

Interview with Edmund C. Tiemann

November 10, 1973

Central Minnesota Historical Oral History Collection

St. Cloud State University Archives

Interviewed by Calvin Gower and John Waldron

Waldron: Mr. Tiemann, as I said before, we start off with general questions: When you were born, where you were born and general background information, education and when you were growing up?

Tiemann: I was born here in Melrose on March 28, 1922. I have lived here most of my life with the exception of the time I spent in the service and away at school. I graduated from Melrose High School in 1939 and worked in Melrose until 1941. I left here and went up to Newfoundland worked for a year and a half after which time I joined the Navy. I spent three years in the Navy in WWII. After that I came back and attended St. John's University for two years and the Minnesota Law School for two years. I ran for the legislature first in 1950 in November and in December. I was called up with the Minnesota Army National Guard for two years of active duty during the Korean War. I was able to get a delay in entering the service until May of 1951 after which time I reported to Camp Rucker, Alabama and was there in 1952 when I ran for re-election in absentia. I had opposition in that election, but I was successful and was discharged from the military service in December of 1952. I came back to Minnesota for the 1953 session. My parents are both of the German descent and my father was born in Germany, he served in the American Army in WWI. Both my parents are still living.

Waldron: Was your father involved in politics at all?

Tiemann: No, he wasn't with the exception that he did handle my campaign during 1952. He ran everything for me while I was gone.

Gower: Had you had any other relatives in politics and why did you decide to go into politics?

Tiemann: Actually I decided to go into politics on the spur of the moment. Several people approached me and I was going to law school and it was a field that I was interested in. I had no intention of winning when I ran initially. However in the primary I beat the incumbent, Mr. Lux by a few votes, not too many, and I guess that's when I got the bug and decided to go on and take it seriously. I won the general election that year by a comfortable margin. I forgot just what it was.

Gower: Had you done any work in politics at all in party activity or anything before 1950?

Tiemann: No, at the time I ran I hadn't engaged in any political activity. In fact, I wasn't sure which side I wanted to caucus on when I went down there. I did caucus with the liberals who were in a very small minority in that term.

Gower: Just one other point along this line, would you say your family was pretty well known in this area.

Tiemann: Yes, they were. I have many, relatives living in Melrose Township and the surrounding area.

Waldron: How long was the incumbent you ran against Mr. Fred B. Lux, was he in office before you beat him?

Tiemann: He was in for twelve years, six terms.

Gower: Who was your opponent in the general election?

Tiemann: Mr. Lux was in the general election, Alvin Ingan, from Belrade, was in the primary.

Gower: Oh, I see, Mr. Lux. I understand.

Waldron: Since this was your first campaign did you have an idea how you should shape it around an incumbent like Mr. Lux?

Tiemann: I believe there's only one, if you can say there's a sure way of winning an election is going house to house, personal contact. That's what we did mostly although we did use a sound truck, my brother and a friend of mine. We'd spend quite a lot of time out with the sound truck. They would make rounds while I was going door to door they would go up and down the various streets of communities. I did make a lot of farms individually, auctions and so forth, mostly in personal contact. At that time I don't think we used any radio and of course there was no television.

Gower: Exactly what was in your district when you were elected geographically speaking?

Tiemann: The western half of Stearns County, the line would roughly go from Birch Lake down through New Munich, Roscoe and then over east to include Zion Township, right south of St. Martin and down to Paynesville. Then west to the Stearns County Belgrade, Brooten and Sauk Centre.

Gower: So this actually was a fairly large territory to cover.

Tiemann: Geographically, it was about half of Stearns County.

Waldron: Along the same lines, what type of people made up the district? Were they basically conservative or were they basically liberal?

Tiemann: The district is basically conservative. The eastern half is very conservative. The Paynesville area is a mixture, but when you get over towards the western part it becomes more liberal. The western townships generally voted liberal, from Melrose west.

Gower: Would you clarify this: you were elected in 1950, but then did you serve in the legislature in the '51 session and how was that?

Tiemann: Yes, I served in the '51 session then I reported for active duty on May 11, 1951 after the session ended. There is a probation in the law that no legislator can be called to active duty without his consent. But having been a member of the National Guard I felt that since you belong, you should go when you are called, that's what you're here for.

Gower: How did you find it when you got down there to the legislature you'd had no experience at all, was it very difficult breaking in there?

Tiemann: Being twenty-eight years old for one thing, I think Don Wozniak and I were the two youngest members at that time. The average age of the legislators was considerably higher than it is today. You had many who had served throughout WWII, and the membership had been rather stable up to that period and then during the 1950 election a lot of younger men were elected. Yes, it was one of those things bit of a shock to find out what the responsibilities were. However, the older members were very cooperative in giving us assistance. I can remember one in particular for instance, George French, although he is a conservative a very good constitutional lawyer, was very helpful on the floor when things came up. If a young guy got in trouble, he would help him out, give his advice not on the issue, but on procedure and things like that.

Waldron: During the rest of your elections I think you ran on post quite a few times. Did you really meet any stiff competition?

Tiemann: I had in the 1952 election, that's when I was in the army, my competitor that time was a man by the name of Cherry, from Sauk Centre, a retail grocer. I won by a fairly substantial margin in the election. Then I had a couple of them where I was unopposed, I think three times if I remember correctly. Then in the last one Mr. Zimmerman from Paynesville opposed me and that was quite a bit closer although I still won, by a comfortable margin. This time if I had opposition in prior sessions I would have resigned or quit running earlier. But I didn't feel that I could do it gracefully and I had, because of family responsibilities, job responsibilities had been considering not running for quite a few years. But it's a lot easier to run again than not run. It's really hard to quit. For one thing you like it, and its very rewarding work, it's interesting, and it's a challenge, and once you get that bug it's pretty hard to overcome it. So the election being closed and this being a rather conservative district I felt that possibly the people did feel there would be time when they wanted to change and I decided as I said before because for family and job reasons that I wouldn't run anymore.

Gower: Maybe we should get on the tape when you were married, and how many children you have.

Tiemann: I married Gerry Cummings from Sauk Centre on October 31, 1946 and we have six daughters. About two months ago we had our first granddaughter. I have no idea when the boys are going to start showing up.

Gower: Okay, very good. Now of course, it has been some years since you've been in the legislature but could you recall some of the issues and name some of the bills that you felt were especially important and controversial while you were in the legislature?

Tiemann: Well, actually, the finances and taxes were not too important, because there were surpluses left from WWII. For instances, the first session I believe the tax committee only met toward the end of the session, when they found out how much they had to increase the budget and there was a very little bit of an increase then. In later years taxes became more and more important. The taconite amendment, when it was withholding state income taxes, I was an author I believe on that bill. I did serve in the tax committee in the last session, I was vice-chairman of that tax committee. I have something in my files that would probably give us the dates of when these things happened. I guess one of the highlights was on the taconite amendment, when it was initially proposed. It would have given tax relief to the taconite companies in perpetuity under the constitution of the constitutional amendment. Those of us who caucus with the liberals thought that his was a little excessive and that there should be a limitation of the number of years on that and on the next session. So the bill was defeated in that session and in the '63 session they did pass the taconite amendment, but with a 25 preusal rather than a tax relief in perpetuity. I guess the one that I spent the most time on was the Korean Bonus. As chairman of the veterans and military affairs committee, the committee decided to make that a committee bill, I handled and it took us several sessions to get that passed. In fact, it was passed finally in a special session, called by Governor Freeman. I think in '57 because of the recession that we were having at that time and among the proposals that he recommended during that special session was the Korean Bonus. So although there was a lot of substantial opposition, because of the economic conditions of that time the bill did finally pass. I found the most interesting part of legislature

work was in the tax area and having an accounting background. I guess it probably follows my interest in it. I guess the most emotional issue that we were involved with back in those days, was daylight saving time, because everybody had an opinion on it, they were either strongly for it or strongly against it, and finally it did pass. Most of the farmers were opposed to it. The movie theater operators, the resort owners, night club operators, were also opposed to it. But most people on main street were strongly for it. That's the one item that I did attempt to poll my district to find out how people felt. Generally from the response I got in this particular area people were against it at the time. I don't think that feeling still prevails. On polling, I never did feel that this was a proper way to determine how one should vote on one particular issue, because I feel that our form of representative government that a man is elected to vote on his convictions based on the information that he has and to use his good judgement. Which may or may not agree with the majority of his district. As a practical matter, if you try to determine what the feeling is, you start going around in a circle, a continuous circle until I don't think you can maintain any degree of consistency and certainly you can't follow your own political philosophy or economic philosophy or whatever might be involved. So I think a representative is elected to do his best, use his best judgement and if that doesn't suit his constituents then of course they can find someone else. If we had a town meeting form of government where everybody was there, it would be different. But I think our system was developed to replace that type of government.

Gower: That's very interesting discussion on that matter of polling. Do you think that the legislation in general would agree with your position on that?

Tiemann: I think generally the most capable ones do. There are some who of course follow caucus positions and their party positions must about 100% of the time. But generally these are

not people who are particularly active in proposing or opposing their views. Unfortunately they vote and they've got a good voting record. They vote 100% of the time. That doesn't always indicate that you are a good legislator. Because a lot of people who miss votes miss them because they are active in committee hearings, conference committees, and things of this nature and aren't able to get to the floor to cast a vote. But you'll find in a lot of elections that they will use a man's voting record as an indication of how he has performed and this may or may not be a good indicator.

Gower: Also, what I was getting at do you think there are some legislators who are constantly trying to find what the views of constituents are and really don't want to be the representative and then casting their vote based on their good judgement?

Tiemann: I think most of them are trying to determine what the feelings of their constituents are, not necessarily for that purpose of deciding how to vote, but to determine what the feeling is. I guess there would be a small minority who were reluctant to cast votes sometimes without checking back with the local political leaders or their supporters back home. Again what their supporters felt might not be indicative of what the general populist felt in their area.

Gower: Also, what I was getting at was, you polled your constituency on the day light saving time matter. You said, a majority were against Daylight Savings, but you voted for Daylight Savings despite that. Is that correct?

Tiemann: There were several votes on the bill and I think I voted for it, but I would want to check the record before I could be sure of that.

Waldron: Along the same lines, how much do you think party designations is going to erode the legislator voting on his own accord, without even polling the district but finding his interest in partisan politics.

Tiemann: Well, there's very little organized political activity in the rural areas as compared to the metropolitan areas. Generally, most of the rural conservatives were in control, up to this past year in the history of Minnesota. But in that conservative group were a number who were basically Democrats, but who caucused with conservatives, for various reasons. As a practical matter, party designation will make one difference, in that you will have primaries which you didn't have before. In other words, before you only had primaries when three people filed for the legislature. Now, if two people file and they're from the same political party, and file under the same label then you'll have a primary even if there's only two people and then one could be running without opposition during the general election. As far as the effect on the legislature itself, I don't know that it's going to make a great amount of difference. It'll still depends upon the individuals, how much weight they give to party support. No, my case as I indicated before I was politically naïve, and wasn't sure what my basic philosophy was during the twelve years I was in, I never received one nickel of support from the DFL party, although I caucused with the liberals. This sometimes created a little suspicion on the part of the dedicated party people although my voting record was there to back up my position as a liberal. I know sometimes like Governor Freeman, for instance never felt sure that I was completely dependable as far as going along with the caucus, and I'll have to admit I wasn't because I was always reserved my right to make the decision on my own. Some of the bills that were introduced by the Twin City liberals, for instance, were not bills that I thought were particularly good for the areas out here, because in many cases they asked for much more than they expected to get and what they were doing is

forcing the more conservative democrat to vote for something that you knew wasn't going to be the end result, but was in there for bargaining purposes. As a result it wasn't truly indicative of your position, whether it was unemployment comp or workers comp or something like that. I guess what I mean is that I would be in favor of an increase, but not as much of an increase as they were asking for. On strictly party issue this independence is a little hard to maintain sometimes. Particularly in the '55 session. The first session the liberals took over. Then we had 66 liberals and 65 conservatives. Of course, then we resolved everything in caucus we had our battles in caucus, we had some dandies but we would never come out with a politically orientated issue until we were assured of 100% support when we got to the floor. So the real work was done in the caucus. Then when it was brought up to floor you'd already indicated whether you could support it. If you couldn't support it, then they couldn't bring it up because they couldn't afford to lose one vote. During the session there was only one time when one of the liberals did switch over to the conservative side and that was on a tax bill and appall just fell over the body when this happened. Because everybody said, "Well what do we do now?" Nobody had an alternative proposal to raise the x number of dollars that were in the bill. So a couple days later the same representatives who had voted with conservatives made the motion to reconsider and they did pass the bill so there is a lot of arm twisting going on but sometimes they're not really sure whether they want you to switch over, because it creates more problems than it solves.

