H. F. No. 350, A bill for an act imposing a head tax on each and every person between twenty-one years of age and fifty years of age, whether a citizen of the United States or an alien, residing in the State of Minnesota, with certain exceptions, and providing for the method of collecting and apportioning such tax.

Was read the third time and placed upon its final passage.

The question being taken on the passage of the bill,

And the roll being called, there were yeas 48 and nays 52, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams, Anderson, A. G., Davidson, Bede, Berg, Brophy, Childgren, Colberg, Collins, Connell, Dahl,

Dammann, Davis, C. L., Day, J. L., Day, W. E., Doerr, Eide, Erickson, Fast, Fikkan,

Glende, Graff, Helgeson, Hitchcock, Hofstad, Johnson, C., Jordahl, Knopke, Kramer, Lowe,

Melby, Merrill, Morton, Naylor, Neuman, Odegard, Olson, Opsahl, Paige, Petersen,

Renick, Rohne, Rosetter, Scallon, Smith, Thorkelson, Williams, Mr. Speaker.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Atwood, Barker, Bateman, Beach, Beckman, Bloom, Burling, Campbell, Coughlin, Dahle, Davis, R. R.,

Finstuen, Gehan, Haugland, Holm, Iverson, Johnson, D. W., Johnson, G. L., Johnson, H. A., Johnson, T. H.,

Kennedy, Kieffer, Kingsley, Kozlak, Kueffner, McDonough, McGhee, McNelly, Merritt, Meyers,

Munn, Nellermoe, Nelson, Paulson, Powers, Quinlivan, Regan, Riley, Salmoisson, Samec, Sanger,

Schneider, Spillane, Stockwell, Terwilliger, Wahlstrand, Weeks, H. H., Youngdahl, Zech.

So the bill was lost.

EXECUTIVE AND OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.
St. Paul, April 20, 1931.

Hon. Oscar A. Swenson, Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Sir: I am returning herewith without my approval H. F. No. 1456, "A bill for an act to divide the State of Minnesota into nine Congressional Districts."

The State of Minnesota must be redistricted, but that redistricting should be based upon a fair division of population. H. F. No. 1456 is obviously an inequitable distribution of the population of Minnesota.

There is a difference of 116,000 between the proposed Fifth District, which contains the largest population, and the proposed First District, which contains the smallest population.

Taking the so-called agricultural districts there is a difference of 98,000 between the proposed Seventh District, an agricultural district which contains the largest population of the agricultural districts, and the proposed First District, an agricultural district which contains the smallest population. This is an unfair discrimination between agricultural districts.
Minnesota being an agricultural state is entitled to as much agricultural representation in Congress as possible. A plan of reapportionment may easily be worked out which does not involve any great disparity between agricultural districts as such nor any great disparity between so-called country and so-called city districts; and which will be fair from the standpoint of contiguous territory.

The people of Minnesota are entitled to a reapportionment upon the basis of an equitable distribution of the population, and upon the basis of contiguous territory.

To avoid the confusion of having candidates for Congress from Minnesota running at large I earnestly urge you to work out an equitable plan of reapportionment.

Respectfully,
FLOYD B. OLSON,
Governor.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS—CONTINUED.

Mr. Iverson moved that the message and the bill be laid on the table. Which motion prevailed.

Mr. Kozlak moved that the vote whereby S. F. No. 499 was lost be now reconsidered.

The question being taken on the motion to reconsider S. F. No. 499, And the roll being called, there were yeas 68 and nays 56, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:


Those who voted in the negative were:


So the motion prevailed.

The question being taken on the passage of the bill, And the roll being called, there were yeas 69 and nays 54, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were: