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In writing a treatise such as this, it is necessary to inform the reader of the facts for the analysis that is presented. Accordingly, it would be well to begin by examining the platforms of each of the parties involved in this year's legislative session. Thus an attempt will be made to evaluate how successful each party efforts in drafting and implementing its campaign promises.

In the field of agriculture, the Republicans offered several resolutions most of which dealt with the issue on a national level. The key main points were the need for lower prices for the Secretary of Agriculture and the allowance of a selling in the quota of meat exports. On the state level, the Republicans proposed to provide funds for research and pesticide control.

On the same subject, the majority of the Democratic resolutions were concerned with national affairs. They proposed that 1965 Farm Program be extended and that funds for Conservation appropriations be doubled. Like the Republicans, the Democrats also called for beef imports held at a reasonable level. With respect to agriculture in general, they urged the appointment of a grade A milk producer to the National Livestock Commission. They insisted liberal and adequate credit should be extended to the dairy type farmers. Finally, the Democratic party wished to control the use of livestock and poultry.

The Republicans called for these main plans in regards to wild life. In order to increase revenue for tax issues due to forest stripping, they asked that 25% of the gross receipts from the sale of national forest timber be returned to the parties. To restrict the exploitation of land by mining interests, they recommended that legislation be passed which would guarantee the rehabilitation of this land (especially coal mining). Finally, they presented the vague dictum of preserving and improving wild life resources.
In writing a thesis such as this, it is necessary to inform the reader of the basis for the analysis that is presented. Accordingly, it would be well to begin by summarizing the platform of each of the parties patronized in this year's legislative session. Then an attempt will be made to evaluate how successful each party has been in maintaining and implementing its campaign promises.

In the field of agriculture, the Republicans offered several resolutions most of which dealt with the issue on a national level. The two main points were the removal of power from the Secretary of Agriculture and the placement of a ceiling on the quota of meat imports. On the state level, the Republicans proposed to provide funds for rodent and pesticide control.

On the same subject, the majority of the Democratic resolutions were concerned with national affairs. They proposed that 1965 Farm Program be extended and that funds for Conservation appropriations be restored. Like the Republicans, the Democrats wanted beef imports held at a reasonable level. With respect to agriculture in Montana, they urged the appointment of a grade A milk producer to the Montana Livestock Commission. They advocated liberal and adequate credit should be extended to the family type farmer. Finally, the Democratic party wished to control the use of insecticides and pesticides.

The Republicans called for three main planks in regards to wild life. In order to increase revenue for tax losses due to forest stripping, they asked that 25% of the gross receipts from the sale of national forest lumber be returned to the counties. To restrict the devastation of land by mining interests, they recommended that legislation be passed which would guarantee the rehabilitation of this land (especially coal mining). Finally, they presented the vague dictum of protecting and improving wild life resources.
In general terms, the Democrats desired a more improved, modern forest management. They advocated protection of streams. To preserve wild life, they designated that animal habitat be left unmolested. Since tourism is one of the state's biggest business, the democratic party urged the improvement of the facilities which to lure the tourists to Montana. The Democrats, like the Republicans advocated the restoration to its natural beauty of land destroyed by mining interests.

Since veterans constituted a large segment of our population, the Republicans asked that service benefits be more widely dispersed. Legislation should be introduced to increase the Montana Veterans' Preference Law to include Viet Nam veterans. Increased appropriatins should be given for the operation of the Montana Welfare Commission. A state bonus should be allocated to veterans of the Viet Nam conflict. By further developing the facilities at the Montana Veteran's Home at Columbia Falls to include nursing home facilities, many problems should be alleviated. To aid the orphans of Viet Nam veterans, they should be given educational benefits.

The Democrats also offered various enactments along these lines. They called for a state honorarium for Viet Nam veterans. Enlargement of the state's Veterans Law to include veterans of the South East Asian conflict was stressed. By allowing the Veteran's Administration to retain its distinct identity, they hoped to gain singular responsibility for veteran affairs. The Columbia Falls Veteran Home as well as those at Fort Harrison and Miles City should be extended to include nursing home facilities. Finally, state allowances for burial of service men should be increased to a desirable level.

To Montana, the preservation of her water is of prime importance. The Republicans proposed the extension of the Montana Resources Act of 1967. By updating...
the Montana Water code, they hoped to attain more efficient administration. Conservancy district legislation should be introduced to further implement the State Water Plan. Continuing efforts should be undertaken to better coordinate state agencies for the utilization of Montana water. They strongly recommended that efforts be attempted to protect Montana's priority rights to her water.

Nationally, the Democrats supported Senate Bill #6 which would reactivate the dormant State Water Conservation Program through the organization of Water Conservancy Districts. In order to attain multi-interest representation, the Democrats advocated the reorganization of the Montana Water Board. In a proposal similar to that of the Republicans, the Democratic Party reaffirmed Montana's legal claim to her own water.

Advancement of Montana's educational facilities, is a prime requisite for the growth and prosperity of the state. The Republicans advocated the development of realistic educational requirements and flexible methods of instruction. Adequate financing to expand the Montana educational system both qualitatively and quantitatively was stressed. One major proposition is that the Republican Party supports "adequate" School Foundation Program schedules and proposed to completely fund these schedules. Increase appropriation should be given for post-secondary training in vocational fields. Legislation should be passed allowing Montana to join in the Interstate Compact for Education. The Republicans fully reaffirmed the renewal of the 6 mill levy for the Montana University System. In Resolution eight, the Republicans wanted to "commend the vast majority of students and faculty who have a seriousness of purpose to seek the truths of life in a low abiding fashion.

The Democrats coincided with the Republicans in favoring adjustments of the Foundation Program schedules to allow greater equalization. They offered to fund
100% of these revised schedules. Vocational Technical education operations should be increased to include a substantially larger portion of the populations. Improved facilities should be developed for special education. Proposals should be presented for continued federal funds which can be used for education as the state sees fit. They advocated the adoption of definite plans to utilize educational television in Montana. "The Democratic party supports full responsible academic freedom at all levels." 2

With the growth of industry and labor, improved legislation is necessary to cover new situations. The Republicans definitely oppose any "right to work" laws. With the increased hazardous conditions associated with certain industries, they backed legislation that would upgrade safety codes. The Republicans urged that legislation be enacted to give those not covered by federal law a liveable wage and reasonable work hours. The Republicans advocated the extension of tax incentives to encourage industrial development. They wanted a strengthened planning commission within the State Planning Board. Unemployment benefits should be increased to a more equitable amount. Finally, the Republican party definitely opposed any further federalization of the Unemployment Compensation Program.

The Democrats categorically condemned any form of "right to work" legislation. They supported a minimum wage law for the state which would conform to federal statutes. Since unions are a necessary instrument of the labor force, the Democrats promised complete assistance to democratic unions operated by majority vote. They were fully in support of collective bargaining for public employees. Since Montana Unemployment Compensation is at a low ebb, the Democratic party advocated the recodification of the act to make it consistent with federal standards. They believed that the free wage earner should not have to compete with convict labor
and their products. A study should be undertaken to devise methods of attracting industry to the state. The Glasgow Air Force Base be implemented for civilian purposes.

With the growth and development of Montana cities, it is necessary to procure certain legislation to move along with the expansions. The Republicans urged that the Montana Legislative Council make a study of municipal laws with the primary good of creating a limited reserve accounts. Legislation should be presented to aid the cities in respect to their classification (first class city, second class city). The Republicans wanted to make financial aid available to the cities. They wished to sufficiently compensate police, fire and other municipal officials. By eliminating the three year averaging clause of the universal mill levy, they believe that the municipalities could better plan their budget. The Republican party supported a plan allowing voters of a city to impose additional levy beyond the maximum prescribed.

In the same category, the Democrats offered a properly staffed State Department of Planning and Economic Development to coordinate necessary activities (of which eight are listed in their platform). They urged a Constitutional amendment repealing Article 12 Section 4, which prohibits the state from providing financial support to the cities and towns. Believing that cities need more freedom, the Democratic party proposed that cities should have the right to sell or to trade property to any city, town, or county. They deemed it necessary that the city-county planning board jurisdiction be extended to twelve miles beyond any city limit. Like the Republicans, they asked for the repeal of the three year averaging clause of the universal levy.

In addition to the previously stated plans, the Republicans offered some less
structured proposals. They stipulated that legislation should be passed to improve the judicial system. One Constitutional amendment was designated which would require the Governor and Lieutenant Governor to be of the same party. In Resolution #6 the Republicans proposed a reorganization of the state administration with the extension of the state merit system.

The Democrats, also, advocated some items which do not fall into the broad categories suggested. They asserted that more and better farm to market roads be developed. They urged that an independent judiciary system should be enacted based upon ability rather than politics. By raising the salaries of judges to at least the national level, they hoped to better the whole judicial system. They supported a Constitutional amendment to change the voting age to 19 years. Finally, the Democrats in Resolution #2 urged the reorganization of the administrative branch of government with the emphasis on the state merit system.

