

Interview with Mr. Keith Hughes
June 21, 1973
Central Minnesota Historical Oral History Collection
St. Cloud State University Archives
Interviewed by Calvin Gower and John Waldron

Waldron: I guess what we want to know first is your name, where you were born, things like that.

Hughes: My full name is Keith Francis Hughes. I was born July 27, 1936, in St. Cloud, MN. I was raised in St. Cloud, graduated from private grade school, and high school, attended and graduated from St. John's University, and graduated in 1961 from the University of Minnesota Law School.

Waldron: I was just going to ask you about your family background, and when you were growing up, what ideas and conceptions did you have concerning the U.S.

Hughes: I am a twin, and my twin brother Kevin and myself were the oldest in a family of five children. My father was a lawyer; my mother was unemployed outside of the house. My father originally came from Wisconsin and attended school at St. John's. My mother was originally from the St. Cloud area; she's a Spaniel, daughter of John Spaniel, who used to own the Spaniel Hotel in St. Cloud. I married Julie Ann Jansen from Aitkin, Minnesota in 1960, on August 27, 1960. At the present time, we have five children: The oldest, Mary Theresa who is 12, Kathryn Ann who is 10, Mark Joseph who is 9, Timothy James, 7, and Rachael Elisabeth, 3. My wife was born and raised on a farm, and attended college at St. Benedict's in St. Joseph, MN, and that's where we met.

You've asked me what conception I had – ideas of the United States as I was growing up. That's a very broad question. Basically, I always had a rather good conception or image of the country in which I lived, and the community in which I lived. I was not in any sense of the word deprived. I would argue that I wasn't born to the silver spoon, but we lived comfortably, and happily, and relatively stable in St. Cloud all through my youth. I was an active participant in school, in extra-curricular affairs – speech and debate, and athletics, primarily track and hockey. Generally, I guess, I considered myself well-adjusted and attuned – did fairly well academically, this type of thing. So I got along fairly well, as well as having what I would term a reasonably active social life, social activity. The same thing prevailed at St. John's when I attended school out there. So I always had a relatively favorable image of my situation, and of the country, and community that gave that situation to me or that helped me attain that situation. Also my father's background is political in a sense. My grandfather was an active politician in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin. He served as the postmaster in Chippewa Falls for several years. He was a Democrat (a Franklin Delano Roosevelt Democrat as he was fond of saying). My dad was very active in politics, extremely active, and played a significant role in Stassen's rise to power in Minnesota in the late 1930s. He followed very actively Governor Stassen's political campaign all the way through to the bitter end. His activity didn't cease there. In all honestly, he knew and was a close friend of all the men of either party who have been and held the positions of governor, U.S. senator, certain congressmen for the state of Minnesota for a period of thirty or forty years. So with that kind of background, we were always encouraged at home to critically examine the American political scene, the American social scene. Many conversations that we had as kids, I wouldn't presume to say that there was not any joshing around the table, but many conversations that we had as youngsters, high school, college revolved around social and political problems

that we would be made aware of either at home or at school, and brought home. There was always a great breadth and depth to these discussions, a great tolerance and understanding of everyone's points of view, and a realization that there were a lot of points of view. So I guess in sum total, I would have to say that I had a very favorable impression of the political and social climate of the country, and at the time was exposed to a critical analysis of that, and encouraged to form my own judgements, and to critically evaluate it.

Waldron: During the election of 1964, when you ran because of Raymond Bares death in the 27th Legislative District, you were quite young, - I believe you were 28. This seems like a paradox because youth at the time was not considered a valid idea for politics. It wasn't until later on in the '70s that young, aggressive youth were trying to win elections.

Hughes: At the risk of sounding somewhat presumptuous, I guess that's a fair statement. I think, I could say with some truth that I was in what you might call the vanguard, or in the early days, when youth was generally being accepted – at least the state of Minnesota and particularly in central Minnesota I certainly can't speak for the suburbs or the metropolitan area. But certainly, generally in the state of Minnesota, and particularly in Stearns County where the tradition, frankly, has been to elect older, more experienced, generally conservative – whatever the label was – people. This was a strong tradition in Stearns County. Also there had been a rather strong legislative tradition in central Minnesota. I think we can't talk about legislative districts, they change too often, but going back through 25-30 years, I suppose, two key members of the Minnesota legislature stand out in this area – Senator Sullivan from St. Cloud, who represented the general central Minnesota area for some time in the legislature, and was chairman of the Senate finance committee, an esteemed position, at that time when he retired. The second would be Mr. Lawrence Hall from St. Cloud, who served a good number of terms in the House of

Representatives, who incidentally, I think, was a brother-in-law of Henry Sullivan, and who served as the youngest speaker in the House of Representatives for a number of years, I forget exactly when Lawrence left. You had that kind of political tradition – you had some breaks in it – but you had that kind of rather significant and powerful representation in the legislature. Then you had what I think is fair to say is kind of a hiatus period where perhaps that wasn't so true. Senator Richardson was elected after Henry Sullivan was retired, and Jack was a fine and dedicated public servant. He never did, I guess it's fair to say, attain any position of real leadership or overriding influence in the legislature. However, when you talk about me being youthful at the time, I think it's important to remember that as much as anything in this area, I think Bob Mahowald and Ray Bares themselves began to break down what might be called the inertia of age in public office. Ray, himself, when first elected, although somewhat older than I was, was not ancient by any stretch of the imagination, and I think Bob Mahowald came back from a career in the military at about thirty-six and was elected to the House, which is eight years older than twenty-eight, but begins to look like you're going in the right direction from age fifty and sixty. But, I was very young, and frankly, the youngest man by some distance when I first went to the Senate. It was really one of the reasons that I ran. Some of the people who asked me to run suggested that I check the Minnesota Blue Book and examine the age of the men in the Senate. Representative Mahowald was one of those who suggested to me that there would be a significant turnover in the state Senate within a period of the next two to three elections and that there was a tremendous opportunity for a young person to attain relative superiority and influence at a pretty young age. So that was actually one of the things, I guess, that triggered me into running for the Senate in the first instance. When I first ran, relative to the youth issue, it was strongly suggested for political motivation and I'm sure, sincerely, in some quarters that I

was too young. The two biggest complaints that some of my adversaries brought to my attention about my candidacy were: (1) I was too young and (2) that I was running on my father's coattails. Those two are not unconnected, but those were the two complaints I heard quite apart from my other general lack of qualifications, but those were the two factors. I suppose, in all honesty, there might have been some truth to both of them. But we decided at the time that we were going to turn youth to our advantage and this is exactly what we did. We turned loose, in my estimation, a tremendous campaign force, through no genius of myself, of young people – the oldest of whom would have been thirty-five. We ran a campaign in the district like I don't think had ever been run before. In regard to the second criticism, I came to my father promptly and said, "I don't want you within ten feet of my campaign." And apart from financial help and a few general consultations at home on Sunday afternoon, he never did come within ten feet of my campaign.