Waldron: You were in the legislature for twelve years. During that time can you give us any indication of what things or combination of things make for effective leadership?

Tiemann: Well, there are two areas. Number one, the speaker of the body of the House must be a man who is quite judicious, who doesn't rattle too easy, and is pretty good parliamentarian, and generally is a type of individual who commands respect from all the members. The floor leader,

the majority leader, the minority leader, they're more of a combat type of individual, they generate the debate. They respond to any criticism or remarks that are made on the floor and they lead on the debate of the various bills. So they are a different type of person, they are more outgoing, gregarious type, and they the type who like to battle. Fred Cina, for instance, who is the majority leader of the liberals, was I think probably the most capable leader we had, because he had the ability to conduct a good debate, get to the issues and at the same time if things got a little hairy and a little uptight, he had a sense of humor. So that he could cool it before people got too emotional that they said things they might be sorry for later. There were very few people who felt that they could take him on effectively in a debate because he was, I think, particularly good. Of course, this requires knowledge of the subject matter. During the time I was there, I guess Don Wozniak, then you'd have other people like Reuben Nelson, from western Minnesota who would carry the conservation bills or the water shed type thing, soil conservation, I'm speaking of. People specialized in different fields, because there is no way you can possibly be knowledgeable in all the fields you have to consider. Whether it's highways, taxes, welfare, education the practice of assigning people to committees because of their individual background sometimes is expected, because you put bankers on the banking committee, insurance people on the insurance committee, and so on, farmers on the agricultural committee, but at the same time you get a wealth of knowledge from these people, their backgrounds. Assuming that they are honest people, this helps and they contribute a lot. Like I say, a lot of people don't agree that this should be done. The leadership, Lloyd Duxbury for instance, who was the conservative speaker later. He came in the same time I did, in 1950. He's a very competent individual and he conducted himself in a manner in which nobody could criticize him. I don't if there is any particular requirement prerequisite for a person to take a position of leadership that just depends upon his personality,

sometimes you get some who aren't particularly effective. But it's a very demanding job and it's very demanding work.

Gower: What were the principal committees that you were on while you were in the legislature?

Tiemann: As I mentioned before, taxes, and then I was chairman of the Veterans Military Affairs Committee for three terms, I was chairman of Towns and Counties which is now a local government committee for one term, and then highways, banking, insurance, dairy products and livestock. I served on the enter commission on Juvenile Delinquency and adult crime, I might mention that in connection with the Juvenile Delinquency my association there was due of course to the location of the Sauk Centre Home School in my district. From '51 through '55 when during the period that Governor Youngdahl was governor there was a lot of activity in the youth conservation area. This was highly political for a while and there was a lot of debate and criticism of various proposals. Many proposals were made to revitalize our youth conservation area. So for quite a few years I did spend a lot of time in that area.

Gower: How many of the years when you were in the legislature were the liberals in control of the House?

Tiemann: Oh, especially since after we were in the majority then we as near as possible, you were given the assignments that you preferred when you were in the minority you get exactly what they want to give you, that's one thing about majority-minority when you're in, you've got everything. When you're in the minority you've got nothing. Even if it's by one vote as far as implements are concerned.

Gower: We talked to 19 legislators or former legislators in our interviewing and I recall I think there were two, three legislators, who said that even when they were in the minority they usually got about what they asked for on committee assignments. Would you like to comment on that?

Tiemann: Yes, I think I should probably modify my previous statement to this extent that since I've left, it's changed considerably, the minority has many more privileges granted, much more consideration than back in '51 and '53. For instance, now they have people from minority sitting on the Rules Committee. Back in the early fifties when even other members of the same caucus couldn't come in the Rule Committee normally. It would have to be an unusual situation where someone who was not a member of the Rules Committee could sit in on their deliberations. Now they're open, for the press, this is another thing that has changed so much that they don't have any more closed meetings. In the past, all of the Conference Committees were closed completely and freely when TV cameras are on a person. I think they are somewhat less candid when they're on film or on the air. But sometimes I think this worked. Everybody got things off their mind and they got down to business and finally resolved it in most cases. Oh, I just think the way they are operating now with all the committees open is generally better. There may be certain times when they may not be as effective that way but I think over all it's much better than it was in the past.

