and discussed various strategy and caucus problems. He had talked at length with you about Senate debate and mentioned your plans to carry on weekly in committee and on floor. In the course of our chat I picked up a thought for you next week:

Mr. Rosenzweig made an obvious error in this comment, the Senate committees are "large enough and diverse enough to be true cross-section of this body itself." Rather than analyzing the Elections & Reapportionment Committee, it might be better to point out the different reception received by the oleo bill in the two different committees it has gone to. Mr. Blane's comment about Mr. R's statement was, "Well then, why should there be any objection to bringing it to the floor of the Senate?"

I gather the leadership over in the House side is just as worried as is the Senate leadership - both are fully aware that Party Designation would pass either floor in no time at all. It's going to be most

to match the rest of this session and see all the various ways used to keep that bill off the floor of both houses.

dropped my note
I'm dropping a note to Senators Lew Larson and Langley to try and bolster their spirits a bit and encourage them to prevail upon Senator Froehner to let the bill come to the Senate floor.

Cordially and thanks again,

Mrs. Nicholas D. Buff
Legislative Chairman

File
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Mrs. Allan J. Wash, Public Relations
15th and Washington Aves. S. E.
Minneapolis 14, Minn.

April 2, 1963

To the editor: As you know the League of Women Voters of Minnesota has been working hard throughout this session of the Minnesota legislature for the passage of a party designation bill. (This would make it mandatory for candidates for the state legislature to file and run under their party label.) It now seems that our efforts as well as those of the DFL and Republican party leaders have been to no avail. We also feel that the reason for failure of this bill has been tight control within the caucuses rather than the will of the individual legislators. We thought you might be interested in informing your readers of the fascinating events in the political arena that have led to this stalemate. We hope that if you decide to use any of the material in the "Capitol Letter" which we are enclosing, that you will refrain from using any of the quotes out of context.

The following has been prepared for your use if you do not care to use the chronological story as told in the Capitol Letter.

Party designation for state legislators has shown more life and vitality even in defeat than either its proponents or opponents believed it would display at the beginning of this session of the legislature. The bill, referred to the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee, after its introduction by Senator Paul Thuet, received a fair hearing in this committee. Both political parties, George Farr, state chairman of the DFL party, Robert Forsythe, state chairman of the Republican party, and Mrs. O. H. Anderson, president of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota testified for favorable consideration of the bill. There were no speakers to testify in opposition to the bill. At this point although he declined to testify, Senator Rosenmeier wished it noted that he stood in opposition to the bill. The motion to recommend passage of the bill was defeated 10-7. In order to forestall any further action on this measure a motion to lay the bill on the table was introduced and passed. This does in effect "kill" the measure. The only way that a bill may be removed from the table and brought to the floor of the Senate is under Senate Rule #71. This rule provides protection for the minority and allows the author of the bill to request the bill from committee to the floor of the senate for consideration.

In requesting the bill under Rule #71, Senator Thuet on March 21 stated that he believed the function of the committee was to recommend bills to pass or not to pass and that the Elections and Reapportionment Committee in tabling this

measure had not fulfilled this purpose. In the vote on whether or not to bring the bill from the committee caucus lines held firm. The vote was 24 Liberals "Yes" and 41 Conservatives "No."

On March 26 in the regular meeting of the Elections and Reapportionment Committee, Senator Coleman made a motion to remove the Party Designation bill from the table. Senator Sinclair then moved that the committee stand adjourned. (This motion for adjournment takes precedence.) The motion for adjournment passed.

Senator Theut on March 27 on the floor of the Senate again moved to withdraw the bill from committee and bring it to the floor, under Senate Rule #71. Upon being pressed as to the propriety of the motion, Senator Thuet asked for a ruling from the chair as to whether or not his motion was in order. Lt. Governor Keith, presiding, ruled that it was. After some discussion, the Senate adjourned in order to work out the controversy. Attempts to compromise the matter failed. When the Senate reconvened, Senator Rosenmeier moved to appeal the ruling of the chair. The vote was 42-23 to reverse the ruling of the chair. This seems to have been, in the memory of all concerned, a singular procedure. Lt. Governor Keith said, "I believe in my heart the correct ruling was made."

Refusing to take "no" for an answer, on April 2, at the regular meeting of the E & R Committee another attempt was made by Senator Coleman to bring the Bill out of the committee. This also failed.

Although the central committees of both political parties worked with the League of Women Voters throughout the strategy planning sessions for action which might have given this bill a chance to be heard on the floor of the senate, the control of the Conservative Caucus overrode all the pressure the Republican party could bring to bear on the legislators, many of whom were elected with endorsement and support of the party. The League of Women Voters cannot help but conclude that although citizens will continue to participate in hammering out party objectives from the precinct level up through the state conventions--their elected state legislators will not be responsible for carrying out party programs. Instead, particularly in the Senate, we will continue to have a powerful, tight-knit little group of "bosses" whose nod determines whether or not a bill is given the consideration of the Senate as a whole.

Capitol



Letter

a publication of the
League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Vol. III, No. 5

Editor: Mrs. R. A. Jensen
President: Mrs. O. H. Anderson
April 3, 1963

THE PRESSURES ARE FIERCE, say observers....

The 1963 Party Designation story reads like a whodunit. The corpse keeps coming to life. Extraordinary measures have been taken to kill it again and again. Here is the drama!

Scene: Minnesota Senate

Background music: Powerful Conservative opposition. Theme: Lawmakers should be "independent." They should not have "party bosses" telling them how to vote.

Synopsis of Act 1: With able assistance from both political parties, the League of Women Voters secured authors for the bill. S.F. 514 was introduced Feb. 11 and referred to the Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee. Hearings were held Feb. 27 and Mar. 6. Among the proponents testifying were the Republican and DFL state chairmen and the LWV. No opponents spoke, although a couple strolled in. Sen. Rosenmeier, Conservative committee member, wished it noted that he was opposed. A motion to recommend passage of the bill lost, 10 to 7. A motion to lay the bill on the table was adopted.

Intermission: Conferences and more conferences among party leaders, authors, the LWV. Support of at least 13 Conservative senators and all the Liberals (24) seemed assured—a comfortable majority for passage if the bill could come before the Senate. A plan was agreed to. At the appropriate time



under Rule 71* Sen. Lew Larson-C, chief author, would move on the Senate floor to withdraw the bill from committee. The other two authors (Langley-C, Thuet-L) would support him.

On Mar. 18, after Sen. Larson had revealed the plan and the press had reported his intention to move for withdrawal, the plan changed. Sen. Larson would not make such a motion after all.

Synopsis of Act 2: On Mar. 21 the Liberal author—Sen. Thuet—arose on the Senate floor and moved that S.F. 514 be withdrawn from the E & R Committee and placed on general orders. The function of a committee, he said, is to recommend bills to pass or not to pass. This function had not been fulfilled with respect to the PD bill. It was tabled. That puts it in limbo, makes neither a majority nor a minority report possible, renders the Senate power-

* RULE 71: Majority of the Senate may at any time recall a bill from any committee or take a bill from the table and place such a bill on general orders.

less to act on it, and thus defeats the purpose of the committee system. It is not only an author's right, but the Senate's right, to hear a bill of great consequence. Rule 71 exists to protect that right. Some may speak of the sanctity of the committee system, he went on. It is because they are opponents of this bill and do not want it on the floor--do not want to have to punch that green or red button.

Sen. Zwach-C: We must look to the purpose of this motion. It is aimed at the very heart of every legislative body--the committee system. Withdrawing this bill would break down completely the order of the Senate and cause confusion to reign supreme. No one has been denied anything, he said. This bill is not dead. Any (committee) member, when he gets recognition of the chair, can bring up this bill. (See Act 3.)

Sen. Bares-L: If we say yes to this motion, are we for Party Designation?

Sen. Thuet: I would presume so, yes.

Sen. Bergerud-C: I favor PD, but I'm going to vote to support the committee action (against the motion).

Sen. Lew Larson: I'm an author of this bill. I still favor PD. My party still favors it. I also believe in the committee system. I will vote against this motion, but if it passes I reserve the right to carry on and get the bill passed.

Sen. Grittner-L: Are you for PD or against it? Or are you fair weather friends--for it only at election time when you are making speeches before public-spirited groups where it sounds good? You will never get this bill out of the E & R Committee as that committee is presently constituted.

Sen. Parish-L: Tabling in committee is a technical device to prevent the Senate from coming to grips on this bill--a slick way to kill it. Saying the Senate couldn't function if we pass this motion is raising a bogeyman. Either you support PD on this record vote today or you don't.

Sen. Rosenmeier-C: This is not a test of how we stand on the bill itself. Some say I am against PD. When the issue comes before us properly, it will

be voted either up or down. The issue today is--will we have a parliamentary crisis or not?

Sen. Thuet: We are sophisticated enough to know what we are voting on.

Then came the vote; 24 Liberals voted "yes," 41 Conservatives voted "no." Caucus lines held firm. In one section of the balcony where several lobbyists were foregathered, an audible sigh of relief went up. Smiling broadly, they filed out in a body. LWV observers were not smiling.

Synopsis of Act 3: On Tuesday, Mar. 26, the E & R Committee held its regular 8:00 a.m. meeting. At 8:40 Sen. Coleman-L, said he would like to make a motion to bring S.F. 514 out of committee. Sen. Sinclair-C, moved to adjourn. (A motion to adjourn takes precedence.) The motion carried, and the committee meeting ended--early. Sen. Coleman's only comment was, "Well, I tried."

Synopsis of Act 4: The following day, Mar. 27, Sen. Thuet moved again on the Senate floor to withdraw the Party Designation bill from the E & R Committee where it was still "on the table." Refusing to yield to Sen. Rosenmeier, he asked the chair to rule on whether his motion was in order. Lieutenant Governor Keith ruled that it was. In the ensuing debate Sen. Rosenmeier argued that the matter had been disposed of on Mar. 21 and could not be brought up a second time--that the only recourse would have been a move for reconsideration within two days. (Such a motion would have to be made by someone who had voted on the prevailing side.)

At 11:30 the Senate recessed until 4:00 p.m. According to Sen. Zwach, majority leader, the object of the recess was to allow time to work out the controversy, but attempts to compromise the matter failed.

When the Senate reconvened at 4:00 Sen. Rosenmeier moved to appeal the ruling of the chair. He argued that if the chair's interpretation of Rule 71 were allowed to stand, Sen. Thuet could make the same motion day after day and there never would be an end. (The St.

Paul Pioneer Press reported Sen. Thuet had indicated outside the Senate chamber that he did not intend to continue his efforts in this manner.) On the floor Sen. Thuet argued that rules are for the protection of the minority; further, that Sen. Rosenmeier's interpretation of the rule would make the Senate subservient to its committees and that committees would be relieved of their responsibility to report to the Senate. Sen. Rosenmeier agreed that rules are for the protection of the minority but not to the point where Sen. Thuet could inflict his self-imposed segregation on the Senate. Sen. Wright-C, took the view that the majority is entitled to be protected from political hair pulling directed by the minority.

The vote was 42 to 23 to reverse the chair's decision--again strictly along caucus lines. So the ruling of the chair was reversed. An extraordinary measure? Nobody is sure it ever happened before. In the memory of H. Y. Torrey, Senate Clerk for 25 years and

Senate employee for 8 years before that, this is the first time such action has been taken. Lieutenant Governor Keith said, "I believe in my heart the correct ruling was made."

Epilogue (editorial comment): It looks as if Minnesota's legislators will continue to be "independent," safe from the dictation of "party bosses." Many citizens will continue to participate in hammering out party objectives--from the precinct level right up to the state conventions--but their legislators will not be responsible for carrying out their party's program. Instead, particularly in the Senate, we will continue to have a powerful, tight-knit little group of "bosses" whose nod determines whether a bill is voted up or down, in committee and on the floor. Addendum: Apr. 2 saw a re-run of Act 3, with Sen. Rosenmeier moving to adjourn. "Is the author here?" he asked. (None is a committee member.) "Very delicate to fool around with a bill when author is not present," said Sen. Rosenmeier.

HOME RULE CHARTER BILL . . .

by Jan Sigford

A bill which would provide a new method for amending home rule charters has been drafted by the League of Minnesota Municipalities and has been introduced in the 1963 legislature (S.F. 597). Aimed at facilitating the modernization of many lengthy and antiquated charter provisions, the bill would authorize a municipal council, after charter commission recommendation, to approve a charter amendment by ordinance by a 2/3 vote of its members. The ordinance could be adopted only after a public hearing after duly published notice and it would be subject to the right of referendum on petition of 5% of the voters, filed within 60 days after passage and publication of the ordinance. A charter amendment on which there is a referendum would not become effective until approved by 55% of the voters voting on the proposition, as is the case with amendments submitted under present methods.

This additional method of amending charters would not apply to any amendment which would:

- 1) change the city's basic form of government;
- 2) increase the tax levy limit in the aggregate or with respect to any particular measure or authorize any new taxes;
- 3) deprive the people of an existing right to vote on a proposition or an office or change the majority required for approval;
- 4) change charter provisions relating to liquor patrol limits or the legal status of the city for the purpose of the sale of liquor;
- 5) authorize the city to issue general obligations in the amount or of the kind not then authorized;
- 6) increase the salary of any elective officer during his term or provide a pension for any officer or employee;
- 7) authorize the city to acquire a

public utility or business affected with a public interest.

Provisions are also included for a summary judicial determination of a contest to decide whether a particular amendment is within the stated exceptions.

The bill also amends an unworkable statutory provision which requires that

a council-initiated amendment must be submitted to the voters even if the council, after charter commission review, decides against such submission.

Because the bill would make it easier to amend home rule charters and provide safeguards against arbitrary council action, it seems to be within the purview of the LNW position on home rule.

IN A NEW LEGISLATOR'S SHOES . . . by Virginia Torgerson-C
State Representative, 2nd District

I am in a somewhat unique position in that the City of Winona has a special charter* and needs a bill from the legislature on everything from tree trimming to jury fees. I came up to the legislature with seven bills requested by the City Council and more have come up to be introduced. I certainly didn't want anyone to think I was bill happy but assumed the legislature would be used to all this Winona legislation and pay little attention to it. Also, being a young and innocent Freshman, I got sucked into being prime author on a couple of no doubt worthy bills which hadn't a chance of passage. As soon as I found out being prime author meant chasing to committees and arguing both in committee and on the floor, nobody has been able to get a pen within 10 feet of me. My poor little Winona bills have been attacked by a couple of Minneapolis Liberals every time they hit the floor. Without a doubt, they have done me the greatest favor in the world because it has made me mad enough to get up and fight. But it shows one of the problems of the legislature--the urban rural split.

Ordinarily, Winona's interests are those of the metropolitan area in that we have the problems of a city in a county where we are not sufficiently represented on the County Board of Commissioners. We send much more income and estate tax money to the state than we ever get back. We are very low in

the amount of school aids we receive. We have no bonded indebtedness to speak of and try to run the city as economically as possible. We do not come to the legislature--hat in hand -- asking for money.

However, our trade area includes many farming communities and rural districts so that I must keep in mind what legislation affects the farmers, too.

We would not think of telling Minneapolis what to do about its city government. Yet when we come up and ask for a special bill enabling our City Council to levy for library purposes or enact a tree trimming levy or some other unimportant local bill, I am attacked on the floor by Minneapolis representatives.

It is a good thing for Winona that I happen to be in the majority this time. They tell me you haven't lived until you have been in both the majority and minority parties, and I'm not sure I want to live all that bad. This has been the hardest work I ever did in my life and I'm well known as a hard worker. It is interesting, fascinating, absolutely frustrating at times, and I enjoy it. I wake up every morning wondering what will happen today and come home at night tired out with just enough energy to read the papers and see what we have done that I haven't heard about in my own committees.

* Winona has a legislative charter, established by state statute in 1895. Should the city desire a home rule charter, it could have a local charter commission appointed and proceed from there.

M
E
M
O

TO: A. Duff

- copy M M.
H.S.

FROM: Grace, for Mary Mantis

SUBJECT P.D.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and WASHINGTON AVES. S.E.

MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

DATE 2/1/63

A. Duff
GB 3-9189

Mary Mantis couldn't reach you, so told me the following....

Rep. Klaus suggests we write, asking help on P.D., the following:

Mrs. Rose Thorburn, 417 N. 3, Marshall, Minn. Pres. Republican Women's Club of Minn.

I'll send "form" letter sent to others. Mary asks me to add note asking her to do what she can to encourage Rep. W. C. Fisher, of Marshall, to support P.D.

Clarence Myers, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, Commerce Bldg., 4 Wabasha, St. Paul. Will do.

Do we know anyone in District 22, Lacqui Parle County, Pederson (Vice Chairman's) district Mary talked to him, said, Well, IF anyone talked to him at home this week end, it might make a difference. Lives in Dawson, Minn.

Rep. State Central Committee today sent every Cons. Repres and Senator a message asking to support P.D. (Klaus showed Mary his copy).

P.D. bill is drafted. Will send copy to office by Monday morning. May include amendment, or change, to please H.C. Wright and Geo. French, re Leg. "entitled" to be member of County Party Committee. IF, Mary says, we see anything to object to in this, let her know!

cc: A.Duff,File,MMantis

A Duff phone - GR 3-9189

February 1, 1963

Mrs. Rose Thorburn
417 North 3rd
Marshall, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Thorburn,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Republican Women's Club of Minnesota in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. E. Anderson
President

P.S. I have just learned from Mrs. Mantis that it would be very helpful if you would talk to Mr. W. C. Fisher of Marshall, your legislator, about Party Designation for Legislators. The enclosed flyer touches on some of the reasons the League thinks this is a good governmental improvement. I'm sure you, as a party leader, would have additional good reasons, based on your Republican party experience. We'll appreciate anything you can do.

Similar letter also to Mrs. Rose Thorburn, 417 No. 3rd, Marshall, also asking her to contact Rep. Fisher of Marshall
CC: File, PWash, H. Shimmin

Feb. 1, 1963

Mr. Clarence Myers
Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation
Commerce Building
4th and Wabasha
St. Paul 1, Minn.

Dear Mr. Myers,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI-4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson,
President

M
E
M
O

TO:

FROM:

SUBJECT

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and WASHINGTON AVES. S.E.

MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

DATE

Mrs. Rose Thorburn - Marshall, Minn
417 N3 - Pres. Rep. Women Club
Add note - hope you will express
your spt in favor of P. D. &
Rep. W. C. Fisher of Marshaps

Clarence Myers - Minn Farmer Bur Fed. -
Commerce Bldg - 4 Wabasha St. - STP, 1

MEMO

TO:

FROM:

SUBJECT

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and WASHINGTON AVES. S.E.

MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

DATE

- ✓ Mr. Clint Hess---Farmers Union
- ✓ Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs - *Van Fairbanks Hall - 4017 Harding blvd*
Ma. - Lewis MINION WINDAM
- ✓ Mrs. Victor Cohn (National Council of Jewish Women) *4845 Irving So - Upt.*
- ✓ Mr. Bert Jones,--St. Louis Park, Junior Chamber of Commerce (Minnesota) *4213 Sailer St*
- ✓ Executive Secretary of Minnesota Newspaper Association - *Wobitail Bldg - Upt.*
- ✓ Minnesota State Bar (Legislative Chairman) - *Thos C. Myers - 5000 Hwy. - Natl Bldg*
Upt.
- ✓ Mrs. Mary Ann Leadholm, President Republican Workshop (Mrs. Carlton) *5547 Clinton*
So - Upt.
- ✓ Mr. Robert Hess, 47 W. 9th. St. St. Paul (AFL-CIO)
- ✓ Mr. George Farr, DE Central Committee
- ✓ Legislative Chairman of Citizens League of Minneapolis *Wobitail Bldg*
- ✓ Mr. Robert Forsythe Central Committee of GOP

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

✓ Mrs. Edna Schwartz, President 608 Bremer Arcade, St. Paul 1, Minn.
Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

✓ Mrs. R. F. Kennedy Legislative Chairman of AAUW
5513 Chantrey Rd. Edina

~~Mr. Robert Granovsky, 34 Legislative Chairman (?)~~

✓ Mrs. Charles Huffman, Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers (president)
426 Hiawatha Ave. - Hopkins

✓ Mrs. Walter Lynn Hennepin County Medical Auxiliary - Legislative Chairman
4601 Oak Drive S.E.

✓ Miss Hermine Postelner, Minnesota Historical Society.
St. Capitol

MEMO

TO:

Grace

FROM:

Patty W. and Ann Buff

SUBJECT

Letter to Orgs. Enlisting

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

15th and WASHINGTON AVES. S.E.

MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

DATE

January 19, 1963

Support for PD

The text of this letter has been revised by Ann and it should go out as per this copy unless DA has further additions or corrections. The list of orgs. it should go to has also been edited by Ann and is herewith enclosed.

Ann also suggest that we enclose a copy of "Minnesota Needs Party Designation " with each letter.

I am returning your list of orgs. with a check mark by each one that should recieve this letter. There are some duplications between these two lists. I will cross out on my list the ones that are on yours. Ann also suggested that wherever possible a small personal note by DA would be a good touch.

January 19, 1963

Dear Mr. _____:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of _____ in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Nantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (Mi 4-1156,) is the officisilly designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

cc: MMantis, DA, AD, HS, PW

Mrs. Victor Cohn, Natl. Council Jewish Women, 4845 Irving
So., Minneapolis
Exec. Secy., Minn. Newspaper Assoc., Mobiloil Bldg. Mpls. 2
Thos. Myers, Exec. Secy., Minn. State Bar, Natl. Bldg. Mpls.
Citizens LmV, Mobiloil Bldg., Mpls. 2
Mrs. Chas. Huffman, Minn. Congr. PTA, 426 Hiawatha, Hopkins
Mrs. Walter Lynn, Henn. Co. Medical Assn., 4601 Oak Drive
Edina 24
Miss Hermina Postgieter, Minn. Historical Soc., St. Capito

January 31, 1963

Mrs. Lewis Minion
Legislative Chairman
Winona, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Minion,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota Legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. C. H. Anderson
President

January 31, 1963

Mrs. Victor Cohn, National Council of Jewish Women,
4845 Irving South
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Cohn,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for Party Designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

January 31, 1963

Executive Secretary,
Minnesota Newspaper Association
Mobiloil Building
Minneapolis 2, Minn.

Dear Sir:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

January 31, 1963

Mr. Thos. C. Myers, Executive Secretary
Minnesota State Bar
National Building
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mr. Myers,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

January 31, 1963

The Legislative Chairman, Citizens League
Mobiloil Building
Minneapolis 2, Minn.

Dear Sir:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

Jan. 31, 1962

Mrs. Chas. Huffman, President
Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers Association
426 Hiawatha Ave.
Hopkins, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Huffman,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

January 31, 1963

Mrs. Walter Lynn,
Hennepin County Medical Auxiliary
4601 Oak Drive
Edina 24, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Lynn,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (Mi 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

January 31, 1963

Miss Hermine Postgister,
Minnesota Historical Society
St. Capitol
St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Miss Postgister,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesotais anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (M4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

CC: DA, AD, MMantis, PW

Sent to Bert Jones, Jr. Chbr. of Com., 4213 Salem So., Mpls. 16
Mrs. Carlton Leadholm, Pres., Rep. Workshop, 5547 Clinton So.
Mr. Robert Hess, AFL-CIO, 47 W. 9th St.
Mr. Geo. Farr, 1637 Hennepin Ave., Mpls. DFL
Mr. Robt. Forsythe, 585 Endicott on Robert Bldg., St. Paul REP
Miss Edna Schwartz, Pres. Bus. & Prof. Women's Clubs, Inc., 608 Bremer Arcade, St. P.
Mrs. R. F. Kennedy, Leg. Chm. AAUW, 5513 Chantrey Rod, Edina 24

January 29, 1965

Mr. Clinton Hess
Farmers Union
2470 University Ave.
St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Mr. Hess,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Farmers Union in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (M4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

LFV:WVF

CC: DA, AD, MMantis, FW

Sent to Bert Jones, Jr. Chbr. of Com., 4213 Salem So., Mpls. 16
Mrs. Carlton Leadholm, Pres., Rep. Workshop, 5547 Clinton St.
Mr. Robert Hess, AFL-CIO, 47 W. 9th St.
Mr. Geo. Farr, 1637 Hennepin Ave., Mpls. DFL
Mr. Robt. Forsythe, 585 Endicott on Robert Bldg., St. Paul REP
Miss Edna Schwartz, Pres. Bus. & Prof. Women's Clubs, Inc., 608 Bremer Arcade, St. P.
Mrs. R. F. Kennedy, Leg. Chm. AAUW, 5513 Chantrey Rod, Edina 24

January 29, 1963

Mr. Clinton Hess
Farmers Union
2470 University Ave.
St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Mr. Hess,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Farmers Union in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

January 29, 1963

Mr. Bert Jones
Junior Chamber of Commerce
4213 Salem South
Minneapolis 16, Minn.

Dear Mr. Jones,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 461156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. C. E. Anderson, President

January 29, 1963

Mrs. Carlton Leadholm, President, Republican Workshop
5547 Clinton So.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Leadholm,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Republican Workshop in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

January 29, 1963

Mr. Robert Hess
Vice President AFL-CIO
47 West 9th St.
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Hess,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the AFL-CIO in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of Party Designation for Legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

January 29, 1963

Mr. George Farr
DPL Central Committee
1637 Hennepin Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mr. Farr,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the DPL in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (HI 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a wide and large cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson, President

January 29, 1963

Mr. Robert Forsythe,
State Chairman, Republican Party
585 Endicott on Robert Bldg.
St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Mr. Forsythe,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the passage of legislation in favor of Party Designation for Legislators and would be glad to have the support of the Republican Party in these efforts.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (Mi 4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson,
President

January 29, 1963

Miss Mina Schwartz, President
Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
608 Bremer Arcade
St. Paul 1, Minn.

Dear Miss Schwartz,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators.

We hope that either you, or your appointed representative, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (HI -4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters Lobbyist for party designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. El Anderson
President

January 29, 1963

Mrs. R. F. Kennedy
Legislative Chairman of AAUW
5513 Chantrey Road
Edina 24, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Kennedy,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of Party Designation for state Legislators.

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota.

We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. Homer Mantis, 2352 Buford, St. Paul 8, Minnesota (MI-4-1156) is the officially designated League of Women Voters lobbyist for Party Designation. She would like to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

We hope that by making use of the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to influence the present Minnesota legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on this in the very near future.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. O. H. Anderson
President

Proposed Party Designation Bill. Copies sent to L.Kuderling, A.Duff, D.Anderson, Forsythe, Farr, Klaus, M.Mantis, E.Warden, Larson, Langley, Thuet, Pederson.

A BILL FOR AN ACT

RELATING TO ELECTIONS; PROVIDING FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE BY PARTY DESIGNATION; AMENDING MINNESOTA STATUTES 1961, SECTIONS 202.03, SUBDIVISION 1; 203.29, SUBDIVISION 2; 203.35, SUBDIVISIONS 7 AND 9; AND 206.07, SUBDIVISION 1.

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

Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 202.03, Subdivision 1, is amended to read:

202.03 [NONPARTISAN NOMINATION.] Subdivision 1. [OFFICES, BALLOT.] The chief justice and the associate justices of the supreme court, judges of the district and probate courts, ~~all-members-of-the-state-legislature~~, and all elective county officers shall be nominated upon separate nonpartisan ballots, as hereinafter provided. The ballot shall be designated "ballot of candidates to be nominated without party designation."

Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 203.29, Subdivision 2, is amended to read:

Subd. 2. [FORM OF CANARY BALLOT.] The canary ballot shall be prepared under the direction of the county auditor, and the ballot shall be headed, "County and District Ballot." (a) In the general election the candidates for senator in the legislature shall be first on the canary ballot, and the candidates for representative in the legislature shall be second on the canary ballot. under the heading "Nominated With Party Designation." The name of each such candidate shall be rotated with the names of the other candidates for the same office, so that the name of each candidate appears substantially an equal number of times at the top, at the

bottom, and at each intermediate place in the group of candidates for that office, except that the name of any candidate of one party shall always immediately precede or follow the name of another candidate of that same party, if there are two candidates of that party. (b) In the general election the names of candidates for nonpartisan offices shall follow under the heading "Nominated Without Party Designation."

Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 203.35, Subdivision 7, is amended to read:

Subd. 7. [PRIMARY PARTY BALLOT.] The party ballot shall be headed by the words, "Consolidated Primary Election Ballot." Each political party shall have a separate ticket on the consolidated ballot, under which the names of all the candidates of the political party shall be grouped. Each political party ticket shall be headed by the words, "..... Party Ticket," giving the party name. Below the party name shall be printed the words, "You cannot split your ballot. If you vote for candidates of more than one party, your ballot will be rejected." Each party ticket shall be separated by a 12-point solid rule line. On the consolidated ballot the candidates for the state legislature shall follow the candidates for state offices; the candidates for senator in the legislature shall be named first, and the candidates for representative in the legislature shall be named second.

Sec. 4. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 203.35, Subdivision 9, is amended to read:

Subd. 9. [PRIMARY NONPARTISAN BALLOT, FORM.] The nonpartisan ballot shall be headed, "Primary Election Ballot

Candidates to be Nominated Without Party Designation," and otherwise the same as the party ballot. ~~At the top of the nonpartisan ballot the auditor shall place the names of the candidates for nomination for senator in the legislature and next, the candidates for representative in the legislature.~~

Sec. 5. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 206.07, Subdivision 1, is amended to read:

206.07 [CANDIDATES, ARRANGEMENT OF NAMES.]

Subdivision 1. [PLACEMENT.] Where voting machines are authorized and employed, the titles of offices may be arranged horizontally with the names of the candidates arranged vertically under the title of the office, or the titles of the offices may be arranged vertically with the names of the candidates arranged horizontally opposite the respective titles. ~~On the nonpartisan ballot prepared for primary elections; and~~ ^(X1) On the county and district ballot prepared for primary elections, and on the county and district ballot prepared for the general election, the names of nominees, or names of candidates for election, as the case may be, for state senate ~~or~~ shall be placed first and ~~for~~ for state house of representatives; shall be placed ~~first~~ second on said voting machine ballots. More than one column or row may be used for the same office or party. Questions, constitutional amendments, or other propositions shall be placed on the machines in the space provided for that purpose and shall be arranged in the manner which the construction of the machine requires.