Gower: John mentioned, I don't know whether you caught that or not, but he said that you had run because of the death of Ray Bares. I'd like you to comment on that. Also had you thought for some time about running? Did you have political aspirations even as a college student and so on?

Hughes: That's a very fair question and you might expect an answer from it in view of my background and my proximity to politics. I should underscore that. My dad never held public office, but he ran for Congress against Harry Knutson in the Republican primary back in 1942; and he did so at Harry Stassen's suggestion. The people back then, at least, began to realize that, that was probably the thing that first set in motion Knutson's downfall which led to Fred Marshall's election in, I think, 1946 [1948]. So I underscore my proximity to the political arena, and I was also active in the College Republicans when I was out at St. John's. Although I was never an organizational fanatic, I was interested in it and attended a couple of conventions, I

guess. As a matter of fact, I attended a state DFL convention one time when a good friend of mine, Jim Adams, from St. Paul, was running for State Chairman of the DFL. Unfortunately, I had a little trouble getting past the credentials committee, and I was found out for what I was. So I've always had that avid interest. Frankly, I never designed a political career. I state that only as a fact for whatever it's worth. I suppose it's not totally by accident that I got into politics in view of my background in it, but I really never sat down and decided that at some point in time I wanted to run for office, that this was the particular office I wanted to run for, and if possible I'd like to move from there. Not even in the most elementary sense was I politically ambitious in that sense of the word – not that it's bad to be that; but I just never was. I think my proximity to the political arena ultimately walked me into it when the opportunity arose. How hard I would've searched that out is something that I'll never even know, but I was not searching it out at the time. Interestingly enough, Senator Bares was elected in 1962, and served one term. While I never had any great difficulty with Ray, he was of a different political persuasion than I was, and I felt sometimes that he did not always exercise what I considered to be maturity and judgement. I think of the occasion in which he thoroughly insulted St. Cloud College down here on the front pages of the state media in a discussion over whether or not they ought to broaden the scope of their educational program. He suggested that all they do is teach dogs to roll over or something down here. These were the kinds of lack of prudence that I felt Ray demonstrated. Also his failure to support the taconite amendment after Fred, Gene, and Hubert Humphrey and many others had worked desperately to put that thing in order. But I never had big gripe with Ray – never involved in the campaign, not actively, that he ran when he beat Jack Richardson. Although in the spring or winter of 1964, prior to Ray's death, some people came to me and asked me to run for the city council preparatory to running against Ray when his term was up in

1966. Interestingly enough, I was not interested in that proposition and did not run for the city council. I can't really, frankly, remember at this time whether I had completely put out of my mind running against Ray Bares but at any rate, I didn't feel it was sufficiently significant or important or whatever to run for the city council at the time. I remember when Ray was killed, I knew Ray and Arlene personally. I went to school with Arlene Hushley's older sister and brothers – knew her when she worked at the chamber office. That was a tremendous personal tragedy if you were in that area at the time that it happened. It kind of stunned everybody where a whole family is wiped out, and I remember going to the wake and the funeral and seeing some political people, etc. I have often remarked privately that if anybody had said to me then that I'd be going down to the State Capitol in November of that fall, I'd have said they were crazy. So I didn't really have any design. Whether I would have run against an incumbent I just can't say; but I didn't really have that design. Some other people talked to me and I think Bob Mahowald was really as instrumental as anybody was in getting me to run for the Senate. There were people at that time, Bob had established a tremendous reputation in the House of Representatives in short period of time. While he had some political shortcomings, he was a very astute legislator. They wanted him to run for the Senate, and he was a very astute Legislator. They wanted him to run for the Senate, and he didn't want to do so but he said he'd find somebody and he talked to me and he talked to me awfully hard and I remember conversations very well in his office and he just finally told me, "Keith, this is in your blood; some of it's in your background. You don't have to make a commitment for life, but in November somebody's going to go down there and if it isn't you, you might just wonder forever why and what would have happened". So then I visited with my family about it, and I talked to my dad about it and his only remark was do it if you want to. He always felt very strongly that he didn't want to push in that direction although I think

he always got a kick out of my involvement. He certainly did not prevail upon me to do so, he just merely opened the door and said, “Look we can get along without you if you want to go down, and made it a possibility if I wanted to do it. Then once we made the decision we went hell for leather.

Waldron: One more thing on the campaign in 1964. I find this somewhat ironical that your opponents – well one of them is Weyrens, he called himself a conservative; Al Loehr called himself a liberal and you ran on the conservative ticket, too – and yet you seem to be more progressive at least than Al Loehr who said he was running on Raymond Bares record, but he didn’t seem to come up with any programs whereas you said you wanted to see a better welfare system in this state so no one will fall through the floor of certain standards. I think is the way it went, and a few other things like reapportionment and that.

Hughes: It always bothers a fellow when he is asked a question by a guy who has obviously looked at his background and you wonder how much more he knows. We have good political instincts, I think, and other friends have remarked about that. I got it from my home, and I think some of it is just ingrained. I like people; I like public life in that sense of the word – don’t shy from it in any way. Kevin and I, and I add him in here very advisedly and with malice a forethought, just undertook this as a tremendous challenge in our young days. I was only back in St. Cloud for, well, I guess I came back to practice in 1962 when I finally passed the bar – or was it 1961, I forget, whenever I left the university, but only two or three years at the most. While I had grown up in St. Cloud and my father was reasonably well known, I was not. It bothered me greatly that people thought I was capitalizing on him, hence, my remark that I made earlier to get him to stay the hell out of it. But Kevin and I really undertook it as a personal challenge and we organized very objectively and we strategized very objectively. I might add here that Senator

Richardson, who was a good friend of mine, and who I think my father had supported in prior campaigns, and I had, although not that actively, had another candidate for the state Senate. And in a very real sense, I always felt I was Bob Mahowald's candidate and Jerry Wyrons was Jack Richardson's candidate. I don't know whether I had failed to ask Jack soon enough or get him involved enough or what but there's no question that that's the way the thing lay. Neither of these men had that much influence with the local Republican's organization and both of them – and indeed myself – had always stayed kind of apart from that organizational arena and so nothing was dictated and Jerry and I just kind of decided to fight it out. When Jerry announced, he said that he was a conservative and he accented his conservatism. You must remember that this was the year that Barry Goldwater ran for the U.S. Presidency. Jerry thought that was an asset. I instinctively knew it was a liability and I figured that as long as he thought it was an asset, I'd let him run with it. And frankly, when Weyren's came out and indicated he was a conservative and more conservative than Keith Hughes – I think he actually made that statement to the press at that time – and knowing Al Loehr was a liberal and while Al and I were probably not philosophically very far apart, he carried the liberal moniker – we felt that gave us a wonderful opportunity to step in the middle. And when you're in the middle, of course, one of two things happen – you either get squeezed from both directions or you do the squeezing from both directions, and I think that is really what happened in that campaign. Al was more of a partisan then he is now. I shouldn't say philosophically a partisan, but he had been an organizational partisan. He'd actually gone around seeking legislative candidates that year, and what we did, at least what we attempted to strategize, was to force AJ and Jerry out to the two perimeters. And with a position of moderation bordering on a liberal position, we just carved it right out of the center. As a result, we won the primary in September which you may remember would be a little

unusual in this area where you've got two conservatives and one liberal running. We really figured that, that was where the ballgame was won or lost, and there weren't any catches from then on in, and that proved to be the point. But you must remember my political tradition is a very liberal political tradition without regard to what we call artificial political labels. In human rights and civil rights, really in many respects in economic considerations my father's family was Democrat. To his dying days my grandfather never recognized my father's political tradition as legitimate. He was brought into the political arena through Harold Stassen and the young governor – Harold was elected governor at 31. My dad was then 28 and dad was one of six or five people who put that, together and was very close to this man, of course, in his day he was brilliant. The sad part of the story comes later – Harold Stassen was a very progressive man. He came into the state in 1938, worked all kinds of reforms, and actually was always kind of feared by some of the more staid elements of the party. So basically my dad's family is democrat; my mother's family is democrat. My grandpa Spaniel was an old-line FDR man. I think Dwight Eisenhower brought him back or changed him a little, but basically he was an old-line democrat. My dad's political thinking has always been very liberal. Neither one of us supported Goldwater. I remember very well in the campaign that I was running, Dad took on the Republican County Chairman on the corner of Main Street one day, and I asked him to please hold that until after the election, because I didn't think it was helping me much. But that's our tradition and subsequently, of course, my dad was a state chairman for Nelson Rockefeller in 1968 when he was going for the presidency. So that's the tradition. Philosophically, I was not attuned to Senator Goldwater in 1964. Politically we did everything we could possibly do to divorce ourselves from him because I felt instinctively it was going to be the disaster it turned out to be. Therein lies, I think, the greatest difficulty of our campaign. It is very difficult to get way from party regulars when they

think you are their person. Anybody who has ever run for office will tell you this, that their friends give them more trouble than their enemies, at times. And party regulars have a way of forcing you on these candidate positions, and many times it kills you. So we tried to avoid that like the plague. Now you have got to remember, that in 1964 we were in a special election for the Senate. The whole Senate was not up for election. There were, I think, four other senate elections up that year. Ray Higgins was elected from Brainerd, Frenchy LaBrosse came into Homer Carr's seat, myself – my recollection is there was one more, but I forget. Many times you wouldn't have four in an off year, but we had just four. St. Cloud was considered very key. To begin with it had been a liberal seat for the last two years. They had hopes, obviously, of holding it with Al Loehr or somebody else at this time. And frankly, Al Loehr was a very formidable opponent. He just gave up the tenure of the chairmanship of the VFW, and was a good platform speaker. I think, in those days, not quite so good up close, but Al had platform presence and wide exposure, and he was a very formidable candidate and he had the Goldwater debacle to contend with. I remember very well in a period of ten days, right before the end of that election we had Fritz Mondale, Joe Donovan, and Sandy Keith in St. Cloud, you know, within a ten day period of time, at events for Al Loehr and that's tough. When they started throwing those kind of guns we really were quite concerned. Hubert Humphrey, as you would expect, gave Al his support, but then I guess Hubert was in the Senate and he wasn't in campaigning, he was somewhere else. But these personal appearances, you know, when you got a picture in the paper with Fritz Mondale with his arm around Al Loehr or something and you're pushing away Barry Goldwater, in a two to one election you've really got problems and they really zeroed in on this senate race. Incidentally, Ray Higgins was replacing a Republican or a conservative up there and a man who had run this district then included the silk stocking district or Duluth and up to the North Shore

and had been for 20 years a conservative district and they didn't feel they had that much chance there. Frenchy LaBrosse was replacing Homer Carr who had been a railroad man from Proctor and who had represented that area as a liberal for almost an equal number of years. Once again that wasn't such an open district. We were right in central Minnesota, a wide open district, and I'm sure that the Democrats recognize me and who I was and everything had every reason to try to get in and see that I didn't win. So we had a real tough campaign, but a very good one and Al Loehr remains a good friend of mine to this day.

Waldron: Being a young and freshman legislator when you got into the Senate, did you find any special problems because of this, mainly because of your youth?

Hughes: Yes, I was clearly, as I indicated before, the youngest man in the Senate and while youth had begun – I guess Jack Davies was in the Senate then – I guess, Wendy was in then, too. I suppose I shouldn't say I was all that young because I was in law school with both Wendy and Jack but they were three or four years ahead of me--service veterans or something--they were more than just a year ahead of me in school and they were the next in line--Senator Davies and the present governor, Wendell Anderson. While youth had begun to make some inroads in the House, and while youth had begun to make some inroads in the Senate liberal caucus, youth has not dented the Senate conservation caucus which, as I had outlined before, was a motivating factor in my wanting to get in. So I was very much a young person and I retain relative youth for 37 years today, I guess—36 going on 37—and I was really young at 28. I looked young, and I don't say I was that immature but I looked young. I was not a big rugged 6'6, 28 year old who looked 40, so my youth showed. And I think half of the custodial staff and the Sergeant at Arms and the other personnel at the desk, and Senate and House figured I was just a new page or a new staff man. I've often joked that, we had a private Senate bathroom, and I often joked that it took