The most important field into which they delved was that of taxation. It was here that the Republicans and Democrats differ fundamentally. The Republicans condemned the antiquated present tax structure. To Montana property owners, they promised a reduction of the property tax. They recommended that state income taxes remain the same or be lowered. They proposed to obtain the revenue to operate the state mainly through the initiation of a retail sales and use tax. Since the Co-operatives have grown considerably, they urged that tax payments be made by them. They endorsed a program of unconditional return of a percentage of revenues collected by the federal government back to the state. New forms of revenue acquisition were also proposed such as: tax on tourist traveling in the state, tax on out of state corporations operating in Montana, tax on property based on a broader foundation and tax credits to low income families.
On the question of taxation, the Democrats advocated solutions distinctly different from those of the Republicans. They planned to run the state based on the present tax structure. It can be accomplished through "medium" increases in the rate of income tax and the corporation license tax. They proposed the renewal of the five percent deduction which would bring added revenue to Montana. Another point advocated would be the elimination of the Federal income tax deduction in computing Montana state income tax. Service and severance taxes should be strengthened, and a more equitable system offered. They pledge to correct the inequities and loopholes in the corporation license tax.

Although this is a cursory view of the two parties platforms, it entails a summary of the main planks. With this summary as a guide line, I attempted to analyze the proceedings of the 1969 Montana State Legislature.¹

¹ This preface has been the authors summary of the platforms of the Democratic and Republican Parties of Montana as found in:


Chapter 1

Introduction

From its very conception to its final resting place, the platform undergoes a perilous journey permeated with numerous pitfalls. The platform is merely a statement of the parties' (especially the leaders') fundamental programs. Once these ideas are transferred from the realm of the theoretical into the treacherous world of practical reality unforeseen consequences lurk for them. Many new elements enter the picture during the legislative process, which were not considered when the central committees of the two parties formulated the platform. It is for this reason that the platform enters a perilous journey through the legislature.

With more than 1000 bills having been introduced, every plank of a platform can suffer a fate in one way. Many of these bills will fall prey to the unpredictable circumstances surrounding the session; others will be left to rest for legitimate reasons. Of course, a fair segment of these measures will have successful journeys to the governor's office. The intention to analyze the success of bills which are extensions of the parties' platform in each designated area. The first question discussed will be education.
Chapter L-l

From its very conception to its final resting place, the platform embarked upon a perilous journey accentuated with numerous pitfalls. The platform is merely a statement of the parties (especially the leaders) fundamental program. Once these ideas are transferred from the realm of the theoretical into the treacherous world of practical reality unforeseen consequences lurk for them. Many new elements enter the picture during the legislative process, which were not considered when the central committee of the two parties formulated the platform. It is for this reason that the platform enters a perilous journey through the legislature.

With more than 1000 bills having been introduced, every plank of a platform was covered in some way. Many of these bills will fall prey to the unpredictable circumstances surrounding the session; others will lay to rest for legitimate reasons. Of course, a fair segment of these measures will have unsuccessful journey to the governor's office. It is my intention to analyze the success of bills which are extensions of the parties' platform in each designated area. The first question discussed will be education.
The vital subject which rather typified the trend of the session was the funding of the School Foundation Program. This program supports the primary and secondary educational system in Montana. In this regard it is possibly the most important area with which the legislature concerns itself. The situation in the session appeared simple, since both parties agreed to fund fully the legislated schedule.

Foundation Program bills (House Bill 34 and 319) were introduced into the House of Representatives, while a lighthearted atmosphere was still prevalent. Although debate on the matter was limited, it was a precursor of what was to happen later. Speaking for the Democrats, Representative Jim Reed said that they would pass the bills although they were financially unsound. He stated that the Republican proposed schedule was too high, and he hoped that the Democratic-controlled Senate would rectify the discrepancy. Representative Majority Leader Willard Kasper, then, settled the debate by neglecting their responsibilities to the subject. The two companion bills passed the House unanimously, and were transferred to the Senate.

Rather than acting upon the House bills, the Senate had one bill of its own (Senate Bill 98) to offer. Early in the session Republican Senator James Hougher asked the democrats to allow the bill out of committee. He hoped that Senate Bill 98

This information was gathered by personal attendance on the floor of the legislature. These facts were obtained while the author listened to the discussion of the legislators. These observations from the floor will be noted hereafter.

1. N. S., House of Representatives, Jan. 16, 1969

2. N. S., House of Representatives, Jan. 16, 1969
Chapter 2-1

The vital subject which rather typified the trend of the session was the funding of the School Foundation Program. This program supports the primary and secondary educational system in Montana. In this regard it is possibly the most important area with which the legislators concern themselves. The situation at the outset appeared simple, since both parties agreed to fund fully the more equitable schedules.

Foundation Program bills (House bill #44 and #194) were introduced into the House of Representatives, while a lighthearted atmosphere was still prevalent. Although debate on the matter was limited, it was a precursor of what was to happen later. Speaking for the Democrats, Representative John Hall said that they would pass the bills although they were financially unsound. He stated that the Republican proposed schedules were too high, and he hoped that the democratic-control Senate would rectify the discrepancy. 1 Republican majority leader, William Mather, then, belittled the democrats for neglecting their responsibilities to the schools. 2 The two companion bills passed the House unanimously, and were transferred to the Senate.

Rather than acting upon the House bills, the Senate had one bill of its own (Senate Bill #88) to offer. Early in the session Republican Senator James Haughey asked the democrats to allow the bill out of committee. He hoped that Senate Bill #88

---

This information was gathered by personal attendance on the floor of the legislature. These facts were attained while the author listened to the discussion of the legislators. These observations from the floor will be noted thusly.

1 fl. ob., House of Representatives, Jan. 16, 1969

2 fl. ob., House of Representatives, Jan. 16, 1969
could be debated and passed before the actual political bickering began. Senator Mahoney, answering for the democrats, replied that they were working on the schedules and the best method of financing them. Subsequently, Senator Haughey's attempt to remove the bill from committee was killed by one vote (voting was strictly along party lines).

The bill remained in committee and the political struggle began. During committee action, the Democrats lowered the schedules proposed by the Republicans nearly fifteen percent, and the bill emerged from the committee in this form. The Senate, being dominated by the democrats, passed Senate Bill #88 which now called for $50.8 million dollars to be provided by the state for education.

When the bill arrived in the House, the Republicans began lashing out at the Senate. In a political move, the Republicans reinstated the 10 million dollars which the Democrats had cut from the proposal.

Senate Bill #88, then, went to a conference committee, where some interesting things happened. Five Democratic Senators, Lynch, Shugrue, Keenan, Reardon and Sheehy, threatened to bolt party leadership. They promised to support the Republicans if they would come up with a revenue bill to meet the increased schedules. The Republican did not find the solution, and the bill was still in a conference committee when the regular session ended.

In the extraordinary session, the bill fared even worse. The schedules were lowered to a despicable level. As the bill emerged, the state supplied only 34.7 million dollars to the school system.

The problem which arises with the funding of the Foundation Program is that money not provided by the state general funds fall back on the property tax. Actually this financing is an arbitrary thing since the parties establishes the schedules themselves. Both the schedules offered by the two parties are below the actual cost which is incurred in operating our educational system. Dave Cooper, Executive Secretary of the Montana Educational Association, stated that they would need a fifteen to eighteen percent increase to bring the funding up to the prescribed eighty percent. He called the bills offered by both sides of the aisle grossly inadequate which would reflect upon the quality of our educational system.

In this case, both parties are guilty of evading responsibility. With respect to a problem as education, one would think that the members could forget their political affiliation for the sake of the state. Senate Bill 983 was cast into political limelight and the quality of Montana education is going to suffer from it. Since the legislative session continued with the treatment which this bill received, this is the bill which set the tone for the 1969 Montana State Legislature.

In fact, the whole question of education seemed to be a thorn in the side of the legislature. The delegates fought amongst themselves. Both parties felt that it was necessary to improve and to enlarge our post-secondary educational schools, but this project was caught up in heated debate.

---

A package of House bills was introduced specifying coverage of vocational-technical education. House Bill #481, which designated five schools as "area" schools, was extremely controversial. The passage of the remainder of the package rested upon the eventual fate of House Bill #481.

When the bill came from the committee with a "do Pass" recommendation, sparks began to fly. Representative Newbey wanted the act amended to include Bozeman as the sixth center. His motion was killed on the grounds that Gallatin County does not have a taxable base of forty-five million dollars which was specified in the measure.

After this the controversy really flared. Representatives crossed the aisle to support or to denounce the bill. Party unity on both sides was widely broken. Representative Kovalen (R-Lambert) proposed to amend section four to limit the area schools to one which would be located at Helena. He said that the state could afford to finance one center not five. He referred to the bill in its original form as a "five-headed" monster. His amendment met with considerable opposition, but it finally was passed by the slim margin of one vote.

This action actually settled nothing at all. The next day the bill was revived and this time the measure in its original form was passed by the House (66 to 34).

In the Senate, House Bill #481 received the same treatment. The Senate Education Committee amended the proposal to limit the number of centers to one which would be located in Havre. When the bill finally reached the Senate floor, a minority committee motioned that the measure pass unamended was victorious by a vote of 36-19. It was the twenty-two vote block of Senators from the five counties that

---

enabled the bill to pass. Main opposition came from counties that wanted vocational-technical centers themselves. These Senators did not push the matter any further, due to the overwhelming strength of the 22 vote block. Subsequently, the rest of the companion bills (House Bills 482, 483, 484, and 485) were also approved.

By passing House Bill #481 and the lesser measures, the parties have followed through with their intentions. The measures will enable the program to become more inclusive without becoming monstrous and cumbersome. It will give the state a firm foundation from which to expand this program.