X Insert: "on the consolidated primary election ballot prepared for primary election and"

Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 202.21, is amended to read:
202.21 Committees, Conventions. Each political party shall also
provide for a congressional district ~~executive committee~~ executive committee/
for each congressional district and a county executive committee for
each county. The party rules shall provide for conventions to be
held at least once every general election year in each congressional
district and in each county, and for a chairman and such other officers
as may be necessary for each congressional district committee and for
each county committee. In each county in which the voters vote upon
his election, each successful candidate for nomination as a candidate
for election to the Legislature shall, upon his nomination, be entitled
to membership on the principal county committee of the party on whose
ticket he is the nominee for the legislature, or in lieu of his
serving on such county committee he shall be entitled to name as a
member thereof a person of his choice to serve in his stead. Such
membership on such county committee shall continue until the primary
election following his nomination. Until the primary election of 1964,
each member of the legislature shall be entitled to file with the
county auditor of each county in which the voters voted for his election
an affidavit stating the party with which he affiliates and the party
upon whose ticket he will file for nomination if he seeks re-election
to the legislature, and thereupon he shall be entitled to membership
or appointment as aforesaid on such county committee of that party he
so indicates he is affiliated and will affiliate with. The party rules
may provide for only one executive committee and one convention where
any county and congressional district have the same territorial limits.

Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 1961, Section 202.21, is amended to read:
202.21 Committees, Conventions. Each political party shall also
provide for a congressional district ~~executive committee/~~
for each congressional district and a county executive committee for
each county. The party rules shall provide for conventions to be
held at least once every general election year in each congressional
district and in each county, and for a chairman and such other officers
as may be necessary for each congressional district committee and for
each county committee. In each county in which the voters vote upon
his election, each successful candidate for nomination as a candidate
for election to the Legislature shall, upon his nomination, be entitled
to membership on the principal county committee of the party on whose
ticket he is the nominee for the legislature, or in lieu of his
serving on such county committee he shall be entitled to name as a
member thereof a person of his choice to serve in his stead. Such
membership on such county committee shall continue until the primary
election following his nomination. Until the primary election of 1964
each member of the legislature shall be entitled to file with the
county auditor of each county in which the voters voted for his election
an affidavit stating the party with which he affiliates and the party
upon whose ticket he will file for nomination if he seeks re-election
to the legislature, and thereupon he shall be entitled to membership
or appointment as aforesaid on such county committee of that party he
so indicates he is affiliated and will affiliate with. The party rules
may provide for only one executive committee and one convention where
any county and congressional district have the same territorial limits.

1963 House of Representatives and Party Designation

Code			
C	Conservative	New First term	
L	Liberal	Support)	Answer to Party Designation Question on
		Not Support)	the 1962 League Legislative Questionnaires

Number in front of name indicates Legislative District

1. Clinton J. Hall C
2. L. L. Duxbury, Jr. C
3. Mrs. Virginia Torgerson C New
George Daley L New
3. Charles H. Miller L New
Alfred Schumann C New Support
4. Donald W. Fisher C New Support Comment: "I certainly would do all in my power to promote and finalize legislation providing for Party Designation."
5. Al Falkenhagen C
Helen McMillan L New
Harvey B. Sathre C New
6. Roy L. Voxland C Note support (Jan. 12)
7. Robert C. Kucera C
8. John A. Hartle C Support
Rodney Searle C Support Comment: "If it does not affect local offices." Listed Republican Party among organizations
9. Paul Overgaard C New
10. Arlen I. Erdahl C New Support (Jan 11)
Kenneth E. Scott C New
11. Donald E. Swenson -G-
(C. A. Johnson L and New is asking for a recount)
Roy Schulz C
12. George B. Krenik C
Henry J. Morlock C New
13. Edward H. Rasmussen L New
Walter K. Klaus C

Dec 11 Mpls. Star had an item that this was not definite. Might be John M. Fitzgerald who was the incumbent.

Support Author in House

14.	Walter C. Jungclauss	C		
	Ralph P. Jopp	C	New	
15.	Harold R. Anderson	C		
	August B. Mueller	C		
16.	Fred Berke	L	New	
	Ernest E. Schefer	C	New	
17.	Ivan Stone	C	<i>Support</i>	Comment: "I believe that the principle of non-partisan legislature is good, but it is becoming more of a theory than a practical fact. As long as the trend is toward party control on one side, while the other party maintains a "hands off" attitude, we may as well be fair and have party designation for all." See note on page 6.
	Aubrey W. Dirlam	C		
18.	M. K. Hegstrom	C		
	Gilbert Esau	C	New	
	George Mann	L		
19.	Wayne R. Bassett	L		Support Comment: "I have consistently supported it because I feel it brings more responsible government."
	Roy Cummings	C		
	Reuben Wee	L		
20.	Graham Fuller	C		
	Verne E. Long	C	New	
	W. Casper Fischer	C	New	
21.	Joe Gimpl	C		
	Robert C. Becklin	C	New	
22.	Donald E. Pederson	C	New	
	George P. Grussing	C		Yes but should include city & county (Jan. 26)
	Curtis B. Warnke	L		Yes (Jan. 26)
23.	Wallace F. Gustafson	C	New	→ Did not complete questionnaire (Jan. 8) Free Willmar League believes "No"
	Martin McGowan, Jr.	L		
24.	S. R. Barr	L		
	Carl M. Iverson	L		
25.	Otto E. Clark	C	New	
	J. H. Peterson	C	New	

26. B. F. DuBois	L	New	
John J. Kinzer	C		
27. Robert Mahowald	C		Support. Supported in House Elections Committee 1961
Marvin C. Schumann	C		Support but should perhaps include county & city
28. George E. Grant	L		
Glenn A. Blomquist	C	New	
29. Victor N. Jude	L		
30. John Wingard	C	New	Support Comment: "But I do not believe that this is such an overwhelming issue that it will correct all the ills of our legislature. Party designation may make political barons of party officers at the expense of dedicated elected officials."
Bill Frenzel	C	New	Support
31. John Yngve	C	New	Support
Salisbury Adams	C	New	Listed Plymouth Republicans among organizations
			Listed Republican Party in organizations
32. W. G. Kirchner	C	New	Support
Joseph Graw	C	New	Support
33. Ernie Jacobsen	C	New	Support
Otto Bang	C	New	Support
34. Stanley Enebo	L		Support
Edward Volstad	L		Support
35. Gary W. Flakne	C	New	Support
Iyall Schwarzkopf	C	New	Support
36. Thor Anderson	C	New	Support
F. Gordon Wright	C		Support with George French Amendment - apart in formation of party platform
37. Harold J. Anderson	C		Support
George A. French	C		Not support
38. Douglas Head	C		Support
Richard White	C		Support

39.	Edward Gearty	L	New	Support
	Robert Latz	L		Support
40.	Stanley Fudro	L		Support
	Edward Tomczyk	L		Support
41.	Arnold Rose	L	New	Support
	John Skeate	L		Support Comment: "I believe the people have a right to know which political party the candidate is associated with." Support
42.	James Adams	L		Support
	Martin Sabo	L		Support. Was an author in 1961
43.	Robert Ashbach	C	New	Support Comment: "Yes, but make provisions for a sincere Independent."
	John Tracy Anderson	C	New	
44.	Robert W. Johnson	C	New	Support Comment: "However, from a practical point of view, it would appear that most issues are not voted on by the legislators on a straight party line. It would appear that after the first caucus there is very much individualism by the mixtures of legislators voting on any given issue."
	Robert F. Christensen	C	New	Support
45.	William O'Brien	C	New	
	D. D. Wozniak	L		Support
46.	Richard Richie	L		Support
	Ernest Beedle	L		Listed DFL 16 years under organizations
47.	Joseph Prifrel	L		
	Anthony Podogorski	L		
48.	William McKenzie	L		
	Leslie Edhlund	C	New	Support Comment: "Yes, providing all of our citizens will be represented. At present there is at least a three-way split in our State legislature: the Liberals, the Conservatives and the Independent. Since less than 2% of State legislation is decided along party lines, the role of the Independent should be preserved."

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|---|-----|---|
| 49. | Lyle Farmer | L | New | Support Comment: "Yes, members of the legislature should identify themselves before election rather than waiting to caucus with a group after election." |
| | Daniel Slater | C | New | Support Comment: "Yes, if it is properly worded, I would." |
| 50. | Richard W. O'Dea | L | | Support Comment: "Yes, as vigorously as I have the past ten years." |
| | Howard R. Albertson | C | | Support (2an 14) |
| 51. | Connie Burchett | L | New | Support Comment: "Emphatically YES! Why try to fool the voter. Immediately after election a legislator has to decide to caucus Liberal or Conservative. The voter deserves to know what he's getting--so the <u>label</u> is imperative." |
| | John A. Nordin | L | | Will not fill out questionnaire |
| 52. | E. M. Wold | C | New | |
| | Bernard Carlson | L | | (In the newspaper story, he was listed as Richard, but I think his name is Bernard.) |
| 53. | Charles L. Halstad | L | | |
| | Gordon Gerling | L | | |
| 54. | Keith Hinman | L | | |
| | Ron Everson | C | | |
| 55. | Roy E. Dunn | C | | No answer to this question. |
| | H. J. Henning | C | | "No--am allergic and sensitive to dictation and commands as to personal convictions."
Listed Republican Party among organizations. |
| 56. | Douglas H. Sillers | C | New | "If the basis of good democratic government is a two party system then serious consideration should be given to party designation in election of legislators." |
| | R. N. Nelson | L | | |
| 57. | Frank DeGroat | C | New | |
| | Harold Johnson | C | New | |
| 58. | Robert G. Renner | C | | "I have always opposed this because it gives too much power to political bosses oriented toward the centers of population -- and away from our sparsely settled areas." |
| | Arthur Frick, Sr. | C | New | |

59.	Francis LaBrosse	L	Support
	Willard M. Munger	L	Support
60.	Earl B. Gustafson	L	New Support
	Arne C. Wanwick	L	
61.	Alfred E. France	C	New Support
	William H. House	L	Support (Jan)
62.	Fred A. Cina	L	
	Peter X. Fugina	L	
63.	Jack Fena	L	
	Loren S. Rutter	L	
64.	Leonard R. Dickinson	C	
	E. J. Chilgren	L	
65.	Alvin M. Johnson	C	New
	L. J. Lee	L	
66.	Harvey A. Wilder	L	
	Andrew Skaar	C	New
67.	Victor L. Johnson	L	
	Richard W. Fitzsimmons	C	
	Everett Battles	L	

District 17-Ivan Stone additional material Under organizations, he listed:
Republican Farm Council 2nd Dist. Secretary 1959-62
Brown County Chairman 1959-61
also Farm Bureau
(He's Representative from John Zwach's district.)

1963 Senate and Party Designation for Legislators

Code				
C	Conservative	New	First term in Senate	
L	Liberal	Y	Yea) Votes in 1961 session to withdraw Party Designation	
		N	May) bill from Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee	
		Support	Answer to Party Designation Question on the	
		Not Support	1962 Legislative Questionnaires.	
Number in front of name indicates Legislative District.				
1.	Lew W. Larson	C	Y	although in Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee he voted against sending the bill out.
2.	Roger Laufenberger	L		New
3.	Robert R. Dunlap	C	N	Not Support Listed Wabasha County Republican Party among organizations.
4.	Harold G. Krieger	C		New Support
5.	P. J. Holand	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee he voted against sending the bill out.
6.	Clarence G. Langley	C		New, but former House member Support Comment: "I have co-authored such a bill in past sessions. Why try to be subtle by calling ourselves Conservatives and Liberals?" Listed Republican Party among organizations.
7.	A. O. Sundet	C	N	
8.	Harold S. Nelson	C	N	Comment on Questionnaire: "I would be inclined to do so."
9.	Rudolph Hanson	C	N	
10.	Ernest J. Anderson	C	N	
11.	Val Imm	C	N	
12.	Michael E. McGuire	L	Y	
13.	Paul A. Thust	L	Y	
14.	Harold R. Popp	C	N	Not Support
15.	Franklin P. Kroehler	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee he voted against sending the bill out.
16.	Stanley W. Holmquist	C	Y	
17.	John M. Zwach	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee he voted against sending the bill out. <i>Not Support</i>
18.	W. J. Franz	C	N	
19.	John L. Olson	C	N	Not Support
20.	J. A. Josefson	C	N	

<i>Hansen Nelson</i>				
21.	Ralph Johnson	C	Y	
22.	Fay George Child	C	N	<i>Firm No</i>
23.	Eugene P. Knudsen	L		New, but former House member <i>Refused to fill out questionnaire</i>
24.	C. J. Benson	L	Y	as member of Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee also voted for sending the bill out.
25.	Clifford Lofvegren	C	N	
26.	Henry M. Harren	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapportionment committee he voted against sending the bill out.
27.	Raymond Bares	L		New <i>Support</i>
28.	C. C. Mitchell	C	N	
29.	Glen W. Swenson	C		New
30.	Richard J. Parish	L		New, but former House member Support Comment: "I have voted for party designation both in the committee and on the floor of the House and will continue to do so."
31.	Henry McKnight	C		New Support Listed Republican Farm Council of Minnesota Chairman 1960 in Organizations.
32.	Jerome Blatz	C		New Support Comment: "Such legislation would benefit the voters and also pinpoint responsibility."
33.	Alf Bergerud	C	Y	Support Comment: "Was an author on the measure in the last legislative session." as member of the 1961 Senate Election and Reapportionment committee, he voted for sending the bill out.
34.	Mel Hansen	C		New <i>Yes in Minnesota - see questionnaire</i>
35.	Wayne Popham	C		New <i>Support</i>
36.	Glenn McCarty	C		New, but a former House member <i>Support</i>
37.	Harmon Ogdahl	C		New <i>Support</i>
38.	Donald O. Wright	C	N	<i>Not Support</i>
39.	Leo Mosier	L		New, but a former House member <i>Support</i>
40.	Harold Kalina	L	Y	<i>Support</i>
41.	Frank Adams	L		New <i>Support</i>
42.	Jack Davies	L	Y	<i>Support - but see questionnaire</i>
43.	Claude H. Allen	C	N	Support

44.	Clifton Parks	C		New, but a former House member Support
45.	Nicholas Coleman	L		New
46.	Karl Grittner	L	Y	Support Comment: "I have been the author of such legislation both as a member of the House and of the Senate." Listed DFL party among organizations (He was a Senate author in 1961 session.)
47.	Edward Novak	L	Y	
48.	Leslie Westin	C	Y	Support Comment: "I have authored the bill in previous sessions."
49.	Wendell Anderson	L		New, but a former House member Support Comment: "As a state representative, I've supported and voted for party designation. Listed DFL Party among organizations
50.	Raphael Salmore	L	Y	as a member of Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee, he voted for sending the bill out.
51.	Vernon S. Holm	L		New Support Comment: "At the present time we have the same thing as party designation in the legislature only the members prefer to be labeled as Liberals and Conservatives. I don't think anyone's fooled by this deception so consequently I think we should go all the way. Minnesota and Nebraska are the only states without party designation."
52.	Norman W. Hanson	L	Y	
53.	Gordon Rosenmeier	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapportionment Committee he voted against sending the bill out.
54.	William C. F. Heuer	L	Y	
55.	Cliff Ukkelberg	C	N	Not Support Comment: "The purpose of the legislature established by the constitution as a part of the government of all the people is not to build political parties but to enact laws which will treat fairly the state problems."
56.	W. B. Dosland	C	Y	
57.	Norman J. Walz	L	Y	
58.	Benjamin Patterson	C		New
59.	Homer M. Carr	L	Y	Support Comment: "It is favored by both parties. However, at least 90% of our legislative program has no political interest, and legislators should be informed on local and state interests, and leave national and foreign problems to the Congress." Listed DFL Party among organizations. as a member of 1961 Senate Elections and Reapp. Committee he voted for sending the bill out. WAS ABSENT.