me half my term before I got a key to the damn thing because I was very much a young person. That is not to say that I was not accepted. Basically, I carried into my legislative experience some sense of wanting to accomplish something. I don't think I was quite as impatient as others who followed me or as some young men who enter politics today. In other words I didn't have any feeling I was going to remake the face of the earth in six months but by the same token I did not just take a seat in the back row and wait to be invited to lunch. I would have been very uncomfortable with that posture over a period of time. So I guess what I did was sit down, basically keep my mouth shut until and unless I had something to say on a subject that I knew something about. I did what was asked of me a little bit better than I felt they wanted me to do it, attended to my business, tried to do my homework, and tried to grow a step at a time. And I think my involvement in the legislative process is an interesting one in that respect. The first thing you have to do when you join a legislative body is to get along in that legislative body or you aren't going to be effective legislator. By that I don't mean that you have to partake in graft or corruption or do things that you don't agree with or vote a certain way because somebody tells you. I just mean you have to understand the ropes, to learn the ropes, to begin to buy a rule book and to bet the game down and attempt to find some position that you can play on the team do the best job that you can. Some young people who have come in the legislature in the last few years don't do a good job of that. If a man stands up and has made a speech and decides to take on the world, he's got a long way to come back before he gains the respect of his colleagues. This is relatively a non-partisan type thing that I am talking about. There is no substitute for the respect of your colleagues when you're in a legislative body unless you want to be a press release politician. You can live in St. Paul and make press releases and speeches back in the district and sound important, but I've always felt you weren't a good legislator unless you had more than one

vote. Anybody can do that and I've always felt that it was not until you had more than one vote, until people had confidence in your judgement and ability in certain areas where certain people will tend to defer to you or accede to your request. Until you have that, until you have more than one vote, as I put it, you're not going to be very effective. And the only way you can do that is to gain respect of your colleagues. I had some problem of breaking down youth barrier, but I did not choose to tell all these wonderful old men-- many of whom have worlds of experience in the legislative body, and I guess that's one of the things you don't slough off lightly. I did not choose to go around and punch these people in the nose. I took from them what I felt they had to offer and then tried to move along in my own sphere and actually was very pleased with the net result of my first session down there. I really didn't have a chance to author that much major legislation. The senate, you must understand, had been set from prior election and you're breaking into a pretty cold mold; not all the balls are in the air. It's not a completely reorganized body, but I felt I had established a position where with some degree of normal attrition, real legislative maturity would come. It came in my second term, helped by the fact that Harold Lavender was elected governor.

Waldron: In 1966 you ran unopposed and by all appearances the election in 1970 wasn't that critical. Did you feel this was in some way helping you, because you didn't have the pressure in being re-elected?

Hughes: It's safe to say that any man running for office likes to run unopposed and his supporters don't like to see it because that's a dangerous way to get fat so to speak. By fat I don't mean careless or anything, but you don't keep the organization up. You're not out pounding the turf; you're not rebuilding the fences. But certainly, for me sitting in my law office—and I remember very well that day because Bob Becker, who was on the staff at St. Cloud State

College and has been active in politics—the DFL had a little headquarters right across the street from our office –I forget which building it was in—and I were waiting out that afternoon. I had a person down there. As of 3:00 nobody had filed, 3:30 nobody had filed, and at that point you begin to pray and hold your breath because no matter how cozy you might view the campaign, and I felt I was in awful good shape—particularly after having served on term—and you get the feeling that one good term deserves another. There are certain times when politicians are vulnerable in their political life and I didn't feel I was vulnerable yet. So I wasn't afraid of the campaign, but just saving a lot of time and effort and being able to practice a little law and go down without that effort. And along about 4:30-4:45 Bob gave me the international salute from across the street and notwithstanding, James Davis abortive attempt to try file at the last minute which was a complete phony because Jim had signed a contract to teach in central Michigan already. I realized then we were home free and when 5:00 rolled around I got a call from down there and we were home free. I felt that that reflected the fact that I had tried to a decent job and a recognition, frankly, on the part of a lot of people that hadn't had enough time to remake the world—that's primarily a position of not having stubbed your toe. I think in an early political career where you are on the ascendancy you're a reasonably attractive, competent, acceptable political figure—at that point you're biggest enemy is yourself. That's the phase in somebody political life where the biggest problem is to keep from making mistakes yourself. You're not yet what I consider to be vulnerable due to any longevity in service and I felt that was my situation. I had run a decent, honorable campaign; Al chose not to run again. We'd served just two years. I hadn't made any nasty remarks about Ray or Al nor would I, and there was just a kind of a feeling of let the thing ride, and I'd be kind of hard to beat anyway. Then in 1970, of course, we campaigned, and I kind of think had Dave not taken a flyer I might have been able to run free

that time; but , I think, Dave Zabinski was then an element in a kind of new DFL political alignment in this area—a more aggressive alignment. I think at about that time they had reorganized on legislative districts and that kind of thing, and I know how that can affect a party's workers. I've seen it on the other side, too—although I've always tried to avoid that kind of staff. Dave was in this newcoming alignment if you will, and I think just felt, and I think some of the people around him that I should not run again free. I'm sure that at that point people are wondering where the hell is he going from here. How do you ever stop a guy if he's got eight years free and clear and nobody's ever said anything about him? I know how people think like that politically. It's the same thing I used to hear on the other side when Ed Henry was mayor of St. Cloud, I always said that if Ed wanted to run for something else I'd make up my mind, but as long as he wanted to be mayor of St. Cloud I wasn't about to put up some Shetland pony to run against him just so we could discredit him. I've always kind of felt that way about local offices. Well, then Dave took his shot and I had serious misgivings in 1970 whether or not I was going to run again for the legislature. I just began to see what this was doing to me professionally and my family—not that I developed any family discord—but in terms of my responsibilities to my children, and my wife and my law partners and my clients. The legislature was getting increasingly consuming and so I had some misgivings in 1970. I finally decided to go again and I think the principal reason was that I felt I would be in a really good position if I went back down to the senate. Frankly, what Bob Mahowald had told me several years ago about the turnover that was happening—it had happened. Some of our old timers had passed away, several more I felt were going to get beat, and then like Don Wright who ultimately did get beat by Bob Tennessen and other of these situations where in my judgement men were ripe to get beat. So I felt it would be a great opportunity and while I had influence for a number of reasons in the four middle