Although the two chambers were liberal in establishing the schools, they were much more conservative in their financial assistance. The main objection to designating five centers was that the state could not afford them. Bills had been introduced to place additional taxes on such items as cigarettes, other tobacco products, and gasoline. This additional revenue would have been earmarked for vocational-technical education exclusively. All of these proposed revenue bills were killed in the Republican led House, which rather weakens the post-secondary education foundation.

Three House Bills (#604, 617 and 28) were passed into law. The two companion measures, House Bill #617 and 604, appropriate money from the general fund to support this facet of education. House Bill #28 asks that a 2 mill levy be imposed, if the measure was approved by the voters at the next election.

The problem is that these appropriation bills were designated with two vocational-technical centers in mind not five. The money is going to be spread very thinly, and the school budgets are going to be at a bare minimum. To complicate the whole situation, the House killed a bill earmarking funds for the construction of centers at Billings and Great Falls. These two cities will have to find other
methods of financing their construction work. Possibly, the legislature did not extend itself in designating five centers, but, at least, it is a move in the right direction.

The two parties also passed legislation that would aid in coordinating the supervision of vocational-technical education. Better efficiency at less expense should be accomplished by placing the control under one agency.

Although the post-secondary educational system suffered to a certain degree from sectionalism and party politics, it emerged from the session fairly well renovated.

The Community colleges were the only branch of education that survived without vigorous debate. The two parties worked together in formulating proposed legislation. Most of the laws were passed early in the session before the heated political fury struck.

Schools at Kalispell, Miles City and Glendive are now able to share in federal funds that are available. Extended powers were given to the directors of these schools that will enable them to update the qualities of the facilities as well as the teachers employed. By granting these three schools the right to include vocational education courses, the legislature has allowed them to offer a more comprehensive curriculum.

At one point, the legislators wasted hours of valuable time debating a resolution that should never have been introduced. A Senate Resolution (Senate Resolution #6), proposed by Senator Klinck (R-Billings), attempted to define "academic freedom" and to limit its practice. In this resolution, the legislature began to delve into a field in which they have no business. If passed, the resolution would...
have taken much of the power away from the board of regent, and would have stifled most of the teachers' perogatives.

Lengthy debate was presented in the Senate regarding this resolution. Senators Klindt and Thiessen went on at lengths expounding upon the resolution attributes. A number of democratic Senators rose in opposition to the proposal. Finally, Senator Gilfeather rose and made the only sensible suggestion. He was definitely against the Senate Resolution and felt that it should never have been introduced. Considering the preponderance of important issues which the Senate had to consider, he felt that the resolution should be indefinitely postponed. His motion was killed by a vote of 24 to 23 with most of the democrats voting in favor of it. In the final vote, the democratic Senate deserted their belief in "academic freedom" and passed the resolution with twenty three votes to spare.

In the House, the affair was approached more sensibly. Although it was a Republican sponsored measure, not one person rose to speak in favor of the resolution. The House accepted the committee's motion of "do not pass" and Senate Joint Resolution #6 was dead.

Both parties supported the six mill levy to finance the Montana University System. Since the voters in the 1968 election expressed their approval of the levy, the parties did little concerning it. They did run into trouble in formulating the budget for the university system. Although all units of the system gained a certain increase, many felt that the increases were not sufficient. The budget which was enacted will allow the schools to function properly, but it will, also, undermine several expansion projects.

---

10 fl. obs., Senate, Feb. 10, 1969
11 fl. obs., Senate, Feb. 10, 1969
Throughout the entire session, the field of education was a touchy one. Pressure was applied from various sides, and some of the legislator which passed depicts this. In an overall view the session was fairly productive by both sides, although they fought fiercely over the issues. If were not for the School Foundation Program, the final analyses might have been brighter. When you abuse the most important facet, the outlook becomes very dismal.

Although the legislators did little to improve the status of education in Montana, they were more successful in attaining benefits for our service men.
Due to the conflict in Southeast Asia, there has been a notable increase in the number of veterans in our society. Since our laws pertaining to former service men were written up before the present situation had developed, it is necessary to revise those codes and privileges. Both of Montana's parties realized this fact and proposed definite planks to rectify the inequities. An honest effort was made on the part of both parties to get this legislation enacted. In most instances, they were actually very successful.

Some of the earliest petitions sent to the governor's office concerned privileges for veterans. A Senate Joint Resolution, which called upon the Congress of the United States to allocate funds to enlarge facilities at the Veterans Administration at Fort Harrison, was one of the first measures signed by Governor Anderson. Later another joint resolution by the Senate, which urged Congress to provide financial assistance for the erection of a "Quartermaster" building to existing structures at Fort Harrison, won equal approval. This would enable many of the older Montana veterans to have access to adequate facilities.

In order to provide a proper burial for service men, the legislature initiated an act which would raise the burial allowance paid by counties to $250. This was deemed reasonable in respect to the inflated cost of modern times, and the bill was passed with little or no debate.

Extension of the Preference Law to include all war veterans was the essence of Senate Bill #163. Under this act, all veterans discharged after January 31, 1955 would benefit from the Preference Law for employment. The bill traveled the two chambers and has been subsequently signed into law.

Another act, which was dealt with favorably, was House Bill #530. This law will allow orphans of veterans to share in the educational opportunities of the
Due to the conflict in Southeast Asia, there has been a notable increase in the number of veterans in our society. Since our laws pertaining to former service men were drawn up before the present situation had developed, it is necessary to revise these codes and privileges. Both of Montana's parties realized this fact and proposed definite planks to rectify the inequities. An honest effort was made on the part of both parties to get this legislation enacted. In most instances, they were actually very successful.

Some of the earliest petitions sent to the governor's office concerned privileges for veterans. A senate Joint Resolution, which called upon the Congress of the United State to allocate funds to enlarge facilities at the Veterans Administration at Fort Harrison, was one of the first measures signed by Governor Anderson. Later another joint resolution of the Senate, which urged Congress to provide financial assistance for the construction of a "Domiciliary" adjacent to existing structures at Fort Harrison won quick approval. This would enable many of the older Montana veterans to have access to domiciliary facilities.

In order to provide a proper burial for service men, the legislature initiated an act which would raise the burial allowance paid by counties to $250. This sum is more reasonable in respect to the inflated cost of modern times, and the bill was passed with little or no debate.

Extension of the Preference Law to include Viet Nam veterans was the essence of Senate Bill #163. Under this act, all veterans discharged after January 31, 1955 would benefit from the Preference Law for employment. The bill breezed the two chambers and has been subsequently signed into law.

Another act, which was dealt with favorably, was House Bill #524. This law will allow orphans of veterans to share in the educational opportunities of the
Montana University system. This bill was based on one of the planks from the Republican platform; it received limited interference on its path to the governor's office.

In order to complete construction which is already in process at Montana Veterans Home in Columbia Falls, the legislature appropriated $27,970 for this expressed purpose.

Two measures, which the parties supposedly supported, were not fulfilled in this session. House Bill #507 would have given a state honorarium to Viet Nam veterans. Although the amount of the bonus was equivalent to those paid to veterans of other previous conflicts, the Republican led House killed the measure.

Proposed income tax exemptions were also killed during the session. Both the House and the Senate turned a deaf ear to deduction on income tax for former service men.

In the field of veterans affairs, both parties were successful. With but one exception, the Republicans and the Democrats followed their platforms to the letter. The parties were able to attain passage of the main tenets of their platforms on this question.

The amount of legislation supporting veterans was light in comparison to the preponderance of bills which involved Montana cities. Municipalities will be the topic discussed next.
One of America's most pressing problems is the preservation of her local governments and the municipalities over which they govern. Montana is no exception, and both parties recognized this in formulating their platforms. In both parties are sound, reasonable solutions for many of the difficulties which beset Montana cities. In the final analysis, the cities emerged from the 1969 session with some significant gains. Although they did reap many benefits, the municipalities suffered for a time from the political football game which was in progress. During this time the cities were on the brink of eventual disaster and their very identity was threatened. Finally, pressure applied to the leadership of the Republican Party helped to bring the situation to its proper perspective, and the cities were resurrected.

Many of the planks proposed by one party were enacted into law. The legislature saw the need for an organization to supervise the cities in regard to legislation. This became an actuality when Senate Bill 417 was signed into law.

The Democrats favored the extension of the jurisdictional lines of the city planning board to twelve miles beyond the limits of any city. This theory was written into Senate Bill 429 which was passed with all due haste.

Bipartisan legislation, which recognized the need for higher salaries for local officials, was handled with little debate. Realizing the need for an increase in the salaries for Montana firefighters and policemen, the legislature desired a measure that would raise the payrolls to a more equitable level. This should greatly help to improve the quality of law enforcement bodies in Montana. Much legislation was passed on a bipartisan basis which brings the salaries of urging and aldermen to a more feasible sum. This also may be an incentive for more
One of America's most pressing problems is the preservation of her local
governments and the municipalities over which they govern. Montana is no exception,
and both parties recognized this in formulating their platforms. In both there
are sound, reasonable solutions for many of the difficulties which beset Montana
cities. In the final analysis, the cities emerged from the 1969 session with
some significant gains. Although they did reap many benefits, the munipalities
suffered for a time from the political football game which was in progress. During
dthis time the cities were on the brink of eventual disaster and their very identity
was threatened. Finally, pressure applied to the leadership of the Republican
Party helped to bring the situation to its proper perspective, and the cities were
resurrected.