60.	Richard E. Ferrario	L	Y	Support Comment:"I have voted for party designation in the past and will continue to support this type of legislation."
61.	Gordon H. Butler	C	N	Support (He was one of the authors in 1961)
62.	Thomas D. Vukelich	L	Y	
63.	R. G. Perpich	C		New
64.	John H. McKee	C	N	
65.	Norman Larson	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapp. Comm. in 1961 he voted against sending the bill out.
66.	Harveydale Maruska	C		New but a former House Member
67.	Donald Sinclair	C	N	also in Senate Elections and Reapp. Comm. in 1961 he voted against sending the bill out.

Special Sheet on Hennepin County Representatives (from Minneapolis League
1962 Questionnaires)

The question was: Are you for or against party designation for State Legislators?

30. John Wingard Yes, we must be careful that party leaders do not become too powerful at the expense of good legislation.
- Bill Frenzel Yes (I wonder if he means "Yes" for or "Yes" against.)
31. John Ingve I am for party designation for State Legislators. The voters should know what party philosophy each candidate supports. Only through party designation can the voter be certain of each candidate's party affiliation.
- Salisbury Adams I favor party designation.
32. W. G. Kirchner For
- Joseph Graw I am for party designation for State Legislators.
33. Ernie Jacobsen I favor party designation because it increases the responsibility of the legislature to the people they represent.
- Otto Bang I favor Party Designation for State Legislators. I feel that Party Designation goes along with party responsibility.
34. Stanley Enebo I have always been an ardent supporter of party designation and will continue to be so. We cannot have a legislature hide behind a mask of nonentity and then place its allegiance to paid lobbyists. Every single legislator enters the political arena with some party loyalty witnessed by the fact that the first vote for Speaker of the House is based along party lines.
- Edward Volstad I am for party designation, and I think it's long past due. There are too many that are running for office that are straddling the fence.
35. Gary W. Flakne I am in favor of Party Designation. Too often, under our present law, people are elected who owe no allegiance to either party, and the voter is there cheated. Party Designation, like Party Endorsements, will give us party responsible candidates.
- Iyall Schwarzkopf I believe the legislative candidate should be responsible to party designation, to his political party, and to party endorsement. Because many citizens do not or can not take the time to be active in government, the political party is a necessity to help them know who represents their philosophy of government.
36. Thor Anderson I am for party designation of State Legislators.
- F. Gordon Wright I am for party designation for members of the Legislature, provided the George French Amendment is included in the Law. That is, the member has a voice personally, or by nominee, in the formation of the party's platform.

37. Harold J. Anderson I favor it and have actively supported such bill in every session that I have served.
George A. French Legislators are elected to consider and pass legislation in the best interest of ALL the people. Under party designation legislation belonging to one party or the other would be bound to vote for party-sponsored legislation even though it was detrimental to the people as a whole.
38. Douglas Head I am in favor of party designation for State Legislators.
Richard White I am in favor of, and will support Party Designation for State Legislators.
39. Edward Gearty Yes (Again I wonder which he means.)
Robert Iatz Strongly support party designation and believe it necessary for responsibility in government. In these days of the long ballot voters are entitled to know the candidate's party affiliation. 48 of the 50 states have party designation for state legislators.
40. Stanley Pudro I am for party designation. As Vice Chairman of the Elections Committee I have worked for its passage. I am proud of my active participation in the D-F-L Party. Party designation would strengthen ~~the~~ our two-party system and would make the legislature more responsible.
Edward Tomczyk For
41. Arnold Rose I favor party designation. Most candidates after a primary have endorsement. Voters don't have to follow recommendations of party conventions, even in the primary, but why shouldn't they be allowed to know the party affiliation of candidates? Party designation will increase responsibility of candidates and permit majority candidates to win.
John Skeate I believe the people have a right to know which political party the candidate is associated with.
42. James Adams I am for Party Designation to make legislators responsible for the platforms they support in their election campaigns.
Martin Sabo I was one of the authors of the party designation bill in the last legislative session. I shall continue to work for the enactment of such a bill.

Special Sheet on Hennepin County Sepators (from Minneapolis League 1962
Questionnaires)

30. Richard J. Parish I believe in party designation for state legislators so that they cannot hide behind general terms and so that they must have political responsibility.
31. Henry McKnight For
32. Jerome Blatz I advocate party designation for members of the legislature. Voters should be able to identify the candidates and hold the candidates accountable if their voting record is not in accord with their campaign promises. Party designation would benefit the voters and pin point responsibility.
33. Alf Bergerud FOR PARTY DESIGNATION: In fact, was an author of the measure in the 1961 session of the Legislature.
34. Mel Hansen Party endorsement in Minnesota is a helpful step in the direction of fixing responsibility. However, the traditional independence of the Minnesota voter is far preferable to the situation in Massachusetts where a man in prison for defrauding the taxpayers can confidently anticipate re-election because party bosses give him approval.
35. Wayne Popham Favor party designation as a contribution to more effective government.
36. Glenn McCarty Favor party designation for all elective officials except judges and members of the school boards. This could possibly strengthen the political parties.
37. Harmon Ogdahl For party designation
38. Donald O. Wright I supported party designation until I saw the DFL party threaten ~~its~~ its members in the House with expulsion from the party unless they voted the dictates of the party bosses. I am now against party designation.
39. Leo Mosier I am for party designation for state legislators so that voters will be better informed, and candidates will act more responsibly in relation to their campaign promises.
40. Harold Kalina I favor party designation for state legislators. I believe Party labeling of our legislators will bring more responsible and effective state government to Minnesota.
41. Frank Adams Both political parties have endorsed party designation on the grounds that only thru party designation can members of the legislature be held accountable to anyone. Many members of the legislature are active members in one or the other political party now. Only two states, Minnesota and Nebraska don't have party designation. Since our constitutional officers are elected on a two party basis it seems only logical that the members of the legislature also run with party labels.

42. Jack Davies

In 1961 the Republican majority in the state senate killed 70 percent of the bills advocated by a Republican Chief Executive. Whether 1962 candidates would continue this negative record or would vote for new leadership through the Democratic Farm Labor caucus should be ~~XXXXXX~~ shown on the ballot through party designation.

What I Could Find on Past Sponsors of Party Designation Bills!

1953

H. F. 9 Oberg, P. K. Peterson, Day, Schulz, Chilgren

1955

H. F. 12 Grittner, Oberg, Wozniak, Rutter, Karth

S. F. 14 Vukelich, Peterson, E. L. Andersen

1957

H. F. 41 Grittner, Oberg, Hartle, Karth, Bergeson

S. F. 705 Quie, Holmquist, Fraser

1959

H. F. 61 Luther, Yetka, O'Dea, C.D. Peterson, Hartle

1961

H. F. 283 Skeate, Luther, Sabo, Klaus, Franke

S. F. 576 Grittner, Butler, Bergerud

Roberta or Grace

*make.
Will you ~~copies~~ for Ann and Mary Mentes. Ann
asked for them.*

Dec. 1962

Harold Shumway

Office
1/22/63

1963 HOUSE ELECTIONS & REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE
18 members

Several more committees were appointed this time than in 1961 but these two separate committees were combined in one this time on Elections & Reapportionment. Not very encouraging. We've lost 9 yes votes (one of these is our chief author now, Klaus) from the 1961 committee (also 2 nos and 2 question marks). Only 1 individual remains from 1961 committee, Representative Gordon Wright. He, by the way voted no in 1959 (last House vote available) and now is firmly in favor of Party Designation. Also he heads up 1963 committee. However, the vice-chairman no doubt is against it and possibly has a personal interest in it (his district is split politically and his Senator Fay Child definitely would be out of a job as would Rep. Grussing from same district if Party Designation should pass.) N.E. Small ray of hope, the House leadership does not have the personal involvement in Party Designation which the Senate leadership does (Duxbury is firmly opposed but he's a Conservative from an overwhelmingly GOP district so would have no trouble at the polls.) Only 3 of these 18 committee members have Leagues in their home towns; 8 have Leagues in their districts such as Brainerd, Granite Falls, Cass Lake etc.)

1963 Committee. 9 members have personal interest in this bill and possible 2 more where I don't have complete election statistics (In Senate committee only 5 and possibly a 6th have a personal stake in Party Designation.)

What to Do - mean - and then

1. Mary Mantis ask our sponsors if there's any way to get Party Designation out of committee onto floor of House without a yes recommendation.
 2. Only possible way to get Yes vote from the committee:
Pick up Mrs. Torgerson from Winona and get the local Leagues plus George Farr of DFL, Wozniak and Bassett to change 2 no votes (Nordin from Anoka and Walsted from Brainerd are both from safe DFL counties) and get them also to hang on to the 2 self-sacrificing liberal votes (Mann & Grant both voted yes in '59 but would lose their jobs if this bill actually went through!)
- So then the Yes column looks like this:
Gordon Wright, chm. - voted no in '59 but favors it now
Mann & Grant - Liberals from GOP counties who voted yes in '59
Long, Fischer & Slater - Bob Forsythe & Ramsey County GOP will have to do some fast footwork here but the districts are safely GOP
Mrs. Torgerson - new Conservative from safely GOP area
Nordin & Walsted - Liberals from safe DFL counties who voted no in '59
And we'll just have to squeeze the 10th vote from one of these not so hopfuls:
vice-ch. Pederson (see first paragraph above), Bailey (new Liberal from rural Winona County -ouch!), Kinner (Conservative from Stearns East - is this GOP or DFL? who voted no in '59), Frick (new Conservative from DFL area) or Miller (new Liberal from GOP area). Or wait until one of these is absent! (which by the way is not meant to be funny because with a favorable chairman this might be possible and perhaps the only way to get a yes vote.)

Love, adoration and consolation from
Anna

I've tabulated the entire Senate and House now. Passage of Party Designation on either floor will be easy!! Extra yes votes all over the place but of course we'd still have to work like the dickens on it.

Mr. Robert Forsythe, Chairman
Republican Party Central Committee
State of Minnesota Building
St. Paul, Minnesota

January 22, 1965

Dear Bob,

We need some advice and help on Party Designation in the Legislature. Fatty Wash tells me of a phone conversation with you last week, that you're already working on this and that a big state meeting is coming up for you this week-end. We're very grateful for all you're doing. I'm dashing this note off now to give you some more specifics for this week-end.

Party Designation is in good shape on the floor of both the Senate and the House; passage should be fairly easy. However, both committees are a challenge, and here's where we need the help right now:

Senate Committee on Elections & Reapportionment. Party Designation needs to pick up 2 crucial votes from among the following 4 in southern Minnesota - Senators Dunlap, Josefson, Kroeler (chairman) and Frans (we feel we now have his yes, by the way). Party Designation will need not only Senator Bergerud's vote in committee but also his verbal support (your conversation with Mary Mantis yesterday brings you up to date on authors and we are so grateful for the wonderful help you are giving us here.) We are counting on Senator Ogdahl's support but have not yet had the chance to speak to him. Mel Hansen is opposed.

House Committee on Elections & Reapportionment. This is where we should really be worrying. Harder than the Senate. Of crucial importance and where you could be most helpful: Mrs. Torgerson from Winona, Mr. Slater from Ramsey County, Mr. Long and Fischer (both from safely GOP counties by the way, it's the Lincoln county representative who might be in trouble in this 20th district - not Long, Fischer or Senator Josefson.) This still leaves Party Designation at least one vote short in this committee. Any possibility of Rep. Peterson, new Conservative from 22nd district and vice-chairman of this committee? Or Rep. Hinner from Stearns East? Or Rep. Frick from Grand Rapids? A special thank you to chairman Gordon Wright for his support of Party Designation. Since this committee is even tougher than the Senate his support is doubly appreciated.

If you, or any one else, wants any more information, please feel free to call me at any time. I'm also inclosing on a separate sheet a small invitation which you can put aside until things let up a bit next week.

Cordially,

Ann S. Duff
Mrs. Nicholas E. Duff, Legislative chm.
Route 3, Box 120, Wayzata

My home phone and reverse the charges please: GR 3-9189

LHW OF MINNESOTA

Please add to 1963 House of Representatives and Party Designation -- Jan. 31, 1963

6. Roy L Vexland	C	Not support (Jan.18)
10. Arlen I. Erdahl	C	New Support (Jan. 14)
12. Henry J. Morlock	C	New Dec.1 Star (Mpls.) had an item that this was not definite. Might be John Fitzgerald who was incumbent
13 Walter K. Klaus	C	Supports, author in House
17 Ivan Stone	C	Support
22. Geo.Grussing	C	Yes, but should include city & county, (Jan.26)
22. Curtis B. Wannke	L	Yes (Jan. 26)
23. Wallace F. Gustafson	D New	Did not complete questionnaire. (Jan.8). Pres. Willmar LHW believes "no"
26. Robert Mahowals	C	Support. Supported in House Elections Com., 1961
27. Marvin C. Schumann	C	Support, but should perhaps include county, & city.
30. Bill Frenzel	C New	Support.
32. W.G. Kirchner	C New	Support.
33. Otto Bang	C New	Support.
34. Stanley Enebo	L	Support
34. Edw. Volstad	L	Support.
35. Gary W. Flakne	C New	Support.
35. Lyall Schwarzkopf	C New	Support.
36 Thor Anderson	C New	Support.
36. F. Gordon Wright	C	Support with Geo. French Amendment - a part in formation of party platform
37. Harold J. Anderson	C	Support.
37. Geo. A. French	C	Not support.
38. Douglas Head	C	Support.
38. Richard White	C	Support.
39. Edw. Gearty	L New	Support
39. Robt. Latz	L	Support.
40. Stanley Fudro	L	Support.
40. Edw. Tomczyk	L	Support.
41. Arnold Rose	L New	Support

41. John Skeate	L	Support.
42. James Adams	L	Support
42. Martin Sabo	L	Support, was an author in 1961.
50. Howard E. Albertson	C	Support (Jan.14)
51. John A. Nordin	L	Will not fill out questionnaire
59. Willard M. Manger	L	Support
61. Wm.House	L	Support (Jan.)

1963 Senate and Party Designation for Legislators - LWV of Minnesota, Jan.31,1963

17. John Zwach	C	Not support.
22. Fay Geo.Child	C	Firm no.
23. Eug.F.Knudsen	L	Refused to fill out questionnaire.
27.R.Bares	L	Support
34. Mel Hansen	C	Yes in Minnesota - see questionnaire
35. Wayne Popham	C	Support
36. Glen McCarty	C	Support.
37. Harmon Ogdahl	C	Support
38. Donald Wright	C	Not support.
39. Leo Mosier	L	Support
40. Harold Kalina	L	Support
41. Frank Adams	L	Support
42. Jack Davies	L	Support, but see questionnaire

~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~

League of Women Voters of Minnesota
Mrs. Allan J. Wash, Public Relations
15th & Washington Aves.S.E.
Minneapolis 14, Minn.

FOR RELEASE
i m m e d i a t e l y

February 21, 1963

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota has announced its support of two bills now before the legislature: a bill to provide party designation for state legislators and a bill to provide that the governor and lieutenant governor run jointly and be elected from the same political party. According to Mrs. O. H. Anderson, president of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, both of these bills will tend to strengthen the responsibility of elected officials and make them more responsive to the will of the voter. Both major political parties favor party labels for legislators. This bill will also provide that legislators will automatically become members of their county party committees and thereby will have an opportunity to make platform policy.

Some conservative members of the committees which will hear this bill during the week of February 25th state that the "average voter has no interest in party designation" -- this may be true, but if it is, the League of Women Voters feels that it is up to the "average voter" to become aware that his elected representative in St. Paul is not merely "liberal" or "conservative" but is in fact DFL or Republican and should be willing to stand up and be so counted. At least the Minnesota voter should be given an opportunity to decide on the ballot whether or not he wishes to have his representatives designated by party. This bill would give the voter this opportunity.

This bill to provide that the governor and lieutenant governor shall both be of the same party would make the office of lieutenant governor, now merely titular, with no real duties or responsibilities assigned to it by the governor, a real assistant's job. Under the present arrangement it would indeed be unusual for a governor to delegate important duties to his possible successor if he were of the opposite party. Certainly it is only sensible that the person who would succeed to the governorship in case of death or emergency would be of the same political philosophy as the elected governor. The governor now holds office for a 4-year term and now more than ever before it is important to have both men of the same party. This is a bill on which both Governor Anderson and Lt. Governor Keith agree.

Some Party Designation Thoughts for Senators L. Larson and Lansing

Senator Larch quoted in Minneapolis Star 1/9/63: "I think our non-partisan legislature is one of the very finest in the country. I don't see any reason for changing it."

Rep. Bartle a couple of weeks ago to Mrs. Mantis and me: Well, you know, I've been opposed to party designation for some years, but now I want it because it brings me closer to the people. I want to be near the wishes of my people and this is what my political party does for me. (Through GOF channels I have picked up the information that Mr. Bartle feels party designation is essential to heal this split in the Conservative caucus. You might wish to chat with him about this.)

Also Rep. Klaus and Bob Forsythe will have some good thoughts.

As for us in the League of Women Voters, our reasons for wanting party designation for legislators are these: our concern is for the voter to be informed. In a democracy government is run by the people, for the people through the political parties. This is our great American heritage. Here in Minnesota we are fortunate in having good government. We wish to make it even better. We would like to see government in Minnesota less responsible to special interests, more responsible to the voter through the party platforms.

In former years in the Senate Party Designation got somehow tied up with reapportionment so you'd hear comments like the following: reapportionment and party designation will just bring into the legislature a wild-eyed bunch of liberals dominated by big-city union bosses. I have not heard this one used on reapportionment since last fall's election results giving Conservatives control of both houses and probably the governorship for the first time in some years, but this line of reasoning seems to persist with party designation.

Senator Lostrand speaking to Mrs. Mantis and me a few weeks ago: Who's the political party up my way? Just a handful of people. I used to be in favor of party designation but you know I'm becoming convinced I can do better for my district by representing all the people.

Fergus Falls Journal (see attached clipping) seems to answer this argument and to summarize editorial thinking around the state on party designation.

Some senators oppose party designation, feeling the voters should elect good people, not beholden to any party, able to carefully legislate in the interests of all the people. The Red Wing Eagle spoke to this point last fall: "Legislatures — aren't like a judge waiting for disputes to come to him and then passing on them fairly. Legislatures require an action program to produce good government, and political parties are the instruments for forging an action program on which governor and legislators can work together. Two parties compete in putting rival programs into action, and voters choose between them." In Alexandria's Park Region Echo, the answer comes out like this: "What does this mean? It means that the voter has no ties upon the legislator for the legislator is not on record supporting or opposing any formal legislative program and thus need not be responsive to the wishes of the electorate which put him into office. This, we contend, is government at its most irresponsible." In the Minneapolis Star it's expressed this way: "Minnesotans should take a close look at legislators who vote consistently against party designation. What these legislators are voting against, to put it bluntly, is a system of legislative responsibility. And what they often fear, more than anything else, is any change in the status quo which might weigh against their re-election."

(for more thoughts see next page)

Party Designation - 2

Jim Vance in the Northington Globe some years back but still pertinent: "Party Designation, in itself, does not make for good or bad government. The responsibility here rests with the voters and the parties to select and encourage capable candidates to seek office. But party designation can help assure party and governmental responsibility."

Last December 30th in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune: "As it is now, a Republican governor has little influence with Conservative legislators, especially in the state senate, because they often feel little responsibility to the Republican party or to its chief standard bearer. The situation is slightly better with respect to the Liberals, who do have closer ties with the DFL party. But the lack of party designation makes it difficult for the voter either to fix the blame or give the credit for what happens in the state legislature. The Minnesota Poll report on the opposite page shows that more Minnesotans favor party designation than oppose it, although the issue still is a controversial one. We do not contend that a vote for party designation will be a tremendously popular one. But we do contend that it will be a vote for more responsible government in this state."

I have been interested to see the wide-spread agreement among conservatives on the need for having the Governor and Lt. Governor from the same party. This promotes responsibility, team-work etc. Party Designation for legislators does exactly this same thing. How can you be for one and against the other? (Senate authors of the Gov.-Lt. Gov. bill are ~~Rep~~ Senators Roland, Olson and Bergerud.

Senator Bergerud used the following argument last session when he was authoring the bill: We've got to have party designation to keep the Senate from being taken over by the Liberals. The good Republicans don't know whom to vote for.

To the political scientists it looks like this:

DFL-oriented Dr. Backstrom of U. of M. - the purpose of party designation is to give a man a larger view (for the good of the state) and a longer view because the party will be around long after he's gone. Individual interests and constituents views will be tempered by party designation.

REF-oriented Dr. Fjeldstad of Carleton College - Where policy determines action you need party designation. The non-partisan legislature makes a fraud of the election process. Legislators assume Liberal and Conservative. "There's something basically dishonest about a person not knowing what he is."

For a bit of history about how we got non-partisanship (it slipped in as a rider on a liquor bill) and for Mr. Langley's 1913 predecessor in the Goodhue County Senate seat and party designation, see the inclosed Sunday Trib article 2/10/58. I just thought you'd get a chuckle out of it. But could you slip it back in the mail to me - or better yet send it on to Phil Duff at the Red Wing Eagle and tell him I thought he'd be fascinated especially now since you are one of the sponsors.

Good luck and let me know if you need anything more.

Cordially,

Mrs. Nicholas E. Duff, legislative chm.
League of Women Voters of Minnesota

Statement of Robert A. Forsythe
Republican State Chairman
Before the Minnesota Senate Elections and
Reapportionment Committee
Feb. 26, 1963

It is my privilege to serve as the present State Chairman of the Republican party in Minnesota. I join with others in urging passage of S.F.514 to restore party designation for candidates to the state legislature in Minnesota.

We are all aware that Minnesota is the only two house legislature which elects its members on a non-partisan basis. The only other state which has a non-partisan legislature is Nebraska, but they have a unicameral system.

I think we are also aware of the history of the non-partisan nature of the Minnesota legislature. Actually we observe this year the 50th anniversary of a famous legislative freak and an accident---the elimination of party designation from the legislature in 1913.

History reveals that there was no great desire to remove the legislators from running on a partisan ticket. To the contrary, such men as Senators F. A. Duxbury, A. J. Rockne, George H. Sullivan fought hard for the continued election of legislators on party tickets. Likewise in the House there was much concern about eliminating party designation from the legislature.

The matter of party designation for the legislature was not the great issue of the day in 1913. The general issue of government reform, however did receive statewide attention. Included were such subjects as primary elections, proportional representation, shorter ballot, unicameral legislature, initiative, referendum, recall, non-partisan election of some local and county public officials.

A move for non partisanship in certain offices succeeded in legislative action in 1912. This included county superintendent of schools, officers of cities of the first class, and state judges.

The move in 1913 was to extend the 1912 action to extend non partisan elections to include all judges and all city and county officials. This was the bill which triggered the action in the state legislature. This bill was attacked by F. A. Duxbury, A. J. Rockne, George Sullivan and others in the Senate. It was attacked because it removed too many office holders from the partisan type ballot.

Senator Rockne summed up the feelings of himself and others when he argued that political parties were necessary to the American system of government.

A counter attempt was made to cut down the number of officials to be elected by the non-partisan technique. This failed. Then the Duxbury-Rockne-Sullivan group moved to include the legislators in the non partisan bill. It was thought this would kill the bill. The original author--Senator Haycraft--was opposed to removing the legislators from the partisan ballot. With the understanding that the House would reject such a bill---the bill including the amendment about legislators passed the Senate.

After Committee consideration, some debate, and final action---the reform bill passed including non partisan status for legislators. Interestingly enough there was no known debate on the matter pertaining to legislators. Most people took it for granted that they would be excluded from the bill. Editorial opinion strongly favored electing legislators on the party ballot. So historians have labeled the Minnesota non partisan legislature as a legislative freak or accident.

But now we face the issue as to whether we should return to a legislature elected with party labels. The Republican party strongly supports such action and urges that this committee report out a party designation bill to the floor of the Senate.

No one argues against the general proposition that our nation and our fifty states need a strong two party political system. On that we seem to be in solid agreement.

The concern for maintaining and strengthening a strong two party system is a valid and important concern. Under our system of government we basically forge our government on the anvil of political action. With periodic exceptions it has been a strong two party system which has given us an effective and successful governmental system. Some persons would like to divorce politics from government and treat them as separate entities.. But this is an academic exercise. Politics and government in our system are joined and interwoven.

Why,---then---do we desire a strong two party system in the United States and in the respective 50 states? There are many different reasons which might be given. Primarily the political parties constitute the legally created machinery whereby the citizen in a free society expresses his desires, choices, and decisions---over a myriad of things political---candidates, issues, platforms. The political parties play a vital role in our nation and in Minnesota.

We can without apology to any state in the country, state most emphatically that we have a strong two party system in Minnesota. If anyone doubts this statement let him visit the Ramsey County Court room where the historic recount trial is in session.

We elect our Congressmen, our U. S. Senators, our state officials on the party ballot. But the legislature sits as an island of political immunity in so far as partisan politics is concerned. It could be questioned whether this immunity is merely illusory---not real.

After having used the term non partisan---I now raise the question as to whether the Minnesota legislature is truly as non partisan as some of its members would have us believe. How many of the legislators really have no political conviction? How many really have not made some kind of political commitment as to basic philosophy? I strongly believe the number is small.

What do the terms Conservative and Liberal mean to the citizens of Minnesota? Are they political terms immune from partisan interpretation---whether that interpretation be right or wrong? I think not.

How many members of the legislature are elected with absolutely no contact with one of the other of the two political parties?

The Minnesota legislature is a fact of political life---it is not immune from politics---it is not completely divorced from partisan consideration. I also know from first hand experience that the political parties in Minnesota constitute a fact of political life. Both are vitally interested in the selection, election and activity of the members of the Minnesota State Legislature. This interest will not only continue but will intensify in future years as both political parties must come face to face with problems facing our state. This is a legitimate

interest by the parties and individuals in government and politics.

It does not constitute as many legislators say---a domination over the legislature by the parties. This argument has always amused me and in my judgment is specious. That is the argument that to have party designation for the legislature is to have "bossism" over the legislature. I would like to have these people identify who the "bosses" are. I would like to have them demonstrate what they think would happen under party designation. I have not observed a political boss complex in Minnesota with regard to the two political parties.

There may be those who would dream of becoming a political boss in Minnesota. There may be those who would want to wield great power for selfish interests. But such dreams would have to come face to face with Minnesota's independent voting power. The dream would slip away unrealized. The power of the people of Minnesota as demonstrated in election after election would send any would-be political boss to find some sort of political aspirin.

Do those who are concerned with bossism believe that the legislature of 1913 was dominated and controlled by political bosses? I have never heard it said. Do they then believe that the legislature of 1963 is not as strong, courageous, fearless and forthright as its predecessors? I don't think so. But when legislators try to hurl back party designation with the charge of party bossism they are in effect suggesting that there is some fundamental difference between themselves and legislators of the earlier days.

At this point it is well to note the bill's amendment to section 202.21 of our state election laws. That section contains the provision that each member of the legislature, or his nominee, is to automatically become a member of the county political committee of his choice. In other words, the legislators themselves will be a part of the political party machinery.

There are those members of the legislature who argue that if they had to run with party labels they could not win. This may be true in certain instances---but to extend this personal argument against party designation to the broader statement which some make that party designation would dramatically alter the membership of

both houses, would appear to me to be an unwarranted extension. I suggest there are many members of the House and Senate in the Minnesota legislature who would be re-elected if they ran as Republicans or if they ran as Democrats. Party designation does not arbitrarily strip away from legislators or candidates for the legislature those elements of personal appeal which win elections.

It seems to me that party designation would be of benefit to the people of Minnesota. This is not to say that it is an issue as to whether one type of legislature has the ability to pass better legislation.

It seems a bit incogruous to place so much emphasis on our political parties, our political system, the importance of citizens participation in politics---and then have a vital part of that system divorced from the party by labels---conservative and liberal. The voter is urged to read the political platforms of the two major parties, to listen to the pronouncement of candidates running on or with that platform, to question candidates on issues---but at the same time we ask the voter not to pay any attention to these party considerations when they elect their representative and senator to the legislature.

No one has been able to demonstrate that the people of Minnesota have benefited more by the non partisan legislature when compared to the people of New York^O, Wisconsin, California, and other states who have the opportunity to consider political philosophy, party platform, and party considerations in casting their votes for their legislators.

In my opinion the people have the right to know who they are voting for---not only the man or woman---but also the political philosophy and platform of that candidate.

STATEMENT BY MRS. O. H. ANDERSON, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA, to the Senate Committee
on Elections and Reapportionment, February 26, 1963
in behalf of the Party Designation bill, S. F. 514

Why does the League of Women Voters of Minnesota want Party Designation for members of the Legislature?

Members of the League of Women Voters, contrary to the belief in some quarters, are not victims of technological unemployment, brought on by household automation. Were we looking for busywork, or did we regard legislation as a spectator sport, we would not have chosen the issue of Party Designation, to which we have been addressing ourselves for these past six sessions of the Legislature.

The League's studies of government--and particularly, the government of Minnesota--have led us to the deep and abiding belief and conviction that the political party is essential to the operation of a democratic society. It is in the party that the citizen takes his first halting steps toward that personal and informed involvement in the political process which is the purpose of the League. It is in this same party that he helps to nominate and elect public officials and may even help to write the party platform through which he has a direct line to the Legislature.

We believe that political parties have been responsible for major governmental reforms; the two rival parties forge the action programs on which the Governor and the Legislature must act; parties create long-range plans for the state, rather than stop-gap and piecemeal solutions.

Lack of party designation often means the lack of a collective program; the lack of an expressive opposition; the absence of clearly delineated issues in a campaign; the lack of party designation makes for a lack of responsiveness and responsibility to the citizen, and a callous indifference to changing public attitudes. With no party designation, the pressure by special interest groups on the Legislature has certainly increased.

Our "Independent" Legislature operates like a two-party system in that it quickly divides into two factions or caucuses which demand-and get-great loyalty from their members. Certainly in a Legislature as large as that in Minnesota, some discipline is necessary. We believe that responsibility to a party platform would make for more citizen-oriented legislation and would direct legislation to more specific ends.

There is ample room within the parties for freedom of thought and choice; parties welcome widely divergent points of view. I suspect that a more active involvement of the members of the Legislature would have a vitalizing influence on the parties. The League considers Party Designation as a basic election law reform; as basic as the premise that the Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be elected from the same party. How can we be for one and not the other?

We need hardly remind ourselves here of the need for making the task of the voter in Minnesota as clear and unmistakable as it is humanly possible. On what basis does he vote for members of the state Legislature? On personal charm and popularity? On his ethnic background? Religious affiliation? Should not the Minnesota voter have the same opportunity as do voters in 48 of the other 49 states--of knowing for what the candidate's name really stands?

We believe that the results of the enactment of Party Designation for members of the Minnesota Legislature would be accountability and accomplishment.

file

June 22, 1964

Mr. Ernest C. Peterson
Minnesota Employers Association
Standard Packaging Corp.
2387 University Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Peterson:

We realize that in the past the legislative interests of the Minnesota Employers Association have not coincided with those of the League of Women Voters. However, perhaps the time has come to re-examine our positions. The Minnesota Employers Association is now urging Minnesota businessmen to increase export sales of Minnesota finished products. The Minnesota Employers Association is supporting the Taconite Amendment. These are both positions with which the League of Women Voters of Minnesota agrees.

During the 1965 session of the Minnesota Legislature, the League of Women Voters of Minnesota will work toward passage of legislation which would allow new state residents to vote for President and Vice President. Your membership probably includes a highly mobile segment of society to whom this legislation is particularly important. The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Procedures, November 1963, states, "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements."

We will also support legislation requiring party designation for state legislators. In spite of your past opposition to this, we urge you to reconsider. Many of your members are becoming more active in their parties. If the influence of these members—and all citizens—in their parties is to be effective, our legislators must be responsible to the parties and the voters.

We solicit your support for both these issues and hope that you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in these two causes of better government for Minnesota. We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. L. G. Murray, Box 82, Minnetonka Beach, Minn. (GR 1-8856) is the League of Women Voters' legislative chairman. She will look forward to hearing from you.

Mrs. Ernest C. Peterson
June 22, 1964
Page 2.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to persuade the Minnesota legislature to pass these much needed pieces of legislation during the coming session.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation. We are looking forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Ma. W. Whiting
President

ATM/mc

June 17, 1964

Mr. Orville Peterson
League of Minnesota Municipalities
Social Science Building
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 55455, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Peterson:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the League of Minnesota Municipalities in our efforts to achieve passage of two pieces of legislation; one in favor of party designation for state legislators and the other to allow new state residents to vote for President and Vice President. The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Procedures, November 1963, states, "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements."

We hope that you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in these two causes of better government for Minnesota. We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. L. G. Murray, Box 82, Minnetonka Beach, Minn. (GR 1-8856) is the League of Women Voters' legislative chairman. She will look forward to hearing from you.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to persuade the Minnesota Legislature to pass these much needed pieces of legislation during the coming session.

Thank you for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Wm. W. Whiting
President

ATW/mc

1
✓ Mrs. Oscar Erickson
Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs
Andrus Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dear Mrs. Erickson,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation to allow new state residents to vote for President and Vice President. The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Procedures, November 1963, states, "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet ~~the~~ State residence requirements."

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in this cause of better government for Minnesota. We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. L. G. Murray, Box 82, Minnetonka Beach, Minn. (GR 1-8856) is the League of Women Voters' legislative chairman. She will look forward to hearing from you.

We hope that by securing the ~~the~~ names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to persuade the Minnesota Legislature to pass this much needed piece of legislation during the coming session.

Thank you for your cooperation. We are looking forward to working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WM. W. Whiting
President

Edwin H. Meyer, State Commander

(Also to:

✓ Mr. Karl ~~Karl~~ Neumeier
Minnesota Taxpayers Association
812 Minnesota Bldg.
St. Paul, Minn.

✓ Mrs. Charles Huffman
Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers
2639 University Ave.
St. Paul, Minn.

✓ The Rev. Alton Motter
Minnesota Council of Churches
122 Franklin Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn.

✓ Dr. Irva Mae Applegate
Minnesota Education Association
St. ~~State~~ Cloud State College
St. Cloud, Minn.

✓ Mr. Clarence Myers
Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation
105 Commerce Bldg.
St. Paul, Minn.

✓ Veterans of ~~Foreign~~ Foreign Wars
Veteran's Service Bldg. 221-2665
St. Paul, Minn. ~~221-2665~~

✓ Howard E. Lehman, Dept. Commander
American Legion
600 Shubert Bldg. State Veterans Serv. Bldg.
St. Paul, Minn. 221-2888
~~12205 7th St.~~

American Civil Liberties Union
1st National Bank Bldg.
Minneapolis, Minn.

could you call these last 2
+ get the names of their
presidents & then send to
them? Thanks a million.

c.w. 34

No copies
Insert name
of club
Ref. to LWS
Per 2-22-72.

2
Mrs. S. A. ~~Krist~~ Christian
American Association of University Women, Minnesota Div.
2115 Stevens Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Christian,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the American Association of University Women, Minnesota Division in our efforts to achieve passage of two pieces of legislation; one in favor of party designation for state legislators and the other to allow new state residents to vote for President and Vice President. The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Procedures, November 1963, states, "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements."

We hope that you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in these two causes of better government for Minnesota. We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. L. G. Murray, Box 82, Minnetonka Beach, Minn. (GR 1-8856) is the League of Women Voters' legislative chairman. She will look forward to hearing from you.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to persuade the Minnesota Legislature to pass these much needed pieces of legislation during the coming session.

Thank you for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Wm. W. Whiting
President

May 27, 1964
Also to:

✓ Mrs. Donald Guthrie

Republican Workshop

120 E. 1st St. Pine Tree Hill
Minneapolis, Minn. *Marion*

✓ Mr. Ed Neilan

Chamber of Commerce of U. S., Northwestern Div.
1807 1st National Bank Bldg.
Minneapolis, Minn.

✓ Mr. Arthur Olson

Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce
926 Budd
Fairmont, Minn.

✓ Mr. Phillip Neville

Minnesota State Bar Association
370 Pillsbury Bldg.
North Star Center
Minneapolis, Minn. 55402

✓ American Civil Liberties Union

1st National Bank Bldg.
Minneapolis, Minn.

June 17, 1964

Mr. Orville Peterson
League of Minn. Municipalities
Social Science Building
University of Minnesota

Mpls., Minn.

3
Mr. Clinton Hess
Minnesota Farmers Union
2470 University Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mr. Hess,

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is most appreciative of the support of the Minnesota Farmers Union in 1963 in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation in favor of party designation for state legislators. We will once again be working for this legislation and would like very much to count on your continued support in the 1965 session.

We would also like to secure the support of your organization in our efforts to achieve passage of legislation to allow new state residents to vote for U. S. President and Vice President. The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Procedures, November 1963, states, "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements."

We hope that either you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in these two causes of better government for Minnesota. We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. L. G. Murray, Box 82, Minnetonka Beach, Minnesota (GR 1-8856) is the League of Women Voters' legislative chairman. She will look forward to hearing from you.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to persuade the Minnesota Legislature to pass these much needed pieces of legislation during the coming session.

Thank you again for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Wm. W. Whiting
President

(Margaret - Please ^{also} send ~~xxxxxx~~ this letter to:

✓ Mrs. Robert Hess
Minnesota Federation of Labor
47 W. 9th St.
St. Paul, Minn.
✓ and Mrs. Leo Weik
Minn. Council Of Jewish Women
I'll try to find the name
and address and call you.)
4910 W. 28th St
Legislative Chairman
Mrs. Peter Zimmerman
3843 Glenhurst
St. Louis Park 16, Minn.

This letter sent to Republican Workshop; Chamber of Commerce of U. S., Northwestern Division; Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce; Minnesota State Bar Association; American Civil Liberties Union.

file

May 25, 1964

Mrs. S. A. Christian
American Association of University Women
Minnesota Division
2115 Stevens Avenue
Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Christian:

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is anxious to secure the support of the American Association of University Women, Minnesota Division, in our efforts to achieve passage of two pieces of legislation; one in favor of party designation for state legislators and the other to allow new state residents to vote for President and Vice President. The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Procedures, November 1963, states, "No American should be deprived of the right to vote for President and Vice President because he changed his address before the election and did not have time to meet State residence requirements."

We hope that you, or someone delegated by you, will be willing to work with us in these two causes of better government for Minnesota. We will be greatly appreciative of whatever efforts your organization wishes to make. Mrs. W. G. Murray, Box 82, Minnetonka Beach, Minn. (GR 1-8836) is the League of Women Voters' legislative chairman. She will look forward to hearing from you.

We hope that by securing the names and voices of influential people from a large and wide cross-section of Minnesota society, we will be able to persuade the Minnesota Legislature to pass these much needed pieces of legislation during the coming session.

Thank you for your cooperation. We will be looking forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

Mrs. William W. Whiting
President

ATW/mc

SUGGESTED ORGANIZATIONS

These are organizations which we think are more apt to be interested in our various items. It is not a complete list. Not all communities have local units of all these organizations. There will be local variations in attitude also. Think about your community--which organizations have groups in your town--who are their leaders--do they agree with us on any of these items?

Lists of organizations interested in foreign affairs and water conservation will be distributed at the June Leadership Workshop.

PARTY DESIGNATION	ELECTION LAW (on new resident's voting for pres. and vice president)	DISCRIMINATION
DFL	AAUW	AAUW
GOP	American Legion	AFL-CIO
Council of Jewish Women	Bar Association	Anti-defamation League
Farmers Union	Business & Professional Women's Club	of B'Nai B'Rith
Federation of Labor	Chamber of Commerce	Business and Professional Women's Club
AAUW	Civil Liberties Union	Bar Association
Bar Association	Council of Churches	Catholic Interracial Council
Chamber of Commerce	Council of Jewish Women	Chamber of Commerce
Junior Chamber of Commerce	DFL	Citizen's Committee on Human Rights
Republican Workshop	Farm Bureau	Civil Liberties Union
Business & Professional Women's Club	Farmers Union	Council of Churches
	Federated Women's Club	Council of Jewish Women
	Federation of Labor	Federated Women's Club
	GOP	Junior Chamber of Commerce
	Junior Chamber of Commerce	Junior Chamber of Commerce
	PTA	Wives
	Republican Workshop	Men's Service Clubs
	VFW	NAACP
	League of Catholic Women	PTA
		Republican Workshop
		Tribal Council
		Urban League

9/9/64

office

TO: LNV of Minnesota Legislative chairman, CRs chairman, office etc.

FROM: Ann Duff

SUBJECT: How the Minn. Legislature became non-party designated. Excerpt from 1958 tape Dr. Ralph Fjelstad (Congdon Professor of Government, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.) series of lectures commemorating Minnesota's Centennial. His subject: Problems for our second century - Constitutional Revision, Party Designation, Reapportionment. Below is his Party Designation section dealing with how we got it.

" We got this non-partisan legislature purely by accident... Charles Adrian got his doctoral degree at the University of Minnesota by submitting a thesis on this subject. He has made the most thorough study ever made of this area. In the winter 1952 issue of Minnesota History he has a little article in which he points out the series of events by which the legislature became non-partisan. I am going to use his material for the next 5 or 10 minutes. ~~Let~~ 'Minnesota's unusual arrangement,' Adrian says, 'dates from 1913 and is largely the result of a political accident of a series of events strongly resembling a comedy of errors...When the Minnesota Legislature met in 1913 probably not a single legislator suspected that before the session ended the Minnesota Legislature would have a law-making body chosen without party designation.' Now I want to try to tell you a few of the events that led to non-partisanship in the Legislature. In a special session in 1912 the state Legislature extended the non-partisan idea to county superintendents, state judges and officials in first class cities. When the ~~1913~~ regular session of the legislature met in 1913, it was recommended that nonpartisanship by extended and Senator Hayercraft who was chairman of the Senate Elections committee put in a recommendation from that committee that non-partisanship by extended to all state judges, all county officials and to all officials in cities and towns. Some of the party people in the legislature were concerned about this for they believed that the elimination of parties at the local level would destroy parties as effective functioning units of government. So a conservative wing within the Republican which controlled the legislature at this time moved in the Senate to amend this bill by striking out all county offices except county superintendent of schools. This, however, was defeated and then you get an interesting effort in defeating the bill. Senator Rockne, who was a leader in the Republican Party in this period, one of the political greats in this state's history, but a person who didn't want parties taken out of party offices, thought that the only way to defeat the bill now was to ~~put~~ embarrass it in some form, so he moved to amend the bill suggesting that all legislators be made nonpartisan. He suspected that if all legislators were also involved in nonpartisanship, they would vote against it and this is what he really wanted anyway. But against the possibility that perhaps the legislature would actually pass it in the Senate, Senator Rockne went over to the Speaker in the House who in turn went to the chairman of the Elections Committee in the House and these two leaders of the House assured him that if by accident the Senate should approve nonpartisanship for legislators, they would strike it out in the House.

So, lo and behold, Senator Rockne introduces his amendment. People who knew Senator Rockne as a party man were startled by this suggestion but they believed as a leader of the Senate they must defer to him and the Senate passed the amendment. The bill then went over to the House. Well, true to his word, the Speaker sent it to the Elections committee and the chairman of the House Elections committee sat on it for three weeks. The intent was to delay it and kill it. The promise to Senator Rockne was the committee would not send it back into the House without eliminating from it legislative.

But now something else happened. During this session of the Legislature, the Republicans who were predominately Dry, controlled both houses. The Wets in the state couldn't get through the Legislature some of the things they wanted, so they saw in the possibility of nonpartisanship the hope that the Legislature which was

JAN 13 1964

somebody forward this to Mary Nash, please

Party Designation meanderings for Sue, Harj., Annette, Irene, Bobbie & Peg
from Ann Duff 1/10/64

Why do we want it? Our main concern I think is for the voter - his right to know behind that canvas curtain, the voting booth, for whom he's voting. What program, what philosophy does this candidate for the Legislature favor? Our concern is for the voter to have the right to cast the informed ballot - we do not care for which candidate or political party - that's up to the voter. But we feel the voter has a right to know for whom ~~he is voting~~ he is voting.

And then beyond the informed vote, we would like to see the citizen become interested in his community and wish to take part in improving it. So we urge him to attend his party caucus, know the issues, dig in and follow them through into legislation. Then he joins his party - either one - follows through on the issues and nothing happens. Why?

Here you get into the next layer of League interest in Party Designation. Statewide, Minnesota is evenly split politically when it comes to voting for Governor or United States President - we can go either way any time. Hence, the consensus among the citizens of Minnesota falls along the Eisenhower or Kennedy tradition - liberal Republican or Conservative Democratic. That is why most of our League program usually has the support of both political parties - we happen to fall right in the middle of the consensus of Minnesota's voters. Then what happens? The Governor proposes a program (either Andersen or Roebuck) and it gets cut to ribbons by the Legislature. Why? A handful of Senators who are ultra Conservative have complete control of state government, through that fascinating system of interlocking directorships, the prominent sub-committees of the important committees which I charted for the last issue of the Capitol Letter. Republican Governors through the years have found this exceedingly frustrating and it always surprises them because they thought a Conservative legislature would be with them. Now, when one house or the other or the Governor's office is controlled by the Liberals or Democrats this muddies the issue because they spend most of their time throwing partisan labels back and forth at each other.