years, there's just no question that I really assumed a position of leadership, so to speak, in the 1971 session. So it was on that basis we decided to run and then we began to work hard. Dave started out very fast. I did not think he was going to be a serious candidate and in the end result he wasn't but in the middle he worked very hard—issued a lot of press releases and these kinds of things. Incidentally, I never issued a press release in my life in politics, except filing statements. I don't know yet how to make a press release. But anyway we saw what we were facing and he was walking the town and all this kind of stuff. Dave didn't have anything to do but just report to the supper club at 6:00 at night or something and we realized what kind of public support you can build up for this let's walk the district and see what the people say. So I remember coming into Kevin after the labor Day weekend and said, look we decide to go, from here on out I'm gonna go that's all, "because I'm kind of competitive," I indicated that when I wanted to get out I'd out voluntarily and not involuntarily. So then we ran pretty hard from there on in and the final result was kind of devastating. I don't think Dave was the man at that time. Nobody's invincible I'm sure I could have been beaten, but nobody could ever make me believe that I could have been beaten by the person who ran against me. I don't mean that in an uncharitable sense, but Dace was just not the guy who was going to do it, that's all.

Waldron: From 1966-1970 what major bills did you work on and what problems did you work on and face?

Hughes: Harold Levander, of course, was elected in the fall of 1966. Governor Levander was a longtime friend of my family's and I guess this undergirds what I said earlier in this interview. As a matter of fact he was in my father's wedding party many long years ago when my dad and mother got married. Dad was also one of the men who was instrumental in getting Harold Levander down to St. Paul to practice law with Harold Stassen after he got out of law school so

the relationship is not a feigned political one. It's a thoroughly personal relationship and for years during the summer when Harold and Ianthe and I would go up to Journey's End, Leech Lake, they'd come down and visit with mom and dad or vice-versa and Harold and Ianthe were in my home many times when I was a kid, so it was a warm personal relationship. In fact, it's the only thing that could have got my dad back in politics, because he had been appointed to the Board of Regents by Governor Elmer Anderson and really from that time until the time Harold came up and told him he was going to run for governor, dad had pretty well washed his hands of politics. But I remember very well his problem with dad and he just said, "Look, when one of your best friends says he's going to do this, you owe it to him to help him," Dave Durenberger, of course, from St. John's and whom I had known from school and whose father I had known for years became Harold's chief administrative assistant – alter ego in the governor's office. With those contacts I had a real interesting and involved career in that four year period of time when Harold was governor. I wouldn't want to leave the impression that my career or involvement was limited or tied in any shape or form to the executive office. I just mean that from my own personal view it was interesting to have the governor's office that available to you, to stop in and visit with Dave about things, and be called upon to try to give some help from time to time. This was what I call the real maturation process for me. When you try and do a good job and have some degree of success, it builds upon itself, and that's kind of what happened to me during that four year period of time. All of a sudden when you carry a bill and you can pass it and when you can handle committee and sub-committee meetings without having them get out of control, you know what you're doing. Your end result will be more meaningful, you are able to achieve things down there. That's, of course, when someone comes up and says, "Will you carry our bill, will you do this for us." You put young legislators on bills to give them good record of

something, but later on you sit around in the session or in the Holiday Inn Hotel or something and a group of people say, “Now look, who the hell can we get, who can carry this ball for us. Well this guy – oh, he’s too busy – Well let’s take a shot at him and if not the next guy.” This is the way you pick your authors out on major legislation and it is the way legislators pick the co-authors so you get the best shot at success. That is the kind of thing that evolved during that four year period of time. one of the most important pieces of legislation that I ever authored, and when I use the word authored I don’t just mean slapped on as the twentieth author, was the legislation to establish the state Department of Human Rights and strengthen the laws against discrimination in the 1967 Session, I think it was. That was a horrendous piece of legislation for a two-year veteran country boy from St. Cloud to take, and I specifically undertook it at the request of Dave Durenberger. I shouldn’t say that’s one of the reasons I undertook it; I firmly believe in the legislation. I felt that it might more appropriately be handled by a legislator with more seniority and with greater metropolitan ties and therefore a better understanding of the politics involved in that kind of an issue. And believe me, I’ve often thought that probably the key maturing process for me in the legislature was handling that piece of legislation – very difficult. It’s the kind of a piece of legislation where 75 – 80% of the people who will support it publicly and a handful of people who will really help you at the key turns in the road privately, because nobody’s that excited about it. It raises some real problems. When we did this – and it’s more than an organizational department. I’m not the kind of a guy who feels that the best thing you can do is start a new department, but in terms of human rights and civil rights I felt, as the Governor did, that we had to have a greater state focus on this. Harold, as you know, was always a great federalism guy and a kind of a state’s right guy, and when you have an executive like that I’m all for him. The present governor understands that, too. We were just losing in this issue. All

the problems were being solved at the federal level and not necessarily in the best fashion – similar to the welfare problems today. Well anyway, it was a major piece of legislation. A major mistake had been made at the executive level. Originally the department was to include the Commission on Indian Affairs. Unfortunately, not enough pipe had been laid in the Indian community – either on the reservations or in the metropolitan area prior to their inclusion in that bill and while I think we would have been far better off then and would be better off to this day, if that problem were considered in the sum total of human and civil rights in that department. We simply ran into a buzz saw with the Indian community. I wanted to take them out voluntarily – the governor’s office didn’t see it that way. I knew it was going to happen legislatively and so it came and I was not unhappy to see it come because I was afraid it was jeopardizing the whole bill. But none the less, I t feel it would have been better off had it been in there. I learned an awful lot about my black friends in that experience – the tremendous frustrations that they have, the great justification of their cause, tremendous sensitivities involved in this things too numerous and complicated to go into. But we had some very difficult legislative problems to overcome, we had some very legislative opposition, albeit quiet, to overcome. I worked very closely with Vi Kanets, a lifelong Democrat Jewish lady, was then the commissioner of the State Commission against Discrimination which is the forerunner of this department. We got along famously. I think I evidenced at every turn good faith in dealing with these problems, but I didn’t know enough about the black problems and this kind of hurt me sometimes. Anyway, through drafting, redrafting, cajoling, praying, contemplating, etc., we brought that bill to fruition at the tail end of the session, which incidentally involved another cute bit of legislative strategy when the House committee refused to accept, I think it was, an amendment that we had put on the bill which meant that the Senate had to recall the bill. And I remember very well going over to the