Many of the planks proposed by both sides were enacted into law. The
Republicans saw the need for distinguishing between the classes of cities in regards
to legislation. This became an actuality when Senate Bill #55 was signed into
law.

The Democrats favored the extension of the jurisdictional lines of the city-
county planning board to twelve miles beyond the limits of any city. This theory
was written into Senate Bill #59 which was passed with all due haste.

Bi-partison legislation, which recognized the need for higher salaries for
local officials, was handled with little debate. Realizing this need for an increase
in the salaries for Montana firemen and policemen, the legislature devised a
measure that would raise the payments to a more equitable level. This should
greatly help to improve the quality of law enforcement bodies in Montana. Next,
legislation was passed on a bi-partison basis which brings the salaries of mayors
and aldermen to a more feasible sum. This, also, may be an incentive for more
qualified men to seek these offices.

One of the more important bills, which the parties said that they would establish and did, was Senate Bill #293. By virtue of this act, an Interlocal Cooperation Commission would be founded to study and to designate means of improving local government in Montana. The commission will concern itself with the removal of duplications in city and county governments, the practicality of creation of new service districts. The bill should greatly aid in creating a more viable system of local government.

Closely related to Senate Bill #293 was another measure which would have set up a county planning board for the consideration of zoning districts, land regulation, subdivisions and other controls. The two acts would have helped to enhance one another. Both bodies of the legislature felt that this was a fine bill and ramrodded it through with a minimum of debate. However, for reasons unknown, Governor Anderson vetoed the bill.1

As I said, cities were not completely aloof of the political fighting. While bills raising the amount of money paid to various facets of localities were pending, the House was killing all the revenue bills. The House Republicans brought the denial of the three extra revenue measures which were being counted upon to provide finances to the cities. These bills would have increased the tax on a 31 gallon barrel of beer to six dollars, the tax on cigars, smoking tobacco, and snuff to 12%, and the tax on gasoline to seven cents a gallon. The Republicans specifically called for aid of this nature to be given to cities "within the scope

---

1 This is a reflection on his feelings toward his parties delegates, since this was a democratic measure. By vetoing the measure, he killed one of his own parties planks.
of such tax revenues as are adopted or available.² Although they recognized the need for the extra revenue, they pulled a political move and killed all three measures. When these measures died, the burden of financing the cities would be thrown to the already-high property taxes. In this way, they hoped to make the Democrats and the present tax structure look bad.

With in a day the Republicans were forced to recall these three bills as the pressure and uproar from various factions gained in strength in opposition to the original motion. The Republican leadership assured me that this was just a temporary political move and that they had intended to revive the bills even if pressure was not applied.³ Since opposition was presented, it is difficult to say where the truth lies. At any length, they had abused their own platform to gain political advantage.

Finally, the tax on beer was lowered to three dollars a barrel and was approved. This measure is predicted to bring $300,000 additional funds to the cities for law enforcement purposes. The gasoline tax bill, also, passed, and the revenue from this act will be used to improve streets and alleys within our cities. The 12½% tax on tobacco products survived debate and was eventually signed into law.

Later, a Republican-sponsored bill was brought on to the floor which would give added revenue to localities. The measure would allow cities and counties to place a $1 per person tax on all passengers taking commercial flights out of their airport. This surplus funds would be used to preserve and update the airport facilities.

Subsequently this bill was made into law.

Two other revenue bills, whose lives were in jeopardy during the political maneuvering, were Senate Bill #149 and House Bill #31. These were the main revenue-producing measures for the cities. The latter would allow a 60 mill all purpose levy for the cities. A law similar to this one has been on the books since 1965, but there is one significant distinction. House Bill #31 is broader than the present law in that the 60 mill levy does not include bonded indebtedness. Senate Bill #149 would increase the maximum levy on taxable property to 22 mills (in its original form, it called for 24 mills) to defray county expenses. At the time of the political power play, it appeared that both of these measures would be killed. As with the other revenue bills, the Republicans reversed their original decision and gave them a "do pass" nod. They were rapidly enacted into law after that.

Another piece of legislation which would allow counties more freedom in establishing a workable budget, met with approval. This act would allow the county budgets to exceed by more than 5% the amount appropriated in their approved budget. This, also, was a point that was brought out in both platforms.

Several important bills were buried during the session. An act which called for municipal utility districts to conserve the water and power resources was introduced by Senator McKeon (D-Deer Lodge). This bill met with vehement opposition from the Montana Power Company, the Rural Electric Association and others. They referred to it as a "socialistic" bill in which the cities could annex the private utility companies. McKeon was aware that the measure had no chance of succeeding. He felt that since the utility rates were increasing so rapidly that this was a
bill of the future, but that it should be discussed now. By accepting the "do not pass" recommendation of the committee, his fellow Senators showed that they did not sympathize with the Senator from Anaconda. McKeon faulted his fellow Democrats for this gesture since the democratic platform supported legislation of this type (although not of this strength). It would seem reasonable that the Democrats should, at least, want to discuss a major enactment of their platform.

Another rather lengthy bill, which would have incorporated some cities and counties into a single municipal corporation, was introduced by Representative McRath (D-Silver Bow). The bill involved part of the desired Republican legislation offered in their platform. Because it would have eliminated the duplications in governments, the bill was a good proposal, but it had numerous loopholes. Opposition was voiced by those who feared that the Montana Power Company could move into rural electric territory as soon as the city annexed this area. It was maligned by representatives from small towns who felt that their towns would be swallowed up by the surrounding larger cities. These men felt that the taxes collected would be used to improve the cities to the demise of the rural areas. Finally, the bill was specifically aimed to help Butte and Silver Bow County, but many people there were against it. They feared that the Anaconda Company would move into surrounding area as soon as the city of Butte annexed them. Despite the boisterous opposition, the measure survived the vote of the House of Representatives, but was, later, killed by a substantial margin in the Senate.

---

The Democratic-controlled Senate laid to rest a bill specifically called for in their platform. This act would have earmarked Federal funds under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 for rural roads and city-county streets. Considering the atrocious condition of rural roads and city streets, passage of this measure would have been extremely expedient. Although it might have alleviated the situation greatly, the Senate did not see it in these terms and killed the bill.

Despite the plank in the Democratic platform that states, "allow better planned city growth through better annexation procedures," the Democrats killed on enactment of this type. House Bill #288 provided for the annexation of areas to municipalities under principles of sound urban development. Although it gave them exactly what they wanted, the bill was indefinitely postponed by the Senate. It was a comprehensive, solid act which would have greatly modernized our process of annexation. For some reason, the Democrats did not keep to their platform.

In a final tally, the 1969 Legislature did much to improve the cities. It is to the credit of both parties that they did see fit to support the vital issues. Even with this in mind, it must be said that both parties abandoned their responsibilities and their platform at certain instances. The Republicans were extremely derelict in playing politics with the cities' finances. Although it was only a short-lined attempt, the power play should never have occurred. On the democratic side, they must be held responsible for deserting several applications of main thrusts from their platform. One final item which I cannot comprehend, is the lack of legislation in regard to the three year averaging clause of the universal levy. Both sides support the removal of this clause in their platforms, but no mention was made of it during the session.

Montana is noted more for the beauty of her countryside than she is for the vastness of the cities. Various types of legislation was introduced to protect the natural grandeur of the state’s resources.
Natural resources are Montana's most important asset. They are reflected in every facet of the state's business especially concerning tourism. In the platform of the parties, they reaffirmed that these resources must be protected. To prevent the depletion of these assets, the parties formulated some logical preventive methods. It seems that they knew the solutions, but did not care to enact them. The preservation of resources was severely handicapped by the end of the session. A few bills were passed, but in most cases these were weak measures.

To Montana, water is a vital source of life. To protect our water from pollution, was the aim of the two parties. When a bill appeared which offered a strong control on water pollution, the Legislators buckled under pressure. Senator Flynn's Bill 305 would have revitalized Montana pollution laws. It went as far as to designate a rise in temperature of water as constituting pollution.

Had the bill passed, it would have definitely established a pollution control as a permanent water pollution law. The Montana Water Pollution Control Council and would have stationed the power directly in the State Board of Health. The Montana Water Pollution Control Council showed its ineffectiveness vividly during the copper strike in Butte in 1967. During this strike, there was severe pollution of Clark Fork River by unprocessed copper sold out of the plants in Butte, yet it took the council thirty days before they finally acted on the matter. With out a doubt, Senate Bill 305 was vigorously opposed by the Montana Power Company and the Anaconda Company, who felt that the measure was discriminatory. The bill never made it through the Senate. The voting line the issue was split evenly—eighteen Democrats and four Republicans voted for it and eleven Democrats and twenty-two Republicans voted against it.

---

Natural resources are Montana's most important asset. They are reflected in every facet of the state's business especially concerning tourism. In the platform of the parties, they reaffirmed that these resources must be protected. To prevent the depletion of these assets, the parties formulated some logical preventive methods. It seems that they knew the solutions, but did not care to enact them. The preservation of resources was severely handicapped by the end of the session. A few bills were passed, but in most cases these were weak measures.

To Montana, water is a vital source of life. To protect our water from pollution, was the aim of the two parties. When a bill appeared which offered a strong control on water pollution, the legislators buckled under pressure. Senator Flynn's bill #305 would have revitalized Montana pollution laws. It went as far as to designate a rise in temperature of a certain degrees in water as constituting pollution. Had the bill passed, it would have removed the almost defunct Water Pollution Control Council and would have stationed the power directly in the State Board of Health. The Montana Water Pollution Control Council showed its ineffectiveness vividly during the copper strike in Butte in 1967. During this strike, there was severe pollution of Clark Fork River by unprocessed copper acid out of the plants in Butte, yet it took the council thirty days before they finally acted on the matter.1 With out a doubt, Senate Bill #305 was vigorously opposed by the Montana Power Company and the Anaconda Company, who felt that the measure was discriminatory. The bill never made it through the Senate. The voting on the issue was split evenly - eighteen Democrats and four Republicans voted for it and eleven Democrats and twenty-two Republicans voted against it.

---

"An act Amending Section 39-302 ROM 1947, relating to the appropriations of Waters, to partially define, the beneficial purposes for which water may be appropriated." This is the title of Senate Bill #45 introduced by Senator Mitchell which would in his words "... lay claim to Montana water." This act was a strong one which would have defined the rights of water appropriation within the state.

Immediately the Montana Power Company and the Montana Farm Bureau protested vehemently that the bill was discriminatory because of certain clauses. Mitchell agreed to remove the offensive statements, but the businesses were not satisfied and asked for the death of the bill. After the bill passed through the Senate, the House fulfilled the opposition wishes and defeated the measure. Proponents of the bill could be heard throughout the capitol. Representative Bardonoue (D-Harlem) staunchly accused the power company and the farm bureau of forming an "unholy alliance". He replied, "This bill is receiving the same treatment that the Water conservancy got in 1967. For some reason Montana Power feels it has the divine right of kings. The powers that be in Montana do not like any legislation passed on this subject." After studying the history of bills of this nature, one would have to agree that these are strong arguments favoring the accusation.

Various other measures which would have strengthened Montana's prior rights to her water suffered the same eventual fate. House Bill #337 was quickly disposed of by the House. It would have initiated a comprehensive study of water rights to aid Montana in protecting her water. The Republicans felt that this was a waste of time and killed the measure.

---

ibid., p.2.

To consolidate the supervision of the development of Montana's natural resources under one agency would remove much bureaucracy and promote efficiency.

Senate Joint Resolution #25 clearly outlined the method for this consolidation. At the present time, there are many overlapping agencies in regard to natural resources. The proposal was popular enough to breeze through both chambers, but the governor struck again. By vetoing it, he rejected his party's platform as well as the beliefs of the democratic delegates.

Two weak bills managed to be enacted into law. The first would limit the type of sewage that could be introduced into our streams. This is fundamentally a compromise bill which is very limited in its scope and very difficult to enforce. The second would give the Board of Health the right to administer funds for the construction of Water Pollution Control facilities. It seems very strange that the legislature feels that this agency should supervise the funds, but should not supervise the actual pollution control (they killed Senate Bill #305).

It took the defeat of a prominent Republican and the screams from enraged constituents before the Water Conservancy Act finally was passed. This was the only important bill passed in regard to our resources. This has been one of the perennial issues for the past ten years, but it has never quite made it. In 1967, a leading Republican cast the deciding vote which killed the measure, and it is said that this had a great deal to do with his defeat in the 1968 gubernatorial primary. Senate Bill #67 sets up Water Conservancy Districts whose primary task is the conservation and development of Montana water and land resources. The public out cry for an act of this type was so great that both parties supported it in their platforms, and neither party even debated the issue. This admittedly was the most important article of legislation introduced concerning our natural resources and the legislature has to be commended for passing it. Actually as people view the
situation with the passing of time, it becomes apparent that this act should have been passed years ago.

Under Natural Resources, we must, also, include the preservation of Montana land. In regard to mining, the platform of both parties supported reclamation of the land which was used. House Bill #569 was aimed at providing funds for this reclamation process. This bill would have raised the tax on a ton of coal to 50 cents of which a share would go for the reclamation of land. Arguing that the bill would overburden them and the coal industry of Montana, the Montana Power Company rose in opposition to the measure. In response the Republican-controlled House lowered the tax to 5.5 cents a ton and as this were not enough, they indefinitely postponed House Bill #569.

With the exception of Senate Bill #67, no legislation was passed to protect our resources. It seems that our resources belong to industry rather than the people. Although the Democrats are not completely blameless, the major portion of responsibility must fall to the Republicans. The Republicans traded Montana's resources for the support of different agencies and industries. They followed the pleas of these outside influences, rather than those of their own platform.

Preservation of Montana's resources was one commitment of the legislature, but the utilization of them for agricultural purposes was another.
Although agriculture is one of Montana's largest businesses, there was a definite lack of bills which dealt clearly with the question. Actually there were several measures introduced, but most of these had nothing to do with the Democratic or the Republican platforms. Of the bills introduced, most of them did not survive the legislative process.

The Democrats asked that new members be added to the Livestock Commission and the Milk Control Board. House Bill 66 would have placed a producer, a distributer, and a retailer on the Milk Control Board. These new appointees would serve in a strictly advisory capacity. The bill was killed and eventually killed in the House. The second measure, House Bill 616, would have included an owner of a dairy, and an owner of a slaughterhouse or meat packing plant on the Livestock Commission. On the floor of the House, this bill's life, also, came to an abrupt end.

CHAPTER 6
AGRICULTURE

The House, also, killed agriculture bills dealing with control of pesticides, control of rodents, and an agricultural market act. Since these bills received their conception in the Republican platform, especially the rodent control act, they should have at least survived the vote of the House. The Republican-controlled House spelled the end of all three measures (which incidentally had been introduced by Republican representatives).

The House did recognize the rights of the Cooperatives. According to House Bill 845, Cooperatives would be forced to pay a portion of their retained earnings to share holders who discontinued doing business with them. When the House killed these measures, they allowed the Cooperatives the right to keep their capital at a higher level. It also, allowed them to function more efficiently.
Although agriculture is one of Montana’s largest businesses, there was a definite lack of bills which dealt clearly with the question. Actually there were several measures introduced, but most of these had nothing to do with the Democratic or the Republican platforms. Of the bills introduced, most of them did not survive the legislative process.

The Democrats asked that new members be added to the Livestock Commission and the Milk Control Board. House Bill #165 would have placed a producer, a distributor, and a retailer on the Milk Control Board. These new appointees would serve in a strictly advisory capacity. The bill was corralled and eventually killed in the House. The second measure, House Bill #516, would have included an owner of a dairy, and an owner of a slaughterhouse or meat packing plant on the Livestock Commission. On the floor of the House, this bill’s life, also, came to an abrupt end.

Several measures did gain acceptance by both chambers. An appropriation bill which would fund increased research for agricultural purposes and agricultural techniques. Another measure would have set regulations for grading of farm products. It was realized that products which would be packed under a cooperative label would be marketed more efficiently.

Since the main thrust of the two platforms dealt with agriculture on a national level, it is hard to judge the parties in regard to this issue. In the majority of the cases, the parties recognized the importance of agriculture to the state’s economy. But it was the opposition party which believed the bills corralled the House. Although the measure of this type, it is extremely difficult to determine what influence this might have had on the party’s position.

The House did recognize the rights of the Cooperatives. According to House Bill #171, Cooperatives would be forced to pay a portion of their retained earnings to shareholders who discontinued doing business with them. When the House killed the measure, they allowed the Cooperatives the right to keep their capital at a higher level. It also, allowed them to function more efficiently.

After viewing the legislative process through the farmers’ eyes, we must now scrutinize from the standpoint of labor and industry.
One Senate Bill, entitled the "Green Belt Bill," met eventual death in the House. Senate Bill #116 would have allowed farm land to be taxed at its agricultural value rather than any value it could have for other purposes. This was the tax break that the Democrats had promised the farmers in their platform. If passed, this act would have assured certain tax breaks for farmers. Although the farmer definitely need some revised form of taxation on his property, this measure had inherent weaknesses that finally brought its demise. When the bill reached the House, the representatives began to discover loopholes in its wording. According to the clause of the bill, there could be a great travesty of its original intention by industry. They said that it was opening the door to land speculations as well as industry to abuse the privilege. In view of these arguments, the House disposed of the measure.

Several measures did gain acceptance by both chambers. An appropriation bill which would fund increased research for agricultural purposes was passed. This provided the necessary financial support to carry out improved research for better agricultural techniques. Another successful measure was House Bill #205 which would set regulations for grading of farm products. It clearly defined those products which would be marked Montana products.

Since the main thrusts of the two platforms dealt with agriculture on a national level, it is hard to judge the parties in regard to state agriculture. In the majority of the cases, the parties initiated and supported their own planks, but it was the opposition party which killed the bills. Confronted with a situation of this type, it is extremely difficult to decipher exactly where the responsibility lies.

After viewing the legislative process through the farmers eyes, we must now scrutinize from the standpoint of labor and industry.

---

With the technological advances of our times, industry became more extensive and comprehensive. A large labor force is needed to guarantee the proper functioning of these industries. Both the Democratic and the Republican parties realized this, and they urged legislation to safeguard Montana laborers as well as Montana industry. Of the legislation introduced, a substantial segment of it was designed to protect the workers.

Unemployment compensation ceased to be a key word during many sessions of the legislature. A deluge of bills were submitted which would streamline Montana unemployment compensation laws. Since both parties had promised to revise the laws to bring them in accordance with federal standards, this did not seem as much of a surprise. Despite the great hope which were conveyed, the results were rather mediocre.

In the Democrat-controlled Senate, seconded were disposed to listen to the pleas that did the Republican-led House. Unemployment compensation was quite evident in the results which were achieved.

Introduced into the House was a package of bills which would clarify various sections of our befuddled Unemployment Compensation laws. One of the bills, including the subjectivity requirement of twenty weeks employment was rushed through both the House and the Senate. By the implementation of this act, the patchwork of unemployment laws was sewed more tightly together, and an increased number of employees were included under the law. A second part of the package set standards of punishment for any type of falsification by the employer or the agent. It was based upon a disqualification period of ten to fifty-two weeks. The final act in this composite of bills was House Bill 323, which changed the name of the commission in Montana and established two separate divisions of the commission. This legislation allowed greater utilization of necessary funds and less subjectivity in dispersing the money.
With the technological advances of our times, industry becomes more extensive and comprehensive. A large labor force is needed to guarantee the proper functioning of these industries. Both the Democratic and the Republican parties realized this, and they urged legislation to safeguard Montana laborers as well as Montana industry. Of the legislation introduced, a substantial segment of it was designed to protect the worker.

Unemployment compensation seemed to be a key word during many sessions of the legislature. A deluge of bills were submitted which would stream-line Montana compensation laws. Since both parties had promised to revise the laws to bring them in accordance with federal standards, this did not come as much of a suprise. Despite the great hopes which were conveyed, the results were rather mediocre. The Democrats controlled Senate, seemed more disposed to listen to the pleas than did the Republican-led House. The difference became quite evident in the results which were achieved.

Introduced into the House was a package of bills which would clarify various sections of our befuddled Unemployment Compensation laws. One of the bills, deleting the subjectivity requirement of twenty weeks employment was rushed through both the House and the Senate. By the implementation of this act, the patchwork of unemployment law was sewed more tightly together, and an increased number of employees are included under the law. A second part of the package set standards of punishment for any type of falsification by the employer or the agent. It was based upon a disqualification period of ten to fifty-two weeks. The final act in this composite of bills was House Bill #25, which changed the name of the commission in Montana and established two coordinate divisions of the commission. This legislation allowed greater utilization of necessary funds and less subjectivity in dispersing the money.
Since all three of these bills were housekeeping acts, they faced limited debate before they were signed by the governor.

The most important unemployment bill introduced had to suffer through the torments of the legislative process, but it did finally weather the storm. House Bill #349 raised Montana's Unemployment Compensation from $34 to $42 a week. Since Montana was lowest in the nation in these payments, the law definitely needed amendment. Other clauses continued in the measure, however caused a great deal of strife. The bill as introduced by the Republicans and passed by the House, would have removed many of the lower income employees from unemployment coverage.

The Democratic leadership in the Senate amended the measure to strike out the sections regarding low income employees. Despite this, the Republicans remained adamant in their convictions and were unwilling to accept the proposed amendments. Finally, on the 60th legislative day, they bowed to the will of the Democrats and sent the amended measure to the governor's office. The Republicans did manage to have one section reinstated. This specific clause would prevent any further federalization of the Unemployment Compensation program which was one of the planks in their platform.

Others measures which would have amended the present Unemployment Laws met with varying success. House Bill #10, eliminating the fifteen dollars maximum wage clause, was highly successful. This law completely deletes the maximum wage earnable clause and sets the basis for losing compensation merely at employment of more than 16 hours a week.

By giving its stamp of approval to House Bill #93, the legislature included individuals suffering from certain enumerated injuries to claim unemployment compensation as well as receiving Workmen's Compensation payments.
Senator Luke McKeon (D-DeerLodge) introduced two bills to extend the amount of time a person could receive compensation. The first, Senate Bill #81, was more comprehensive and involved a wider field of individuals. Although the act survived the vote in the Senate, it was quickly cut down in the House. In the second measure, Senate Bill #91, McKeon asked that compensation payments be extended past the 500 week maximum where the Accident Board deems it necessary. One stipulation of the bill was that it included only cases of total disability. The measure eventually was forced into a conference committee, which amended certain sections of it. The proposal which emerged from the committee was a weakened version of the original.

A uniformity act, which would establish a set policy for creating premium rates for insurance under the Workmen's Compensation program, survived strenuous debate and was signed into law.

The House felt that in certain cases, it is necessary to give more protection to the employer. When a bill, increasing the contribution rate of employers to the Unemployment Compensation program, came from the other chamber, the House wasted no time and very few words in killing it.

House Bill #232 allowed an employee to bring civil suit against an employer for funds and above and beyond his Workmen's Compensation award. The House Republicans, also, defeated the measure, and in so doing contradicted their own campaign platform. The bill stipulated that the civil suit could only be led in cases where the employer was negligent. Faced with the possibility of a law suit, the employers would surely improve safety conditions to avoid being negligent. The Republicans support improved safety conditions, but they killed the bill which would have brought them about.
"On the Table" means that for all practical purposes the bill has been killed. This was the fate of House Bill #180. In the Democratic platform, territorial integrity was promised to the proponents of rural electrics, and this bill was an enactment of that promise. When the bill was voted upon in the House, eleven Democrats from Butte and Anaconda sided with the Republicans, and the bill was defeated by six votes. Representative Wayrynen (D-Silver Bow) defended the group's action saying that Butte had the Montana Power Company as one of its employers and not the Rural Electric Association.\(^1\) Their rejection of House Bill #180 had two repercussions. First the AFL-CIO lashed out at Wayrynen and denied supporting him in the election.\(^2\) In reply Wayrynen made some derogating remarks about the Butte AFL-CIO committee.\(^3\) These rebutts brought some ill feelings between labor and the Democratic Party as well as between the democrats themselves. The over-all repercussion was the bitter feelings that developed between rural Democrats and the Butte-Anaconda delegation. The Democratic unity in the House was broken and caused many problems.

They cleavage in unity plagued the House Democrats and brought the death of many of the labor proposals. After this time, it was extremely difficult for the Democrats to have any labor bills survive a House vote. The Butte-Anaconda legislators had abandoned the rural democrats and they in turn were going to have their say. A check of the voting records will reveal that several rural democrats crossed party lines to kill labor bills bearing the signature of Butte or Anaconda.\(^4\)

\(^2\) ibid., p. 1.
\(^3\) ibid., p. 3.
\(^4\) 1968 Montana Republican Platform, Montana Republican Central Committee, Helena, Montana.
delegates. The dilemma was never resolved and unfortunately many fine Democratic proposals were defeated.

Democratic unity in the Senate was temporarily stifled at one point. A measure was introduced by two leading democrats. The bill would have given the consumer the benefit of Consumer Council. This consumer council would have had definite power to oversee such things as advertisements, research, quality of products and any suspicion of fraudulent practices. At length a vote was recorded, the Democrats split and the bill was defeated. The break in party control was only temporary and did not have severe repercussions.

It looked as if labor was going to be kept completely from political fights, but in the closing days of the session the labor question was cast into political limelight. The Democrats introduced a minimum wage bill covering jobs not brought under federal standards. The minimum wage would have been $1.40 an hour for non-farm workers. Raising opposition to the bill were the Montana Retail Association, Montana Chamber of Commerce and the Montana Employers' Association. They fought the measure, although they could not present a stable case for not enacting the law. When the bill reached the floor of the House, the Republicans killed it. In the Republican platform, it states, "...all Montanas are entitled to an adequate livable wage". Evidently it did not consist of a guaranteed wage which was on the same strata as the remainder of the nation.

Introduced into the Senate was another bill that was extension of the Democratic platform. Specifically this measure would have given public employees the right of collective bargaining. By approving this bill, the state would recognize the need for collective bargaining. The bill passed the Senate with little debate.

---

but it was defeated in the House. Five Democrats crossed party line and voted with the Republicans to kill the bill by a 56 to 46 vote.

In the field of labor, the Democrats were more disposed to sponsor legislation, but a lack of party unity caused them many headaches. This split in party ranks caused the defeat of many measures from their platform. In spite of the cleavage, they did pass many bills. The Republicans did not promise too much along these lines, and they gave very little. On the minimum wage bill, they did abandon their platform.

Labor was one of the broad categories under which several proposals were stated.

Since considerations has already been given to the labor question, other facets of the platform which are not listed under the general structure will now be studied.
In other areas, there were single planks which did not fall into assigned categories. These were the special proposals and for the sake of convenience, I have grouped them in one chapter.

During the campaigns, the weaknesses and duplication in agencies of the state government really came under fire. The 1969 legislative did much to help clarify the situation, although it did kill the most vital bill. Seven bills dealing with some aspect of these deficiencies were enacted into law. Among these measures were a new payroll system, an orderly system of public accounting in the state department, definition of the powers of the auditor, a uniform reporting system for all state executive agencies, updating accounting rules, guiding audit committees, and refined methods of computation. All these measures will be fundamental in creating a more efficient government.

Efficiency would have been added to the most important bill was not killed. Senate Bill 61, entitled the "Merit system" bill, was passed after heated political debate. This proposal would have extended the merit system to include most of the state employees. It was a culmination of what both parties called for in their platforms. After the act was pushed through the Senate it was revised in the House. The Republicans removed the section which dealt with collective bargaining for public employees. They claimed that they were not against collective bargaining, but they did not want to force it on anyone. The Democrats cited numerous examples from the states where collective bargaining is a reality among public employees. In recessional form, they told the Republicans that you cannot have collective bargaining with our representation, and without this section you could not have representation. The newly amended bill was sent back to the 2
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In other areas, there were single planks which did not fall into assigned categories. These were the specific proposals and for the sake of convenience, I have grouped them in one chapter.

