

of their requirements.

6. In every instance of controversy which came to the committee's attention the commissioner or the inspectors made the claim that their attitude was as required by the laws of the State.

7. That the committee found it difficult to secure voluntary testimony from complaining correspondents owing to fear of reprisals, although such persons were given assurance from both the Department and the Committee that none such would occur.

8. That the committee recommends that the Department be lenient with all districts where there are apparent financial difficulties, owing to the delinquencies of tax levies, and that the Department require no extraordinary expenditures of such districts during the two years next following the date of this report, all such districts to be given all possible State aid and assistance during that period.

9. That the committee recommends that visits occasionally be made by the Board of Education apart from the Department, at various points in the State when hearings would be given any school boards who might wish to appear, and educational matters be discussed.

10. That the committee recommends that the State Department place in the hands of every president or chairman and every secretary or clerk of school districts in the State of Minnesota, a copy of the Book of Standards to insure that they will have the requirements of the State Board at hand.

11. That the time available to the committee was far too short for any exhaustive investigation or for the consideration of any constructive plans for any change in the Department, even if such had been found desirable.

12. That the committee feels that a good purpose has been served by this investigation in clearing up at least to some extent, any misapprehensions and misunderstandings that exist between the Department and some of the thousands of schools under their jurisdiction.

EMIL L. REGNIER,
C. L. TODD,
J. B. PATTISON,
H. C. HANSON,
VICTOR E. LAWSON,
GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
R. W. HITCHCOCK,
HERMAN DAMMANN,
A. A. ZECH,
O. K. DAHLE.

Dated at St. Paul, Minnesota.

This 20th day of April, 1931.

Which motion prevailed.

Which report was adopted.

EXECUTIVE AND OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

St. Paul, April 21, 1931.

Hon. Henry Arens, President of the Senate.

Sir: I am returning to you without my approval S. F. No. 147

forthwith upon its receipt by me. It is unfortunate that a bill of such major importance should have been delayed until the closing hours of the Legislative Session.

I object to it upon the ground that it is unfair to the taxpayers of Minneapolis, St. Paul, South St. Paul, and the villages situate in Hennepin County.

Under the present bill the costs are distributed upon the basis of assessed valuation. Under the plan proposed therein, using the estimates of the Metropolitan Drainage Commission for an activated sludge plan, Minneapolis would pay \$1,080,000 each year for maintenance and fixed charges over a period of 30 years, and St. Paul the sum of \$605,000 per year for the same purposes and over the same period. South St. Paul would pay the sum of \$30,000 per year for the same purposes and over the same period, of which \$13,500 would be paid by the citizens of South St. Paul, and \$16,500 by the packing industries of South St. Paul.

If the costs were allocated upon a volume basis South St. Paul would pay \$155,000 per year, of which the packing industries, which contribute 95% of the sewage of South St. Paul, would pay \$147,250 per year, and the citizens of South St. Paul \$7,750 per year.

The only beneficiaries therefore through the allocation of cost upon an assessment basis rather than the volume basis are the private packing industries of South St. Paul, which would save \$130,750 per year through this plan, which of course is paid by the taxpayers.

It is imperative that a law be passed and immediate steps taken to remedy the present polluted condition of the Mississippi River, but a law may be passed which does not discriminate against the ordinary taxpayer and favor the private packing industries of South St. Paul.

The law to which I herein object is unfair in its allocation of cost, and would be the means of promoting perpetual strife between the citizens of Minneapolis on the one hand and the citizens of St. Paul on the other, and would destroy the fine feeling of cooperation which has been gradually built up between the citizens of the two cities.

In coming to the conclusions herein set forth I have disregarded the claims of partisans, and have based my conclusions entirely upon the reports of experts as contained in the published volumes of the Metropolitan Drainage Commission and the report of the special Board of Engineers appointed in January, 1931, by the Northwest section of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Engineers Society of St. Paul and the Engineers Club of Minneapolis, which consisted of five engineers from Minneapolis and four from St. Paul, which Board was appointed for the purpose of presenting the views of engineers on sewage disposal for the Metropolitan Drainage District.

The special Board of Engineers wisely anticipated that a situation would arise such as has arisen by the passage of this bill. In Section 14 of their report they state as follows:

"If differences of opinion should arise concerning the proper methods of allocating the cost of treating the sewage of South St. Paul and Newport, due to the large relative strength and quantity, it would be advisable to leave the solution of that problem in the hands of the Commission to dispose of as future developments might require. If, however, the differences of opinion as between Minneapolis and St.

Paul in regard to the inclusion of South St. Paul and Newport in the Sanitary District cannot be composed at present it would obviously be better for Minneapolis and St. Paul to unite in a common project without those cities; for in such an arrangement both cities will succeed in restoring the river down as far as South St. Paul as fully as if South St. Paul were included, and below South St. Paul fully 75% as much as if South St. Paul and Newport were included. Since it will be at least four or five years before any relief can be accomplished a satisfactory way, not now apparent, may be found within that time for South St. Paul to join in the Metropolitan project. It is fortunate that South St. Paul and Newport may be welcomed into the District later without altering present plans for the Twin Cities, and with but an inconsequential change in construction cost."

The bill which I have returned herewith without my approval can be easily amended so as to include only Minneapolis and St. Paul, and be based upon a straight assessed valuation basis. Under such an arrangement the cost to Minneapolis would be \$995,000 for maintenance and fixed charges per year for a period of 30 years or a saving of \$85,000 a year, making an aggregate saving over 30 years of \$2,550,000 as compared with the present bill. The cost to the city of St. Paul would be \$565,000 per year for maintenance and fixed charges over a period of 30 years or a saving of \$40,000 a year, making an aggregate saving of \$1,200,000 on the project. (See Page 55, Third Report of Metropolitan Drainage Commission for 1929 and 1930.)

Following the recommendation of the special Board of Engineers arrangements could be made by Minneapolis and St. Paul for handling the sewage of South St. Paul and of the packing industries upon a volume basis which would result in the people of South St. Paul, except for those financially interested in the packing industries, saving a substantial sum of money each year, as compared to the cost they will be obliged to pay under the present bill.

The villages of Hennepin County which now dispose of their sewage by contract arrangement with the city of Minneapolis would, under the plan set out in your bill, be obliged to pay from 13 to 24 times as much for their sewage disposal as they are not paying, whereas under the change as suggested by me they could continue to dispose of their sewage by contract with the city of Minneapolis.

I fully appreciate the necessity for action to remedy as soon as possible the river situation that now exists, but I am unwilling to sacrifice the interests of thousands of taxpayers living in this great Metropolitan District in favor of the interests of private industries. The State of Minnesota is pleased to have large packing industries herein resident, and believes that they should be properly encouraged, but you and I are also aware that a large home packing industry is situate at Austin which pays for the disposal of its sewage.

It would be unwise, in my opinion, to permit this bill to become a law because of the general dissatisfaction of taxpayers with its provisions. You should bear in mind that coupled with that dissatisfaction is also a departure from what might be said to be the public policy of the State of Minnesota. Rural Credits bonds and Highway bonds have been issued only after authorization through a referendum by the people. You are proposing in this bill to sell bonds in excess of \$16,000,000 without a referendum by the people, and in the face of widespread and

intense dissatisfaction with the manner in which the money realized from the sale of those bonds is to be spent.

Under the suggestion hereinbefore advanced by me the allocation of cost would be made upon the basis of assessed valuation—the same basis as is used in the bill in question—and it would result in a substantial saving to the taxpayers and in no discrimination in favor of the packing industries.

Respectfully,

FLOYD B. OLSON,
Governor.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS—CONTINUED.

Mr. Orr moved that S. F. No. 147 be placed on its re-passage, the veto of His Excellency, the Governor, notwithstanding.

Which motion prevailed.

CALL OF THE SENATE.

Mr. Orr moved a call of the Senate.

The roll being called the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams, C. E.,	Gardner,	MacKenzie,	Petersen, W. L.,	Smith,
Adams, E. E.,	Hanson,	McCornack,	Putzier,	Smullen,
Anderson,	Hausler,	McCubrey,	Regnier,	Spindler,
Bell,	Iverson,	Marshall,	Ribenack,	Sprung,
Bonniwell,	Jacobs,	Miller,	Richardson,	Starks,
Bridgeman,	Larson, A. S.,	Morin,	Rockne,	Sullivan,
Buckler,	Larson, H. A.,	Morrison,	Roepke,	Todd,
Child,	Lawson,	Mullin,	Rollins,	Weber,
Crowley,	Lennon,	Naplin,	Romberg,	Widell,
Devold,	Lewer,	Nordlin,	Rosenmeier,	Wolfe,
Duemke,	Lightner,	Orr,	Schmechel,	
Farnand,	Lodin,	Pattison,	Sell,	
Fearing,	Loftsgaarden,	Peck,	Serline,	
Finstad,	Lommen,	Pederson,	Siegel,	

CALL LIFTED.

Mr. Orr moved that further proceedings under the call of the Senate be dispensed with.

Which motion prevailed.

CONSIDERATION OF S. F. NO. 147.

The question being taken on the re-passage of the bill over the Governor's veto,

And the roll being called, there were yeas 38 and nays 29, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams, C. E.,	Gardner,	Loftsgaarden,	Ribenack,	Smith,
Adams, E. E.,	Hanson,	MacKenzie,	Richardson,	Smullen,
Bonniwell,	Hausler,	McCubrey,	Rockne,	Starks,
Crowley,	Iverson,	Morrison,	Roepke,	Sullivan,
Farnand,	Larson, A. S.,	Nordlin,	Rollins,	Weber,
Fearing,	Larson, H. A.,	Orr,	Rosenmeier,	Widell,
Finstad,	Lewer,	Peck,	Sell,	
Fisk,	Lightner,	Petersen, W. L.,	Serline,	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson,	Duemke,	McCornack,	Pattison,	Siegel,
Bell,	Jacobs,	Marshall,	Pederson,	Spindler,
Bridgeman,	Lawson,	Miller,	Putzier,	Sprung,
Buckler,	Lennon,	Morin,	Regnier,	Todd,
Child,	Lodin,	Mullin,	Romberg,	Wolfe,
Devold,	Lommen,	Naplin,	Schmechel,	

So the bill failed to pass over the Governor's veto.