House and saying, “Gentlemen, I’m not going to recall anything, you pick that bill up or it’s going to die right on your desk.” That was a real power play and I’d talked some of my friend about that before I did it, and we got the House to it at that point. Senator Rosenmeier, this isn’t for purposes of accolade, but Gordon was then chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and like anybody else in that position Gordon Rosenmeier is a much maligned man. Basically, he’s a highly intelligent, highly competent, highly skilled man of real liberal bend, no question about it. If you don’t think so, ask higher education people in this state what Bob Dunlap and Gordon Rosenmeier appropriated back in those days compared to what’s happening in this day and age. So while Gordon was kind of an unapproachable man, he was not a reactionary by any stretch of the word. And he was extremely helpful I helping to get this bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Well anyway, we won on the human rights thing, and I have a great feeling for the passage of that legislation. There were other bills during that time –bills on drunk driving. Incidentally, my co-authors on that one were Senator Popham and Jack Davies both of whom were excellent legislators, both lawyers as well, from Minneapolis. It wasn’t easy finding authors on the bill. Drunk driving bills I have always felt were one of the ways to get at the problem of highway accidents through highway safety. I can remember accusing the insurance industry down there, at one point, saying, “With all your vast advertising revenue, why the hell don’t you ever advertise highway safety instead of just premiums,” and the insurance industry, I think, has done a better job of that in recent times. Those were very difficult bills, once again, going through the Judiciary Committee because whenever you’re handling that kind of legislation and reducing the limit, presumptive level, and tightening up the implied consent laws, and this kid of thing, there is always that “but for the grace of God there go I” concept. And I don’t care if somebody drinks, and I don’t care whether we call it a crime, I don’t care anything about that, I

just care about doing it and then getting on the highway and wiping out me or my family. Those were difficult bills. There were other bills – reorganization bills. Senator Harren and I, Hank was actually the chief author but I was more than normally involved in that – in the bill establishing the Department of Public Safety which pulled the highway patrol people and other safety elements in the government out from the bureaucrats a little bit and we felt that was significant. There are countless other things – the school bus bill was our first venture into the private education arena, and scholarships for private higher education I think were the key factors in that day and age. I developed a close kinship with Jim Goetz. Jim was young. He was Harold Levander’s Lieutenant Governor, of course, succeeding Sandy Kieth who incidentally, I also like very to this day. Sandy was a very interesting man and back in the days when you weren’t paid anything it just about cost him his livelihood. But Jim Goetz was a young fellow and while I didn’t accept him at the face value on everything, he was young, aggressive, tuned to the young people in the caucus. I was privy to a lot of strategy meetings with Jim in an attempt to try to get some of the governor’s program passed. There was a strong disposition on the part of the chief executive, this is Harold Levander’s biggest shortcoming that he had been too long out of politics – that’s the basic biggest shortcoming in Watergate. Politicians wouldn’t do that, advertising executives and business corporation presidents will. He’d been too long out of politics and I think they were afraid of the legislature, they were afraid of the legislative branch. There were powerful sources in the legislative branch. This goes back even to the liberal days – the Cinas and the Karl Grittners, and Paul Thuets, these kinds of people, strong legislative people. Rosenmeier, Wright, Dunlap, Duxbury, Cina in the House, a strong legislative tradition in Minnesota which, I think, overall, is healthy. But it can frighten a chief executive when you don’t know how to handle it, for a man like Wendy Anderson it doesn’t frighten because, I think,

Governor Anderson knows how to handle a legislature. Unfortunately, Tom Kelm doesn't always, but the only mistake – I've sat her in St. Cloud just musing over it this past session. I thought Wendy did an excellent job in the legislature. He gives them a general concept, gives them a program, gives them a directive and doesn't tie his prestige to one given solution to a problem. You don't close all those bridges behind you. Of course, Wendy had worked in the legislature and understood this. Harold had not. He had a strong tendency to fright the legislature and to be afraid of them, and, I think, that in my conversations in the governor's office and with Lieutenant Governor Goetz who was primarily responsible for sheparding that program, I was able to convince them along with Wayned Popham and Bob Brown, some of the ones who get some of the younger people there, that if you just did it the right way the legislature was going to help you and not kill you. Notwithstanding the sales tax vote over those years that was done.

Waldron: In 1972, the reapportionment bill of which you were on the committee was vetoed by Governor Anderson and then it was sent to, I believe, the courts which made a decision on how the state was going to reapportioned. Do you view Anderson's veto as any political thing for the DFL?

Hughes: I viewed Governor Anderson's veto as strictly a political thing that's obvious, I guess, and a wrong political decision and I wrote him to the effect afterwards which came as no surprise to him. I don't feel that this is one of those things that kind of fades in significance and takes its place in the archives along with this tape. I don't really think it's going to come into any fruition as an overriding political issue. I think, probably in the upcoming campaign for the Governor, the key issue is going to be how well he kept his economic promises. Frankly, I'm not so sure that he hasn't, but I think in the sum total of things as far as reapportionment somebody like me, sitting up here in St. Cloud, I sure don't intent to raise it. I'm not really sure how you'd intend to raise

it. It'll be used in a political campaign anything comes to the foreground, but if you have to ask me whether the 1974 gubernatorial election is going to turn out reapportionment, I guess my answer would have to be no. I had an impossible, when you're talking about the 1971 session, I had a very difficult session 1971. It was a long session as you know, concluding at the end of October. For me it was indeed long, for even though we had that hiatus in August and September, those of us that were working 1) on taxes or 2) on reapportionment were spending most of our time in St. Paul anyway. So while the general legislator was back home trying to pick up the pieces, I wasn't really home much more often in those two months than I had been before. If I hadn't made up my mind prior to that time, I certainly did then, that I would allow the voters in my district an opportunity to have somebody else represent them after the next election. We didn't know, of course, at the time whether we'd have just a two year term or whether we'd go the full four years. Frankly I was delighted when it was determined that the Senate had to be reapportioned and had to run again in 1972. We had a very difficult session. We walked in those first day of January, with a one vote margin and a challenge to that legislator. We had utter and complete political chaos in the opening days of that session and somebody else can record that for posterity. I don't know whether Lebedoff is going to write a book on that or not maybe a legislator ought to. I said to Steve Dorenfeld, a writer for the Minneapolis Tribune down there who used to cover the reapportionment stuff because I had the Palmer election contest and both reapportionments and I told Steve one time, if he'd ghost a book for me, I had the title all worked out, "A majority of one" with a question mark. My theory on a majority of one is that it is no majority because when you have a majority of one every man is a king and you have no effective working consensus majority. This plagued us constantly during the early part of that session. We had a very heated oven in January. Three days after we got down there, I recall distinctly Bill