During the campaigns, the inadequacies and duplication in agencies of the state government really came under fire. The 1969 legislative did much to help clarify the situation, although it did kill the most vital bill. Seven bills dealing with some aspect of these deficiencies were enacted into law. Among these measures were: a new payroll system, an orderly system of public accounting in the state department, definition of the powers of the auditor, a uniform reporting system for all state executive agencies, updating antiquated rules guiding pre-audit committees, and refined methods of transmittal. All these measures will be fundamental in creating a more efficient state department.

Efficiency would have been further improved if the most important bill was not killed. Senate Bill #31, entitled the "merit system" bill, was subdued after heated political debate. This proposal would have extended the merit system to include most of the state employees. It was a culmination of what both parties called for in their platforms. After the act was pushed through the Senate it was revised in the House. The Republicans removed the section which dealt with collective bargaining for public employees. They claimed that they were not against collective bargaining, but they did not want to force it on anyone.\(^1\) The Democrats cited numerous examples from the states where collective bargaining is a reality amongst public employees. In succinct terms, they told the Republicans that you cannot have collective bargaining without representation, and without this section you could not have representation.\(^2\) The newly amended bill was sent back to the

---

1. ibid., House of Representatives, Feb. 27, 1969.
2. ibid.
Senate where it was immediately killed. The Senate Democrats claimed the bill was useless without this section.\(^3\)

A bill which actually should have received bi-partison support was buried because neither party was willing to compromise on one section. Neither party was willing to give up their staunch position, and the "merit system" bill was delayed for another session.

The Democratic platform states, "... our judges should be adequately compensated, taking into account their training and responsibilities. We recommend that the salaries of our judges be increased to at least the national average."\(^4\)

It appeared that the Democrats were going to abandon this plank from their platform. When two House Bills (#84 and 85) were presented to the Senate, they killed the measures. These companion bills would have raised the salary of many judges. Later the democrats vindicated themselves by passing House Bill #521, which raises the salaries of the justices of the Supreme Court and district court judges. The measure raises their salaries to a level compatible with the national average.

Modernization of the probate codes of Montana was the stated intention of Senate Joint Resolution #. If the resolution would have been passed, an indepth study of Montana probate laws would have been undertaken by the Legislative Council. Presently many of the procedures and laws which are associated with probate courts are cumbersome and impedative. The proposal study could have been the basis for alleviating these problems. The Senate did not see that this was a beneficial project and resoundingly defeated it.

---

\(^3\) fl. obs., Senate, Feb. 28, 1969

Possibly, the proposal which has been introduced into more session than any other is that the governor and the lieutenant governor must be of the same party. This is one of those bills which has been introduced in every session since 1961. Strangely enough this amendment has been supported by one or both of the major parties platform since 1963. In fact in 1965, both parties promised legislation of this type, yet it never survived that session.

The circumstances surrounding the brief life of House Bill #257 in the 1969 Montana Legislature are interesting. An amendment of this type was part of the Republican platform. Oddly enough, the bill was introduced by democratic representative McGrath. In the voting of the House, the amendment gained sufficient approval. When the bill reached the Senate, the measure met its inevitable death. I am at loss to explain why this amendment never passes. In discussion with groups of legislature, I found that they were unable to present a suitable explanation too.

Another Constitutional amendment did succeed and now only need the approval of the voters. "The Democratic Party will support legislation to reduce the voting age to 19 years of age." Several bills were submitted which included this stipulation. House Bill #43 was the one that finally emerged. There was extensive discussion from many groups on the measure, but eventually both chambers passed it overwhelmingly.

After considering these sundry planks, it would be well to discuss the vital subject of taxation.

---

5 ibid., p. 16.
So did have that one advertisement that until 10% and to that time was to do not cover the entire branch and had no way of knowing the claim. With these ends, Gov. Mead, Chairman of Montana Democratic Party, explained the advertisement that caused them to such trouble. On January 30th, the Democrats
produced for the House their 24-point election program, and the real political battle was on. The Republican leaders immediately began to slam the Democrats for exceeding the 10% increase and for introducing a preponderance of bills. Political
jostling began on both sides with neither one accomplishing anything constructive.

What in the package caused the Republicans to become so aroused? The
main two bills in the package were House Bill 1502 and 151. The former would have eliminated the deduction for federal income tax paid in computing the net income for state income tax purposes, while the latter called for a 15% increase on personal income tax. A third measure, House Bill 1556, would have increased the corporation income tax by some 15%. The remainder of the 14 bills would have increased taxes on businesses such as insurance companies, mining operations, electrical energy producers, freight lines, and others. The new rates were increases of a 10% increase.

On the 22nd legislative day, this 14 bill package was dropped into the hopper, and what happened after that would make a good script for a comedy. The Republicans were under a mandate not to introduce the sales tax in this session, but they were explaining for one in 1972. They protested vehemently that the Democrats' proposal was a travesty of justice and an insult to all Montanans. Emerging with the

---

2. Id.; House of Representatives, Jan. 20, 1969.
We did have that one advertisement that said 10% and to that time we did not control the executive branch and had no way of knowing the demands.\footnote{Madden, Jerry, Great Falls Tribune, Feb. 26, 1969, p. 5.} With these words, Chet Haylock, Chairman of Montana Democratic Party, explained the advertisement that caused them so much trouble. On January 30th, the Democrats produced for the House their 14 point taxation program, and the real political battle was on. The Republican leaders immediately began to flay the Democrats for exceeding the 10% increase and for introducing a preponderance of bills.\footnote{Ibid.} Political jostling began on both sides with neither one accomplishing anything constructive.

What in the package caused the Republicans to become so aroused? The main two bills in the package were House Bill #555 and 557. The former would have eliminated the deduction for federal income tax paid in computing the net income for state income tax purposes, while the latter called for a 15% increase on personal income tax. A third measure, House Bill #556, would have increased the corporation license tax by some 15%. The remainder of the 14 bills would have increased taxes on businesses such as insurance companies, mining operations, electrical energy producers, freight lines, and others. The new rates were in excess of a 10% increase.

On the 22nd legislative day, this 14 bill package was dropped into the hopper, and what happened after that would make a good script for a comedy. The Republicans were under a mandate not to introduce the sales tax in this session, but they were

\footnote{Ibid.}
Democratic campaign promise of 10% increasing, they accused the opposition party of the people. To correct the Democratic error, the House amended House Bill #557 to a tidy 10% increase on income tax. Next, they killed the Democrats corporation license tax, and, finally, they buried the Federal Income tax deduction bill.

Upon killing this third bill, the Republicans stated that the Democrats were just disguising a raise on income tax by this bill, and if the Senate wanted this needed revenue they could increase the personal income tax rates even higher. 4

In reply, the Democrats in the House could do little, but accuse the Republicans of playing politics and of grossly mishandling their bills. 5

After this order of business was taken care of, the House Republicans went to work on the rest of the package. Chanting that Democrats were initiating a sales tax of their own, the Republican leaders began amending the license taxes on businesses. They said that these measures were nothing but sales taxes, since they would eventually be passed on to the consumer. The Republicans, also, accused the Democrats of discriminating against Montana industries. 6 While they the Republicans amended all the bills to lower the increases to 10%, both sides of the aisle spewed derogatory comments at the other. Finally on the 43rd Legislative day, the revision bills were sent to the Senate.

In the Senate, the bills were held in committee, while the appropriation bills were formulated in the House. To further their efforts at discrediting the Democrats, the Republican controlled House began to pass appropriation bills which called for 20 to 25% increases. With only a 10% increase in new revenue, it is impossible to fund increases of 25% in appropriations. By creating such a dilemma

---

4 fl. obs., House of Representatives, Feb. 15, 1969
5 ibid.
6 ibid.
as this far the Democrats, the Republicans hoped to show that we needed a new source of revenue, namely a sales tax.

The transfer of revenue bills to the Senate occurred on the 43rd legislative day. For 14 days, they remained in the Senate committee, the leaders of the two parties continued to harass each other. The Republicans repeatedly made their bid for a sales tax, while they maligned the Democrats for presenting an inflated program. In response, the Democrats accused the Republicans of abdicating their responsibility. They said that the Republicans should propose their own revenue package if they did not like the Democratic one. This public bickering continued until both sides became disgusted.

Republican Senator James Haughey implored the Democrats to bring the bills out of committee, so that they could be debated. In rebuttal, Senator Mahoney told him they could not plan a budget until all of the appropriation bills were received from the House.

Finally the Democrats pulled a political move of their own. Mysteriously, the package of bills with the Democrats own amendments appeared on committee on Sunday, the 56th legislative day, and were passed to the Senate without committee debate. The Republicans were appalled at this underhanded trick and accused the Democrats of being irresponsible. The newly amended bills called for a approximate 15% increase. By this time both parties were worn thin from the political maneuvering, and they wanted to settle the affair by the last day of the session. Senator Greff,

---

7 ibid.
the Democratic financial expert, announced the proposal budget and told the Republicans to take or to leave it. Since they wanted to finish in 60 days, no the Republicans were almost forced to accept the tax program.