Gower: Do you think all of these changes like having party designation and open committee sessions and so on, do you like all of this is generally better, the legislature operates better because of these things?

Tiemann: As I said before I don't think party designation is going to make a very substantial change in anything. But yes, people are more aware of what is going on and they should be. The problem, of course, is that there is a lot of apathy and unless it is an issue that concerns an

individual directly they really don't pay too much attention to what's going on, until after the bill is passed. The change to the flexible session has really been well, it's changed the way of life of everyone who is involved with legislature now. In my present work I do quite a bit of lobbying and appearing before committees. What I mean, is simply that you're involved from January of one year through the entire year of 1973, in this case, through May of 1974. Last week we had a four-hour hearing on one of our bills. This next week we have another hearing. You've got 1800 bills that are still alive and can get more life into them, at any moment. The time it takes for legislators to do the job is so much greater. They become practically a full-time legislator. In fact, a lot of younger people, not a lot, but several younger people don't have any jobs except the legislation. Of course they're getting paid now much better than when I was in. When I started out were getting \$2,000 for the term and now it's something, \$16,000 or something like that for the term plus per diem mileage and so forth. But I'm afraid that it's going to cost a lot of people who have employment that don't get away from it so resign and not run again, because they just can't spend a whole year with most their time devoted to legislature activities and this could be bad because I think it's good to have people from every industry. As I mentioned before, every segment of our economy is represented. Instead of having purely professional politicians, people, who are self-employed and have their own business and so can get away. The wage earner, the one-man business, he's wiped out as far as being a member of the legislature. No way can he do it under the flexible legislation deal.

Gower: Just other things in connection with this then, do you think the flexible legislation session though, might produce better legislation? That's the first question, secondly, it's sort of a dilemma, it sounds to me like, because the same individuals wouldn't be able to serve unless the salary increase quite a bit, probably. But in the process then, they're asked to participate more,

throughout a greater portion of the year, throughout the legislature, so it looks as if there's quite a dilemma there really. Would you like to comment on these two things?

Tiemann: Well, number one, to answer your last question first. There is a definite dilemma. It depends upon the motivation of the individual, just how badly he wants to serve. If he's really been bitten by the political bug, it can be a vice, like anything else in excess. It takes priority, your family, your job, everything else is secondary. You get so caught up in it that you just don't realize that you're neglecting the other parts of normal life. But this happens to people who become involved in politics, and they'll do it irrespective of their financial loss, loss of family, friends, things like that. They just go ahead and do it, because this is their nature. I think the flexible session gives us an opportunity to give more study and if used properly could result in better legislation. I know in some areas they're giving much more extensive hearings on bills and on complicated bills, I think this is good. We'll be better able to judge this after the session finally adjourns sometime in May, to see if it has been really effective. In some cases, now I get the feeling that they are having hearings which could just as well be conducted during the regular session and committees that aren't too loaded with bills right now. But in some committees they are really giving thorough consideration to legislation which I doubt that they could complete it they had to do it during one normal or regular session as we had in the past. One of them being utility regulation in Minnesota, this is a major item this year.

Gower: No, I think you've referred to this earlier, but maybe we should have you comment a little more extensively on it. You were in there for twelve years and you enjoyed being in the legislature, apparently, what was it that you liked most there?

Tiemann: Well I think the challenge, the fact that you're, one of the things I find hardest to live with now is to sit up in the gallery and listen to some one debate and to hear things that might be irrational and not be able to do anything about it. This is the one area you can really participate in, if you are successful, it's a real rewarding feeling, on the other hand, you learn how to lose. Because you get clobbered and there's never a time when everyone agrees with you, on any particular issue, and you learn to be a good loser, because if you aren't, eventually you won't have any friends left. So you don't take the losses too seriously, and you don't let the wins be overwhelming because tomorrow things may be different. Someone who is opposing you today may be your strongest supporter tomorrow on another issue. So it's just the nature of the game that you're with people who are vital and interesting, they're qualified and capable. I think, in Minnesota we've probably got the most honest group on the political area of any state, and it's just a pleasure to work with them. Also, when you are able to accomplish something you get the real benefits of being in.

Gower: When you decided to retire in 1962 was it, this was primarily because of family and job consideration?

Tiemann: Yes it was. Of course, my being a member of the National Guard took up quite a bit of my time too, and the combination just didn't leave any time for my family. I had a salary job and it just wasn't working out. I was losing, I think I was losing my sense of humor too, I think the strain was becoming too great and I think the most important thing in politics is to retain your sense of humor, once you lose that, you're dead. Because you can't take these things too seriously. You know, you're walking down the street, no matter where you go people are talking to you about different problems. If you did something they felt was wrong and let it bother you, you would become more negative attitude. I think you can't do this if it starts working on you or

giving you ulcers you might say. As I've indicated, I'd been thinking of resigning at the time and the way I did it, like I also said, it's harder to quit than it is to run again. I simply drew up a press release without saying anything to anyone, including my employer, went out and peddled to the papers and after it was once printed then it would be pretty hard for anyone to twist my arm to change my decision. If you announce prior, you know, privately there's a lot of pressure put on you to stay in, by the particular group that you have caucusing with. I know one legislator who ran for several terms after he wanted to quit because of the pressure that were put on him and honestly so. But I think it was deteriorating to him as an individual and I know it hurt his business considerably because he stayed on against his better judgement.

Gower: Back there in your first years in the legislature did you ever have any thoughts of running for another political office beyond the legislature?

Tiemann: No, I wasn't really until 1961 about the time I quit, then Fred Marshall retired from Congress. Mondale, who was the attorney general at that time, called me one day and told me that some people had approached him and indicated that they would support me for Congress and he felt that he would also support me. Prior to the Stearns County DFL Convention we did discuss it and quite a few people were contacted to find out how much support there was and it did appeared that I had pretty good support, but by the time we got to the Stearns County Convention, I had decided that I just didn't feel I could impose any more political activity on my family. I yielded the nomination at that time to Alex Olson at the Stearns County election and he went on to the district and got the district nomination and was elected. Whether or not I would have got the district nomination of course is conjecture, I don't know, because of my activities on the tax committee, bonus bill, and so forth. I had quite a bit of statewide exposure I guess, being candid I would have had a fair chance. But other than that, no I never had any real political

ambitions. I didn't get in the game to move. I got into it just because I thought it was field that I could contribute something to and also learn from.

Gower: Now if you had received the nomination to run for Congress and had been elected then of course you would have had a much higher salary than as a state legislator and all the expense money and so on. So you could have lived on that income, but you have hesitation because you didn't feel you wanted to cut your occupational ties and so on, here?

Tiemann: No, I don't think that was a controlling factor in my decision it was just that at the time wasn't emotionally ready to run. I just had felt that, like I said before I felt I was losing my sense of humor. I didn't think I could withstand the pressure anymore and do a creditable job. I think that's the main reason.

Gower: What are your views on the reapportionment? Redistricting that has occurred here recently?

Tiemann: Well, first of all, to go back a little, I served on the Congressional re-districting during one session. So I became quite familiar with the problems that were involved there. We had an interim committee on congressional re-districting and when the representatives from both the Senate and the House agreed in that committee than the bill was passed finally by both bodies of the legislature. I didn't get too involved with the re-districting, I do feel however that I would prefer to see rather than a total of one man vote concept, I would prefer to have it something like the federal congress is. One body elected on an area basis as in Congress, two per state in Minnesota. It could be per legislative district or by county or something because as you know now, where we had a rural dominance of the legislature for many which probably wasn't good either, now we're getting a metro politician and suburban dominance and the districts out in

Northwestern Minnesota are becoming so large that the contact with the people is much more limited than it has been in the past. I would prefer to see the Senate on an area basis and the House one man vote basis.

Waldron: The questions been brought up before, this has to do somewhat with paying the Legislators more money and that's the unicameral system they have, I believe in North Dakota.

Gower: Nebraska, excuse me. I knew it was one of those states. Do you think this would be effective at all?