When we talk about Party Designation we're talking about a revolution - as major a revolution as was reapportionment. What it would do in the Senate is take the power out of the hands of 7 Conservatives and put it in the hands of all the Conservatives. Note, it is not a switch in power from Conservative to Liberal and I think we should state this very plainly in our 1964-5 campaign. There are 43 Conservatives and 24 Liberals and not a one of them is up for re-election. Everything stays exactly the same as during the last session. The revolution is ~~in~~ in handing the power over to the Republican oriented Conservatives and obviously this is why the Republican Party favors Party Designation. And this is why that handful on the far right does not want it: they wish to have nothing to do with the Republican Party. ~~They feel the Republican Party is much too liberal for them. Why doesn't the Republican oriented faction of the Senate Conservatives simply vote this handful out of their committee chairmanships? Can't be done. They organize on a 4 year basis, considering themselves in continuous session. How'd it happen? The Republican oriented group lacks strong leadership - too new - so the old guard simply outmaneuvered them. It worked because there is a group of Conservatives in the middle ready to go either way (13 in the GOP-oriented group, 7 in the old guard, 23 in varying degrees between the two poles).~~

Now in the Senate this issue always gets gummed up in party politics. The Old Guard saying, "Party Designation - what - and turn this body over to the Liberals? Horrors!" We must hit this argument hard with the facts (see paragraph above). Bob Forsythe's (state GOP chairman) evaluation of this (but do not quote him

publicly in that under Party Designation 2 seats will be lost to them in the

northwestern tip of the state (Sinclair & Norm Larson) and 1 seat in downtown Minneapolis (new Senator Mel Hansen). Bob feels it would strengthen them in the southern part of the state where they are having real problems - DFL candidates almost getting elected in overwhelmingly GOP districts. These snaky Conservatives know they owe their election to having been rescued at the last moment by the GOP (Senator Kroehler, chairman of the committee which gets the Party Designation bill, is one of these). They are caught in a real pinch - owing their election to the GOP but in their hearts favoring ~~the~~ the more conservative viewpoint and - here's the real nub of the problem - owing their committee chairmanships to the 7 on the far right.

Now, there's a group of Senate Conservatives who don't really care one way or the other about the issue, or feel yes, the issue is right "but it's not that important to me - taxes is the main issue, or farm bills" or what have you. "My problem is Sinclair and Norm Larson - I can't possibly vote against these men and expect to get any of my bills through their committees."

Gordon Rosenmeier runs the Senate, and through it, in effect the state of Minnesota. The whole basis of it is seniority (exactly the same technique used by that handful of Democrats on the far right in Congress - fascinating!). Another interesting fact: there are several Senators with more seniority than Rosenmeier. How does he manage this? Through the committee system again - Committee on Committees again! All the power held by the Speaker in the House (Duxbury) and the majority leader is in the Senate funneled through the Committee on Committees ~~in the Senate~~ where Rosenmeier can run things. So, if the power in the Conservative caucus is switched so that the Senate were to be organized as the House, Rosenmeier would be in trouble! The GOP thinks this would be very fine - there is no love lost between the 2. Our chief Senate author on this bill, Conservative Senator Langley (former minister, long time member of the House, now to the Senate) said to me (in confidence - not for publication) that he was shocked - simply astounded - at the bitterness, the sheer hatred expressed by Rosenmeier against the GOP in the Senate Conservative caucus meetings. A young new Conservative Senator said to me he had never seen such pressures - "fierce" - and he's for years been in some very hot spots in the Minneapolis Council. Nothing he had ever seen equaled this issue in the Conservative caucus.

So - what to do? See what kind of support you can get from the GOP at the state level and at the county level where these 15 GOP oriented Conservatives are. Because if the bill could be dropped on the floor of the Senate it could easily pass, with 3 or 4 votes to spare (adding the DFL votes which were solidly in favor last time - see my notes last year on this because they don't all really favor it, just enjoyed embarrassing the Conservatives, I think.)

DFL - Liberals in Legislature very close to their party. They want Party Designation because they want to break up this power structure in the Senate and also they think they can pick up a few seats overall (I do too, but I think they'd lose some in the House and so does the Republican Party). ~~When~~ When it all comes out in the wash, I think politically it would be exactly even. The GOP thinks they'd pick up some seats in the Legislature; DFL thinks they'd pick up some seats. So it comes back right where we started out: the real revolution in the Senate would be in taking the power out of the hands of the far right and putting it in the hands ~~of the~~ of the more liberal Conservatives. This is why the Senate 7 will have none of it. This is why Otto Christensen, exec. sec. of Minnesota Employers Assn. ~~will~~ will have none of it. Otto is still the most effective lobbyist in the Legislature. Some of my predecessors felt he did not accurately reflect the opinion within the MEA (in testimony he's always careful to say, "I'm speaking as an individual"). I don't think the MEA has ever discussed Party Designation (be sure to ask Bob Forsythe this spring to see if he can get it on their agenda; I do not want us to get into any snarls between another organization and their executive secretary) but I do think generally speaking that he does represent them accurately - they snaky very much.

of him. However, I do doubt that the Minnesota Employers Association accurately reflects of Minnesota's employers. I know many businessmen all around this state who are much more apt to think along the lines of Eisenhower, Romney or Nixon rather than Barry Goldwater.

If you plan a major legislative campaign with Party Designation, rather than a community-type public relations one just to keep the issue alive for '67, be sure you have the complete and dedicated support of the Leagues in the districts of these 12 or 15 Senate Conservatives. They and the GOP on the home front will have to bear the brunt of the campaign, directed by you of course but done by them, because when the chips are down in the middle of the session those men will not pay any attention (except courtesy) to you but they are receptive to the home front and since they will be facing an election shortly after the session they will be more receptive than ever.

You will have to find one Conservative among the dozen who will step forward and get the vote out - then all the others will automatically follow. I felt during the '65 session Bergerud was going to be a big disappointment to us. I feel during the '65 session he is going to be our savior - a complete switch and it's too early to really tell for those reasons you and I discussed on the phone this morning.

Now all of you gals - tips - never pass on the confidential information from anyone. Never say publically what one Conservative said about another. Never pass on publically what Bob Forsythe says about any of the Conservatives. Ditto for George Farr and the Liberals. Many individual legislators on both sides of the political fence will take you into their confidence (both House & Senate) on this issue. This is because they often have a very high regard for the League and they like you as a person and have confidence in judgement of discretion. Or if they don't think much of the League or don't have any in their district, they feel strongly that this is ~~the~~ one of the most important issues in Minnesota today and they realize that only an organization like the League could keep this issue alive and get the ball rolling on it. By the way, I feel strongly that the DFL should not be given by us the names of these 12 or 15 Senators. To me, this would violate our nonpartisanship policy - I am not about to give them a prime campaign issue with those Conservatives. If we had gotten the names off our candidates questionnaires then the information can and should be made public but many of these did not reply to our questionnaires. I got the information in a casual little bench session with Dave Kragging, Bob Forsythe's assistant, in the middle of the campaign as we were so strenuously counting noses we just peeked over at each other's lists to double check. To me, this is confidential, and I feel that to keep these channels open (and we've got to or we'll never know what's going on and where the problems are etc.) we must respect the confidence. Mary Mantis, by the way, was magnificent in this department as was Dorothy Anderson and Annette Whiting and Sue Murray. They were the only ones who knew some or all of this stuff. I feel, if you ever get time at a Board meeting, the whole Board should know, because then as they visit their Leagues they can help the Legislative Committee keep current on the political winds. Also, it's so darn interesting - promotes sound decisions too.

You'll have a lot of fun with this issue. It's just about the hottest one over there. Because the leadership in both Houses so firmly opposes it but the majority of the legislators in each House favors it. Fascinating things happen. Remember the 1965 blackmail plot? The GOP had to get a bill through or else pay a huge bill for the cost of the Submaterial Recount. This would have bankrupted the Republican Party. It finally got through the last day of the session - the leadership in both Houses was hanging this as a threat over the heads of the GOP-oriented Conservatives to keep them "in line" on Party Designation. We were sorely tempted to give that pearl to the press and TV - what terrific stories that would have made: GOP BLACKMAILED. I refused to allow this to be done because I felt this would be a serious violation of the nonpartisanship policy: we are not in this business to bankrupt either political party. I was not about to have that on our consciences for the rest of our lives.

I suppose that sounds funny coming from me - I have always been a democrat and always shall be. To me this is the spirit of the nonpartisanship policy in the League. When I'm doing League work I'm thinking only of the issue. I am not about to give either political party any advantage over the other one over any issue. The thing I am trying to do is pull forth all the strands of support for the issue, mold them together and get them enacted into law. I've found that the easiest way to do this in the middle of the fray is to carefully keep the 2 political lines separated - for example, when George Farr was trying so hard to get the 13 Conservative names for his newspaper campaign in middle of session, I turned him over the Sen. Thuest, our chief Liberal author saying: "He's such a fine and able person. Nothing goes on in that Senate he doesn't know about and he'd love to give you all the low down on this issue. He knows everything about everyone." Ditto for the GOP when they wanted to know the names of those 2 or 3 Liberals which I thought might defect; I turned them over to Lew Larson and Langley the Conservative authors.

By the way, during the 1965 session, I doubt that I can be of any help whatsoever to you on this issue. If I happen to pick up any scuttlebutt, of course I'll pass it on immediately. It's just that I don't think I'll hear anything. What talking I'll be doing with legislators - if any - will be about executive reorganization. And I'll be working with Gordon Rosenmaier because I have a strong feeling, but no current knowledge, that he agrees with us on the importance of clearly fixed executive responsibility, post auditor etc. etc. And for exactly the same reasons we do - economy and efficiency in government, business-like chain of command in executive positions etc. I have never met the gentleman but I have developed a very high regard for him - his ability, brains, talent and from what all you say, his charm and spontaneity in conversation. I'm looking forward to it! Also I think (if we can get him on this Governor's Committee) he's going to find it much easier working with a DFL governor rather than a GOP one! My, politics is funny. But isn't it fun????

Affectionately,

Wm

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON PARTY DESIGNATION

1. Have Minnesota legislators always been elected on a nonpartisan basis?

In 1913 the nonpartisan label was attached to those who held office as judges, county officials and officials of cities of the first and second class as well as members of the legislature. In a newspaper "Letter to the Editor" column, one Minnesotan questions the validity of the law since Article IV, Sec. 27 of the Minnesota Constitution says "No law shall embrace more than one subject which shall be expressed in its title." No one has tried to test the constitutionality of this law and it has been in effect since 1913. The nonpartisanship of legislators was added to the bill in the senate in an attempt to kill the House-sponsored bill.

2. How does the legislature organize itself under this nonpartisan basis?

Contrary to the belief of some Minnesotans the nonpartisan feature of our legislature does not mean that their representative will operate in the legislature as an Independent. The legislature is organized into two caucuses—Conservative and Liberal with the faction which has the majority filling the chairmanships and vice chairmanships of all standing committees as well as appointing a controlling number of members of the committee. An "independent" may be able to swing back and forth between the two groups but it is easy to see that he would have difficulty exerting much influence. While there is not a "party whip" or steering committee to control or influence the progress of legislation, the power is exerted by certain committee heads (see Jan-Feb 1964 issue of MINNESOTA VOTER for more information on committee structure). The independence that is exercised in this nonpartisan system is very often independence of responsibility to the voter.

3. What is the role of the political party in Minnesota?

Political parties are the means for the orderly exercise and change of power in all societies where citizens govern themselves. In all states the parties recruit candidates for office; help voters nominate and elect public officials; give candidates support (financial and otherwise) during campaigns; formulate and publicize government issues through platform-making; provide framework for legislative organization; follow candidates in the performance of their legislative and administrative duties; advise elected officials through lobbying; help to coordinate legislative and executive activities and the two legislative branches and very importantly, when not in power, act as the loyal opposition thereby keeping those in power alert. Many of these functions are either impossible or very difficult in Minnesota where the executive branch is elected on a party ticket and the legislators on a nonpartisan one. In recent years there has been a growing trend for some legislators to emphasize party ties. The Liberal caucus agreed several years ago to call itself the DFL caucus and in recent elections candidates in nearly every legislative group have been DFL endorsed. Both parties now lend endorsement to candidates for nonpartisan legislative offices and offer financial support. This support does not always mean that the candidate supports the party platform or will support party designation.

4. How does this nonpartisanship affect the relationship of the executive and legislative bodies?

The answer to this question can be quickly answered using the words of a candidate in his reply concerning party designation on a candidates questionnaire, "In 1961, the Republicans (actually not Republican but Conservative caucus-ed. note) in the state Senate killed 70% of the bills advocated by a Republican chief executive." Changes in public thinking may be reflected by the electorate's

4. Continued

voting into office such men as Floyd Olson during the 30's and Luther Youngdahl in the 40's, but men like these have difficulty carrying out the reforms that they have promised when they must work with legislators who say they owe no allegiance to the parties.

5. Who wants party designation?

Both state polirical parties have carried party designation as a part of their platform plank since the 1930's. This support is very important, for without strong support from within the parties the chances of passing party designation are not good. Organized labor has supported it since 1927; in 1950 the Minnesota Cooperative joined the group; and since 1951 the League of Women Voters has studied and worked for it, starting with the 1953 legislative session. Various newspapers have supported party designation for years and have written favorable editorials. Among these are THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR AND TRIBUNE, RED WING REPUBLICAN EAGLE, FERGUS FALLS DAILY JOURNAL, and WORTHINGTON GLOBE. George Rice has often used this as a subject for his editorial comment on TV. Political scientists have for many years considered this one of the most important governmental reforms for Minnesota. A recent letter from the National Municipal League to the state Board of the DMV expressed satisfaction that we were continuing our work in this field. Many legislators have expressed publicly support for this measure (even some who do not vote for it). The results of the Minnesota Poll dealing with party designation have shown some fluctuation in past years with the smallest percentage (40% in 1958) answering that they were in favor of party labels for legislators. The most recent poll, as published in April 1964, shows 54% who feel that it is better for the state to have legislators identified by party.

6. Why does the League favor party designation?

The DMV believes that political parties are essential to the operation of a democratic society in two ways, 1) by providing the election machinery through which the citizen nominates, then elects public officials, and 2) by providing the party platform through which the citizen communicates his wishes to those who carry out his laws. We feel that the voter has a right and in fact has a duty to know what the candidate stands for. While parties must consider the needs of the state as a whole, under the present system, individual legislators have tended to feel their primary responsibilities are to the particular constituents that elected them, whether individual citizens or special interest groups.

7. Are we any closer to our goal of achieving party designation for legislators?

There are many who feel that if a party designation bill were to be brought on to the floor of either house that it would pass. In the Senate, even though there have been bills in committee for many sessions none has ever been reported out of committee. The committees that consider these bills are usually filled with opponents of party designation. In 1957 a bill not only was reported out of committee in the House (13-2) but passed the House 95-32. It is hard to tell what the factor of the growing involvement with parties by the nonpartisan candidates will mean to the popularity of party designation with the legislature.