Dosland, Wayne Popham, myself, Kelly Gage, all lawyer legislators and Senator Holmquist and a couple of others, we'd lost the guiding light of men like Rosenmeier. But some of the rest of us were in the Bergen, Morgan office in St. Paul until 4:00 in the morning with about ten or twelve other lawyers getting the pleadings ready to go to the state Supreme Court on Rudy Perpich's ruling that Palmer couldn't vote and that he could vote to break a tie which was absolutely revolutionary in Minnesota, totally political. I told my constituents at the time, "Love Rudy dearly, but he knows how I felt and I'm right and he's wrong." But it was a horrendous period of time. Then that election contest fell to me as chairman of the Senate Elections Committee. We had a devil of a time with that and without getting into all of the specifics, a very difficult situation. I guess I wouldn't even want to comment on it until I'd re-read some of my stuff. I did come away with the impression that they campaign a little differently on the Iron Range than we do in St. Cloud. It was a tough, rugged, hard-hitting campaign on both sides. Frenchy LaBraus had been a friend of mine when he was in legislature. He came into the Senate with me, came over from the House. He was in one of those districts, if you remember when I came in in 1964. Frenchy, ultimately, withdrew his challenge when a retraction, an apology, was printed in the Palmer family paper. So we were not plagued with the minutia of tracing down the legal responsibility there. Basically, I think, we handled it properly. We brought a report out on that basis. The Senate never adopted it because it didn't have a majority, Palmer not being able to vote on it, but I think we handled it ultimately a sufficiently non-political way. I just felt there was nothing to be gained by further charging that up. I talked to the Senator Coleman and Senator Kelin about that at that time and we decided to go through the charade on the floor of the Senate and let it drop. I think there as some honor on both sides in being able to resolve it in that fashion. At that time, and I would not want to say that I was primarily or even significantly

responsible, but during the development of that session, which turned out to be a very long one, there was a very strange thing that happened. The Senate had opened up on the hardest political lines possible where you're challenging for control and going to the state Supreme Court on the separation of powers question. The House had opened up on a traditionally soft and amiable atmosphere. You know, where the first couple days of the session you greet your old friends and if you ever go out to lunch you do it then and kind of visit about the families. This is where you kind of get the thing under way. As the sessions developed the exact reverse happened. The Senate – and Senator Holmquist is really to be given the credit for this, as is Senator Coleman – realized that we really had a horribly ineffective majority of one, if you will. Senator Coleman realized you don't get much done by just holding 33 votes no on everything and so there evolved almost a coalition concept governing in the Senate. Interestingly enough, this was a proposal made by the Minneapolis papers way back when we were fighting for control. And while in a operative sense and an organizational sense there was no coalition, in terms of result and spirit there was a regular coalition that kind of developed. There was a cohesion in the Senate and a great softening of those originally very hard political lines. In the House the exact opposite happened. The story of Lindstrom and Sabo, of course, is history at this point. Neither one of them are bad people. I don't know who to criticize there or how it happened but there the harder line evolved. This shows you how people can make a difference you think of this in terms of some of Minnesota's great political leaders – Stassen and Humphrey and people like that. In many respects that spirit in the Senate reflected Nick Coleman and Stan Holmquist's personalities. Stan is a very amiable, friendly, if not Aristotelian type person. He is very much a political force, very much a political animal in the good sense of the word, and so is Nick Coleman. He is an affable Irishman. Basically this is their personalities. Without getting into

nationalities, Mr. Lindstrom is a very tough, rigorous, righteous, honest man but a very difficult immobile hardline intellectual sort of a guy; and Martin Sabo is a very difficult man to move as evidenced by my reapportionment problems. While the force of the personalities of the two leaders of the Senate drew us into a cooperative spirit, the force of the personalities of the two men in the House, I think, drew them apart. That is a gross oversimplification, but I think it's an interesting concept in terms of what happened in that legislative session. Now very quickly, we get rid of the Palmer problem and then we get into congressional re-districting. Our problem was not as difficult as some, because we didn't lose a congressman, I'd gone in to see the governor early and while Wendy and I are of a different political face, of course, I always kind of liked him personally. He is a decent man. I was in law school with him and served in the Senate with him so it wasn't as if I had to get a special order of the day to get in and see him. I visited with him early about what he thought we had to do about this and my feeling was that we ought not, particularly in view of what had happened in the session – the Palmer thing and the fight for control and everything else – we had a hot political potato and we could go one of two ways and I felt the easiest way and the best way and nobody was going to win was to just keep these districts as close as they were presently which is not a particularly noble legislative endeavor or anything but just a practical one. Keep them as close as they were in terms of their geography and their political complexion and everything else and let any great and overwhelming insight into congressional reapportionment wait for perhaps another day. So it was in that spirit that we tried to do that, and I did it right from the start. Once again, the House position was different. I had a deep liberal involvement in the congressional redistricting from the start; they did not in the House. We finally came out with a plan that I thought was fair. Once again, no great statesmanship effort in terms of the concept of reapportionment. I think it was somewhat

statesmanlike in sense that we tried to avoid what I thought could have been an utter debacle. About all we needed was another Palmer thing and we never would have got off the ground. So we had the lines drawn very close proximity. There was some help to the sixth district interestingly enough. Largely, just because that that is the way the geography laid – some help the other way to the Seventh District. Once again just because that's where the geography laid. There was some mix in the first and second in the southern part of the state, once again largely geographic. Left third in the 5th District alone cut out Anoka and some of those areas of the third, once again a largely geographic thing and sent that up to the 8th Dist. and made that even more liberal. Kept Don Franser's district safe and made Bill Frenzel's safe. Safe is a bad word, but made them relatively politically secure which is not my concept. If I had my way in the state of Minnesota, if I had my way in the United States, I'd have every political district a swing district. Now that's spoken by someone who was born and raised in a swing district and like what a swing district makes of a politician. You just don't have the luxury of sticking up your nose at people. The problem with that, of course, is that you never gain any seniority in the United States Congress so there are arguments both ways. But anyway we kept the districts pretty similar. I had two problems. I had a little problem executively. In the final analysis, the governor and I reached a conclusion. He would have liked to see Anoka county in the Sixth District, and I politely informed him that if it was going in the Sixth District, the court was going to do it, that I didn't think that was fair and that we'd been very fair all the way along the line on this thing and that I was not going to do that just to go out of my way to hurt somebody. By the same token the House Republicans were very adamant about trying to hurt Don Fraser, and so I told the governor if that's what they wanted to do that's what we'd do. We'd make the Sixth District worse, if that's possible, and we'd give the Hennepin County Mafia a shot at Don Fraser. Well,