The whole affair might have ended on the 60th day, if it had been for an unforeseen occurrence. On the last day of the session, an economics expert discovered a trifling deficit of 6.8 million dollars in the proposed budget. It was an honest mistake, but proved to be extremely costly. There is no reason for a mistake of this kind to happen. If more time would have been spent working on the budget and less on playing politics, this might not have happened.

The whole situation was blown wide open again. Senator Graff attacked Governor Anderson for his lackadical attitude, and accused him of being impedent in the formulation of the budget. The Republicans seized upon the chance to belittle their Democratic adversaries. The Democrats, themselves, just smiled rather sheepishly and remained rather silent.

An extraordinary session of the legislative body was called by the Governor. At a cost of $9,000 a day, a special session was held. During this time, the situation remained in a rather suspended state as both sides worked on their bills. Finally after much fighting and talking the budget was drawn up and passed.

The total impression which I gathered from the financial bickering is that both parties talked more than they listened or performed. Without any semblance of an open mind for logical discussion, neither side was willing to listen to the other at all. The lack of communication caused a great deal of trouble and eventually brought about the extraordinary session.

On the Republican side, they did to a certain extent follow their platform. They made an attempt to have the main tenet of their platform initiated in 1971.

---

In doing this, they relinquished much of their responsibility to the people of Montana. By destroying the Democratic tax package, they left the state with no source of new revenue. To further emphasize their point, they passed inflated appropriations bills. Politically they may have succeeded in promoting their sales tax, but they have done so at the high cost of efficient management in our state government. If their tax pitch had been tempered with a spirit of cooperation, the whole affair might have been resolved. Representative James Lucas believes that they have won many new supporters for a sales tax and the chances of the success in 1971 seem very bright. This question should not have been one for the future, but it should have been considered in this session. The state will have to operate two years under the stigma of the 1969 session. If the Republicans did not approve of the Democratic package, they should have offered some temporary revenue proposals to carry the state until 1971.

Actually in the field of taxation, the Republicans presented only one important bill, House Bill #204 which the Republicans' version of the corporation license tax. In this measure the rates were 3/4 of 1% lower than those offered by the Democrats, and the Cooperatives were also to be taxed under this bill. Taxation of the Cooperatives was one facet of the Republican platform. The bill passed the House, but was rejected in the Senate. In a conference committee, the two parties held their position on Cooperative taxation. Finally in a frenzy, the committee was dissolved and the measure was buried.

Looking at the Democratic slate, things appear quite similar. They followed their platform and introduced all their tax bills. The income tax bill, the corporation license tax, and the revocation of Federal Income Tax deductions were

---

Per. Inter., Lucas, March 1, 1969.

Hadden, Jerry, Great Falls Tribune, Feb. 26, 1969, p. 5.
presented just as they were in the platform. The problem wasn't their platform, but a campaign advertisement signed by Chet Bloyloch calling for 10% increase.

If they would have adhered to "medium" increases in their campaign advertisements, things would have been less complicated Bloyloch defended himself saying, "Our platform was not 10%. Our feelings is that we must take a responsible position of raising the necessary revenue to meet the state needs irregardless of a fixed percentage figures. We have shown our willingness to do so through the Democratic tax package plan,"

In the business license taxes, the Democrats generally followed their planks. They asked for a revision of service and severance taxes which there are. The Republicans accused them of introducing a sales tax, but, generally, this charge has no basis. These were increases on taxes that already existed and that had not been increased in twenty of thirty years. In some cases the added cost might be passed on to the consumer, but not in all cases. For example, House Bill #566, a tax on mining operations, was called a sales tax by the Republicans. The Anaconda Company opposed the bill on the grounds that they could not pass the new cost on to the consumer.

Despite the authenticity of most of the bills, there was one bill that was a flagrant violation of their platform. House Bill #570, a 5% tax on living accommodations, has to be classified as a direct sales tax. If the consumer is taxed directly for a commodity or an accommodation, it is nothing but a sales tax.

The real problem which developed for the Democratic party was a lack of communication within their own ranks. The Democratic legislators were never fully assured of the Governor's intentions. The first three bills vetoed by the Governor were Democratic proposals. Several times he was quoted as being opposed to certain

Madden, Jerry, Great Falls Tribune, Feb. 26, 1969, p. 5.
facets of the Democrats tax package. Senator Greff struck out at the top executive for not helping formulate a budget. It seemed the Governor was indifferent to the outcome of the budget. The Democrats had to function in the face of this reality.

The overall spectrum is rather bleak. Although both parties can say that to some degree, they did follow their platform, they did so in the wrong manner. Although all of the complications were eventually worked out it entailed an extraordinary session that was unnecessary. The state will manage during the next bimium, but the 1969 session did very little to improve the situation.

Now that the broad expanse of the summary presented in the Preface has been exhausted, certain conclusions can be drawn for the entire 1969 session.

---

A single equation lacks the complexity to explain the complicated procedures of a modern legislature. Numerous factors are involved, and only a composite of these will supply the answer. There are two factors that must be considered when analyzing a party's platform in connection to bills enacted into law. First the platforms are usually written in general and vague terms that make it extremely difficult to pin point the exact purpose. Secondly, the legislator is an individual who votes in accordance to his own conscience not that of his party. There were two elements which had to be dealt with in surveying the situation.

Even with the understanding of these factors, one cannot help to be slightly discouraged after following the proceedings of the 1969 session. The parties said much more in their platforms than they produced during the session. In fact, they said much more during the sessions than they said after. If as much energy would have been expended for logical discussion as was spent on political bellowing, the accomplishments of the Legislature would have been more notable.

In evaluating the whole session, I would say that neither party seemed to support firmly certain planks of their platform. Of course, legislation upon party lines was passed on a number of areas, and the legislators did follow through with their party's promises. In some cases, the opposition brought the demise of a bill, but just as often it was a party's own members that killed the proposal.

When weighing the pros against the cons, they often seem to lose their significance. The shabby treatment, which important bills such as the School Foundation Program bill and the tax proposals, received is a definite blotch on the record of the legislature. There was definite lack of responsibility on both sides. A good example of this is the extraordinary session which cost the taxpayers of Montana $9,000 a day. Although it is difficult to give all legislation the
A single causation basis cannot be utilized to explain the complicated procedures of a modern legislature. Numerous factors are involved and only a composite of these will supply the answer. There are two factors that must be considered when analyzing a party's platform in comparison to bills enacted into law. First the platforms are usually written in general and vague terms that make it extremely difficult to pinpoint the exact promise. Secondly, the legislator is an individual who votes in accordance to his own conscience not that of his party. These were two elements, which had to be dealt with in surveying the situation.

Even with the understanding of these factors, one cannot help to be slightly discouraged after following the proceeding of the 1969 session. The parties said much more in their platforms than they produced during the session. In fact, they said much more during the session than they produced. If as much energy would have been expended for logical discussion as was wasted on political bellowing, the accomplishments of the Legislature would have been more noteworthy.

In evaluating the whole session, I would say that neither party seemed to support firmly certain planks of their platform. Of course, legislation upon party lines was passed on a number of areas, and the legislators did follow through with their party's promises. In some cases, the opposition brought the demise of a bill, but just as often it was a party's own members that killed the proposal.

When weighing the pro's against the hevier con's, they often seem to lose their significance. The shabby treatment, which important bills such as the School Foundation Program bill and the tax proposals, received is a definite blotch on the record of the legislature. There was definite lack of responsibility on both sides. A good example of this is the extraordinary session which cost the taxpayers of Montana $9,000 a day. Although it is difficult to give all legislation the
proper consideration during a 60 day session, it could have been done this time.

In an affair such as this, someone has to emerge victorious. Undoubtedly the victor in the 1969 session was the Montana Power Company. In every instance in which the utility company had preference regarding a measure, their preference was followed. They survived the session without even one minor detrimental bill being passed against them. The expanse of the company's support was such that they were able to have members bolt their own party and its platform. Senator Mitchell said, "Lobbyists usually don't implant ideas in a legislator's mind, they take advantage of what's there." If this is true, the Montana Power must have exclusive control over the ideas of some legislators. If the trend were to continue, both parties will have to consult the company on what planks should be included in their platform. If Montana Power entered the session a prince of the land, it surely was crowned king, during the proceedings.

The story is told of the spider and the frog which casts a little insight into the 1969 session.

"Please help me," begged the spider, approaching a frog on the bank of a swelling stream. "I must get across."

"What?" said the frog laughing. "Do you think I'm a Fool?" "If I did that, you would surely bite me and I would just as surely die."

"What could I gain?" replied the spider now desperate. "I too could die, I would drown, don't you see?"

The reasoning impressed the frog and he consented to take the spider across on his back. There, in the middle of the stream, the frog suddenly looked back, his face masked with terror. "But how could you?" he screamed. "You promised..."

"I know my friend," said the spider mournfully. "I am sorry. It is just

1 Great Falls Tribune, Feb. 27, 1969, p. 2.
my nature."

If the two parties would have cooperated, the session might have been a success. If the member of the party's would have worked with their affiliated brothers of the same party, the affair might have been at least noteworthy. Like the spider and the frog, they followed their nature, and sank. With the lack of communication in the session, main tenents of platforms sunk in the mid-stream of political bidding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

8. Personal Interview, Sen. Eugene Mahoney (D-Sanders), March 1, 1969.