8. What is the history of nonpartisanship in Nebraska, the only other state that shares our anonymity for legislators?

Nebraska adopted nonpartisanship for legislators in 1934. Nebraska has long been a strongly "one-party" state and those that wanted to make the legislative offices nonpartisan felt they needed the support of George Norris, one of the leaders of the Progressive movement that was strong in this part of the country

8. Continued

in the 30's. Norris favored the unicameral form of legislature and in order to get his support for the nonpartisan factor Nebraska became the only state to have a one body legislature and shares honors with Minnesota as the only other state to have a nonpartisan legislature. The Federation of Republican Women's Clubs in Nebraska has been trying to get a ballot issue to decide the fate of nonpartisanship.

9. What can the citizen do to help achieve party designation in Minnesota?

There are many things that you as League members as well as other citizens can do. The first thing to do is to become active in a political party (that is, all but League leaders). Through the parties you can work to secure candidates and help to elect those who not only believe in party designation but will commit themselves to work for the necessary legislation. At the same time you should be working to develop additional community support. Some of the old standbys for accomplishing this are writing letters to the editors of newspapers, writing legislators, seeing that your local newspapers receive information on a current basis, distributing fact sheets in your community. A local citizens committee composed of people from other organizations could be formed to publicize interest in party designation so that legislators cannot say that the average citizen has no interest in this measure.

M TO: Dorothy Anderson
E FROM: Mary Nash
M SUBJECT: PD Campaign
O

File
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

STATE ORGANIZATION SERVICE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS 4, MINNESOTA
PHONE: 373-2959

DATE 2-6-64

You probably know that thru the next legislative session we expect to follow legislation relating to our entire state Program and are planning to campaign for the election law relating to new state residents voting for pres. and v.p. and for party designation. It is in regard to the latter that I am coming to you for help. We hope to set up an active Speakers Bureau through the local Leagues (augmented by state Hd. if and where necessary). Would you be willing to write up some rather complete outlines for speeches on PD that could be sent out to the local Leagues for their use? We're thinking of some of various lengths and for different groups (perhaps one for men and one for women.) We would also like to work out some suggestions for visual aids to be used with them. Undoubtedly you'll have many good ideas which will help to spark our campaign and inspire our local leagues. We need your help.

I'll be calling you Mon. or Tues. and we can discuss it more fully then.
Thank you very much.

SAMPLE SPEECH ON PARTY DESIGNATION

PUT THE LABEL ON THE MAN

You wouldn't walk into a supermarket and be satisfied if you had to make your selection from a shelf of unmarked cans! Yet that's just what you do when you walk into the voting booth and make your selection for the state legislature from among unmarked and unlabelled candidates.

The only thing you know about the candidate is what he has decided he wants to tell you. No "brand names" to guide you as to general philosophy--no labelling of contents to give you some idea of basic policy endorsements.

You wouldn't stand for trying to buy a can of peas in this manner---why should you have to settle for less in picking the men who are going to make the laws for the entire state of Minnesota?

Legislators must have a responsibility and accountability to more than their own constituents---they must commit themselves on broad matters of statewide concern.

If each legislator is going to limit his identification to matters of purely local interest, who is going to be concerned with issues of importance to the whole state of Minnesota? The legislators, after all, make laws for the whole state.

Don't let the cry of independence confuse you---the only independence a nonpartisan legislature has is independence from the voter! With no stated platform, legislators are ill-equipped to resist the special interest groups which now influence policy in a disproportionate manner. The voter should be influencing policy at the polls---if he can find out what the candidate stands for.

Let's explode once and for all the myth that we have a nonpartisan legislature!

The legislature organizes itself into two factions before each session, caucuses to decide which men will hold important positions and decides upon the position their faction will take on controversial legislation which will be introduced during the session. The majority faction in either house always fills all chairmanships and vice chairmanships of all 39 standing committees and appoints a controlling number of members of these committees from its faction.

The Minnesota legislature doesn't function on a nonpartisan basis---it functions on a winner takes all basis!

But the candidates fool the people by campaigning as if they were independents. Most voters don't even know which faction they join when they get elected. A candidate may call himself a Liberal and then join the Conservative faction, or vice versa. And the voter hasn't a thing to say about being bamboozled. The voter often doesn't even have a choice between two points of view since the two nominees for whom he has a chance to vote may actually be members of the same faction.

The time has come for the voters of the state of Minnesota to demand a direct vote in their state government by insisting that the state legislature pass the legislation required to

PUT THE LABEL ON THE MAN!

STATEMENT BY MRS. O. J. JANSKI, FIRST VICE PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA, to the Senate Committee on Elections and Reapportionment, February 16, 1965 in behalf of the Party Designation bill, S.F. 271.

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota is an organization composed of Leagues in 65 communities throughout the state -- large and small, rural and urban; from our northernmost League at International Falls to Worthington and Jackson in the south; Moorhead, Crookston, the Range towns, Silver Bay, Duluth and one of our newest Leagues in Winona -- all working to promote informed citizen participation in government.

The support of Party Designation for members of the Minnesota Legislature has been on the Program of the League of Women Voters since 1951 and is still there in 1965. The League's studies of government, and particularly the government of Minnesota, have led us to the sure knowledge that the political party is essential to the operation of a democracy. It is in the party that the citizen takes his first step toward personal involvement and participation in the political process. It is in this same party that he helps to nominate and elect public officials. He may even help to write the party platform through which he has a direct line to the Legislature. When the state Legislature, which determines whether or not the party's program becomes a reality, is elected without party designation, the whole pattern of responsible government is weakened. There is a lack of responsiveness and responsibility to the citizens.

We feel that the voter has a right, in fact has a duty, to know what a candidate stands for. Under our present set-up, the voter is more than likely to be confused. Why shouldn't he have the same opportunity to cast an informed ballot as voters in all the states except Minnesota and Nebraska?

Candidates for Governor in Minnesota run for office on a party basis. The electorate shows its support of the candidates' political party platform by electing him. Then he is expected to carry out the program he has pledged. When elected, the Governor frequently finds his program blocked to a standstill by legislators who do not commit themselves to a party platform. It seems to us that this method of operation makes a difficult job even more difficult.

In recent years there has been a growing trend for some legislators to emphasize party ties. In fact, both parties now endorse candidates for nonpartisan legislative offices. This means, of course, that these candidates enjoy the benefits of party designation -- financial support and publicity as well as political advice and guidance.

The League of Women Voters believes in the party system; we encourage and urge our members to work in the party of their choice. We believe that Minnesota should have a party designated legislature.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

Outlook for Legislative Action - 1965

The League of Women Voters has derived its legislative program from three areas of League study. 1. State Current Agenda items which include positions arrived at under both current and previous study. 2. State Continuing Responsibilities which are issues the League has previously studied and on which positions have been reached. 3. National Program positions which require action in the state legislature.

CURRENT AGENDA POSITIONS

Indians

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will study specific areas where legislation would be effective in improving the situation of the Minnesota Indian.

The League will support legislation to *insure services for Indian citizens which are equal to those provided for other citizens*. We oppose in principle the idea that legislation should single out any race or that separate services should be provided. However, since Indian citizens have been singled out for separate consideration throughout our history, we recognize that the state of Minnesota should give them special attention. We believe that this attention should be directed toward solving existing jurisdictional conflicts in order to guarantee equal treatment for Indian citizens by all levels of government.

The League will work for a *declaration of responsibility for Indian citizens* by the state and for an *effective agency* to facilitate solutions to their problems. Our criteria for an agency are: acceptable to the Indians themselves, permanent, staffed by professionally qualified people, authorized to act in setting up, carrying out, and coordinating programs, empowered to utilize the services of other existing agencies, and provided with adequate funds.

In general, when a county is too poor to expand its public services to cover Indian citizens, we favor financial participation by the state, but in that case, the state should have the power to set and enforce standards.

Constitutional Amendments

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will work for amendments to improve the constitution. Under this item the League has a new position on reapportionment as a result of recent consensus which states: The LWVM supports the principle of regular and equitable reapportionment. The League favors an amendment to the Minnesota Constitution which would:

1. Leave the primary responsibility for reapportionment with the legislature but would establish definite procedures if the legislature fails to act.
2. Specify the maximum deviation of any district from the ideal (total population divided by number of legislators).

3. Prohibit an increase in legislative size.

Under this position the League can support the recommendation of the Governor's Reapportionment Commission for a constitutional amendment on reapportionment.

Through years of constitutional study the League has adopted several positions dealing with constitutional amendments which may receive legislative attention.

1. Under our stand supporting an *adequate legislative session* we could support an annual session of at least 60 days.
2. We support provision being made for a *post auditor* (public examiner) appointed by and directly responsible to the legislature. This would most likely be accomplished by statute, but we would support an amendment providing for a post auditor.
3. We could support an amendment to *ease the amending process* which would change the voting requirement for passage to a percentage of those voting on the question.
4. A position for clearly fixed executive authority enables us to support an amendment proposing the short ballot.
5. We support joint election of governor and lieutenant governor.
6. We would like to see constitutional provision for an executive budget. This is now required by statute but is such an important part of the state's financial picture that it should be constitutional law.

LEGISLATIVE POSITIONS UNDER CRs

Equal Opportunities

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will support legislation to insure employment on merit and non-discrimination in transactions involving real property; it will work for adequately financed commission administration of such legislation and of legislation to insure equal access to public accommodations. Specific items of lobbying concern which the League will actively support this session involve:

1. *Adequate appropriations* for the State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD).
2. Complaints of *discrimination in public accommodations* should be placed under the jurisdiction of SCAD to enable them to act on public accommodations discrimination as well as discrimination in employment and housing.
3. As a *procedural reform* the Minnesota State Act Against Discrimination should give SCAD power to issue orders which are binding unless reversed or modified by a court of law.
4. The coverage of the present law dealing with *discrimination in employment* which only covers employers of eight or more employees would be extended to all employers.

At present our consensus *does not* clearly permit the League to lobby for elimination of discrimination in all

rental, lease or sale of single family housing whether publicly assisted or not.

Three Areas of Election Laws

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will support *party designation for legislators* and improvement in election laws in the field of *campaign practices, election procedures* and voting.

For many years the League has supported *party designation for legislators* and will continue to support this important election reform. The inclusion of county officials in a party designation bill is not actually supported but would be acceptable.

The League supports changes in *election laws procedures* in several areas. One of these is centralized responsibility for election procedures. Another is that new state residents should be allowed to vote for President and Vice-president before meeting usual voting requirements. We also support extension of registration to smaller municipalities, counties or the state.

The League maintains a strong interest in *campaign practices* and has these positions: shorter campaigns, expenditure of less money on campaigns, reporting of how all money is obtained and spent to give a tighter control over candidates and volunteer committees. Although some improvements were made through the 1963 revision of the Corrupt Practices Law, the League continues to support dollar limits on campaign expenditures that are more realistic, flexible and enforceable. We also favor requesting, but not requiring, the candidate to sign a campaign practices code.

The League feels neither labor unions nor corporations should contribute to campaign funds.

Ethics in Government

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will support legislation to *regulate lobbying and conflict of interest*.

Definite standards requiring full disclosure of lobbying activities have been set up by the League as a step toward lobby regulation. Disclosure of name and address of lobbyist, name of employer, nature of legislation with which he is concerned, nature of activities in which he engages, amount of money contributed to his lobbying actions and by whom, terms of his employment are included in the League position.

The League's stand on *conflict of interest* legislation encompasses financial disclosure of sources and amount of income related to public service. It also calls for on the spot disclosure of personal interest in legislation and for prohibitions against certain incompatible activities.

Home Rule

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will support the principles of home rule relating to *realistic restrictions on special legislation and broader provisions for the adoption and amendment of home rule charters*.

Under this statement of position the League can support certain legislative proposals made by the Minnesota League

of Municipalities in sections 23 and 24 of their recommended legislative program of June 1964.

Under *realistic restrictions on special legislation* we can support adoption as a legislative policy the principle that no special law will be enacted when a general law can be made applicable.

The LWV supports the recommendation for administrative change which would *improve the home rule charter amending process* in restricted instances by providing an alternative procedure. We may also support several additional amendments to the home rule charter enabling act which have been recommended by the MML.

Constitutional Reform

The League of Women Voters of Minnesota will support *constitutional revision by convention*. The League continues its support of a constitutional convention, but at the same time realizes that at present the most feasible method of constitutional revision is by amendment.

NATIONAL PROGRAM POSITIONS

Opposition to Liberty Amendment

Tax Rates—opposition to constitutional limitations on tax rates. Treaty Making—opposition to constitutional changes that would limit the existing powers of the executive and the Congress over foreign relations.

Under these national positions, state Leagues have been given permission to lobby against the Liberty Amendment which would repeal the 16th (Income Tax) Amendment to the Federal Constitution and limit treaty making powers of the President. Opponents to the income tax want state legislatures to adopt resolutions memorializing Congress to pass the Liberty Amendment. During the 1963 legislative session Leagues in 26 states helped defeat efforts to pass the Liberty Amendment in their states. The Minnesota League did not have an opportunity to testify, but did present a statement in opposition to such action. We are prepared to oppose any efforts in support of a resolution this session.

We may see legislative action under two national CA items—*water resources and foreign economic policy*. Under our national water resources item we may have an opportunity to work for legislation dealing with some aspects of water resources. Under our national trade position we may oppose placing restrictions on imported articles through such devices as requirements for labeling or special licensing.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MINNESOTA

State Organization Service
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March, 1965

Testimony as given by Mrs. O. J. Janski to the Senate Committee on
Elections and Reapportionment in favor of Party Designation
February 11, 1969

I am Mrs. O. J. Janski, President of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota. This is an organization composed of 5800 members in 68 communities throughout the state. You have heard League presidents testify in behalf of "party designation for legislators" since 1953. We believed then, and still believe, that the Legislature which organizes and conducts its business on a two caucus system should give the voters the benefit of knowing officially which caucus a candidate will join. We further believe that identifying legislators with political parties will increase party responsibility and lead to better government.

Over the years we have argued that it is unfair to the voter to lead him to believe he is electing an independent candidate when in fact his representative votes on partisan lines. Is it fair to the public for the Legislature to pretend to operate without factions, when even offices and staff services are provided on a factional basis?

The League's studies of government have led us to believe in the need for a strong two party system. One of our purposes is to encourage our members and other citizens to work in the party of their choice. It is in the party that the citizen takes his first step toward personal involvement in the political process. In the party he is able to help nominate and elect public officials. He may even help to write the party platform which he hopes will give him a direct line to the Legislature. When the state Legislature, which determines whether this platform becomes a reality, is elected without party designation, the whole pattern of responsible government is weakened. The citizen's avenue for political expression breaks down. This election year has made more apparent than ever before the need to strengthen these channels of communication.

Recently there has been a growing trend to bring party designation in the back door.

Both parties now endorse many candidates for legislative offices, giving them financial support and publicity as well as political advice and guidance.

Proponents of party designation admit to some discouragement in the face of repeated defeat of this measure by this Senate Committee. But we are heartened that our interviews with legislators indicate growing support among them. Our members assured us of their own dedication and interest at our last state Convention.

The Minnesota Poll tells us that public support for party designation for legislators is higher than ever before (latest figures are 65% of all adults questioned as compared with 49% in 1967 and 43% in 1946).

Our contention is that the Legislature now operates along partisan lines and everyone knows it but the voters. We urge this committee to admit to and recognize a state of affairs which already exists in fact by giving it expression in our body of laws.