Tiemann: Well, there's a lot of argument for unicameral system in that it would avoid the duplications of hearings and floor activity in both houses on the bill. I think that this could be overcome by having joint Senate and House committee hearings on major legislation. I do think that having two bodies provides a balance especially when one is of one political majority and the other of another political majority. I really think we got our best legislation through when the House was liberal and the Senate was conservative in that any bill that had to go through both houses, the proponents really had to do their best research and have their facts available. They knew they were going to get opposition, and strong opposition. If you've got an overwhelming or even strong majority of the same political party in both houses it's too easy to put somethings through without doing proper research. You might create more problems than you're curing. I think unicameral legislature probably would save time but that's about all. I don't think there's the number of legislators being decreased would make any appreciable difference it might put more of a load on the individual. It might result in a fewer number of bills. But numbers alone is not going to make any difference and I'm not sure that unicameral is the answer. I think you get a better balance when you have two bodies.

Waldron: One more question on that. Do you think there should be an independent body for reapportionment to reapportion the state instead of the state legislation?

Tiemann: I think really either a commission of preferably, I think a group of justices or something like this a commission set up composed of highly qualified people would be the realistic way of handling it. It's really a tough and time-consuming problem to draft an equitable reapportionment bill. After all, you're dealing with your own job, the same way with reducing the number of legislators, who's going to vote themselves out of a job unless you're a truly objective and I'm afraid most of us aren't truly objective.

Gower: Have you had any regrets that you decided not to stay in the legislature in 1962?

Tiemann: Yes, especially when they're in session, I miss that and I miss the lack of information that you have when you're in, no matter how much you try and stay informed on the activities of the legislature when you're out, there is no way that you can get the picture that you do when you are inside working with the particular issues. I miss the association of the people that I worked with there and there'd be nothing I'd rather do as a matter of fact than to devote full time to political and legislative activities.

Gower: Could you describe what your job is now and what contact you have with the legislature through your job?

Tiemann: Prior to 1971, I was employed by the telephone company and in January of 1971 I resigned there and went to work for the Minnesota Association of Electric Co-Operatives. Part of my work there involves legislative activity, testifying before the committees, I guess generally lobbying and I think one of the reasons I did make this change is because it gave me and an opportunity to get back into the swing of things. I do enjoy the work, again the most frustrating

part of it is, to have to sit on the outside and not be able to engage in the debate when the issues come before the bodies, but it does give some opportunity to give some input and to remain somewhat active in the field of legislation and political activity.

Gower: You were working for the telephone company in 1962 when you retired from the legislature?

Tiemann: Yes I was. I went to work for them in 1956 and I stayed with them about fifteen years.

Gower: So actually then for quite a long period of time there from 1962 to 1971 you really had very little contact with the legislature then. Is that correct?

Tiemann: Yes, hardly with one exception, I did during the 1963 session I worked part time as a lobbyist for the Veteran of Foreign Wars. On Veterans legislation, but this didn't involve much time.

Waldron: Now that you sort of do lobbying down there, have you seen any changes at all?

Tiemann: As I indicated before, yes, the openness of the meetings, the time spent on particular legislation during the interim, this has been a real change. So far as the composition of the legislature the age of the members has gone down very much. I think the quality has improved. I think people are more issue orientated now, probably than politically. I think even with party designation, that the legislators generally are more issue orientated towards the type of district they represent, but more involved in non-political types of issues, whether it's environment, welfare, education, things of this nature. As far as adding anything it just occurred to me that back in 1951 I was a co-author of an 18 year old vote bill, and at that time I felt that it was very important that our young people do get the right to actively participate. My premise a lot of

people thought at that time, this was during the Korean War, the argument was used, if you're old enough to fight, you're old enough to vote this may be true, but I don't think it's really a criteria that should be deciding. I felt that the fact there was a gap from the time that young people got out of High School and sometimes even college before they could vote after being exposed to classes in civics and political science and so forth during their school years, and then they had a four to five year period of inactivity during which they were not involved. I felt this caused some of the apathy among voters. I felt if nothing else that if the young people were given the opportunity to vote and if the older people were afraid, as they sometimes indicate, that they wouldn't use good judgement, the other thing that might happen is we'd get more older people out to vote. Get more and more people involved, cause we had this bill over and over again for many years until finally several years ago they were given the right to vote at 18, and I still think that this was a good idea.

Gower: This concludes this interview.