that wasn't a very acceptable trade-off and basically these discussions are amicable. I remember one time the House Republicans and conservatives were most unhappy with me because they thought I was bending over backwards, and when I finally had an agreement out of the governor's office, I went to the conference committee. There were no liberals on our conference committee and I went to the conference committee about noon and our Senate conferees had agreed on this, and I said if you don't take this bill by 5:00 tonight I'm going back to the Senate and report that we can't agree and ask for an appointment of a new conferees, ask that I not be reappointed and tell the Senate that I will not vote for the committee on committee's report for appointing our conferees unless they had two liberals on that conference committee. Of course they couldn't get the conference committee appointments passed, because we only had a one vote majority and if I didn't support it that was the end of the ballgame. That's what I meant before when I said everybody's king when there is a majority of one. The House conceded and we came out with really a very politically fair and acceptable reappointment bill. You can argue the merits of swing districts and other kinds of things, but we did relatively little damage to anybody. I felt extremely fair. We didn't geographically alter any districts. We felt strongly about keeping two principally rural districts which the Seventh and Sixth are, and there are a lot of other reasons we felt we had done a reasonably good job. Unfortunately, I think we shot our wad on congressional redistricting. It wasn't until after the legislative session that I found out that nobody could remember a state legislative session ever undertaking both of those reappointment problems in one session. You'll remember other reapportionments, except the one in 1966 with Rolvaag, were prerentals. That was before the United States Supreme Court had come in to dictate these legislative reapportionments. So, for instance, I think they reapportioned legislatively in 1959 to be effective in 1962. Then they did congressional after that, and we were

really in a crunch on reapportionment in 1971, and we had both of these tasks plus the Palmer thing that had preceded it. Well we tried to be very fair in the legislative reapportionment and I felt we were very fair. We ran a completely open ship at my absolute insistence when the Senate ultimately passed a bill to go into the conference committee which was really very fair and we got a lot of votes from the Senate liberals on that bill. I'd talked to Nick Coleman about that because we'd been much fairer than the House, at least they felt we had, and Nick wanted to be sure the bill went in there with at least some liberal support for the leverage that would give us in negotiating the differences between the Senate and the House. At the time we appointed our conferees, I insisted that two of them be liberals. I was met with rather staunch opposition from my own committee on committees of which I was not a member, but I had a couple of friends on there, not the least of which was Senator Holmquist and we prevailed. Not only that, but I allowed the liberals to pick them. Nick came to me with two names, Dick Parish who was then really the only liberal senator from a suburban area and Gene Mammenga, since then beaten in the last election, from Bemidji. So those were the two liberals on there and Bob Brown and myself and Bob Ashbach. Bob is a partisan but he's fair. Bob Ashbach is not much of a partisan so I felt we had a good conference committee. The House committee wasn't bad. At my insistence and with our pressure they appointed one liberal conferee, Howard Smith from Crosby. We labored openly, long and hard. I think we had the confidence of the Senate when we finally did pass the conference committee bill. I know for a fact that Senator Coleman and other liberals Senate leaders including Mammenga and Parish, both of whom signed the report, urged the governor to sign it. There were margins of error and margins of differences, but there came a time when I told the conferees that in my judgement, this could be an endless process. The real reason that legislative reapportionment failed is because of what I refer to as the young liberal

gunners in the House. When you reapportion, particularly legislative reapportion where you are dealing with the lives of these people, you can't satisfy everybody and kind of traditionally, seniority and influence, something has to carry the day because if you throw it up for grabs there is no way it comes down and nobody's hurt. But Martin Sabo had had a fight for the liberal leadership of the House with Tom Tisen from Bloomington and Marty had enlisted the support of the young first term, maybe second term, liberals who were beginning to feed into the House liberal caucus. These are the people to whom he owed his election as the liberal minority leader and these are the people he had to satisfy on legislative reapportionment. I am firmly convinced to this day that if all we had to worry about was Sabo and L.J. Lee and others from both the country and the city in satisfying them on a best effort reapportionment, the governor would have signed it. Somebody else's history can disclose that the governor was hard pressed and literally impaled in terms of signing that bill, because there was a great dispute his own Senate and House liberals as to whether he had to sign it. Marty Sabo is a very hard line politician, and he felt he had given in too much on congressional reapportionment, which is a complete and utter folly. Furthermore, I have reason to believe that Mr. Sabo and other members of the House liberal caucus actually felt that a court would politicize its plan with a realization that the court would be generally democrat, the federal district court panel, with Larson and Haney from Duluth and Mr. Devitt, two Democrats and one Republican, they actually felt they would get a political result out of that. I never felt that, and I don't feel that way with the court's plan. I felt that about the court getting involved and reducing the size, and of course, the court, the U.S. Supreme Court, threw that right back in their face. But then the court went back in and designed a plan and I don't yet know where the chips fell but I would be reasonably sure that there isn't anybody there withdrawing political lines. When you draw reapportionment lines, there is no way of

doing it without hurting somebody. Two final comments in this area: One, I firmly believe that legislative reapportionment, possibly congressional, although I'm not sure that's all bad, that's a question of a kind of additional check and balance congressionally and legislatively and an argument can be made that that is a healthy situation, but particularly legislative reapportionment must be taken out of the hands of the legislature. I don't think there is any question about it. It's too highly partisan an issue, and even if you are going to have partisan people making these decisions, it is better that they be non-interested partisan people so to speak. I would like to see some kind of commission that is apolitical and as non-partisan as you can be. There are those that say you can't do that and I say you can. You pick three people off the street in Marshall, Minnesota and two in Duluth and two from northeast Minneapolis they may not know what the names of the parties are. I think you can get that kind of a situation but somehow you have to avoid the problems of legislators. Just absolutely refusing to make any changes in the reapportionment process. So I think that should be done and second, at the best—and I guess I selfishly would say we had a good legislative plan—at best, I would say it is far too time-consuming a task for the legislature without any particular merit, without any end result in terms of the public good so to speak. Maybe there are ways of doing it. Maybe there are ways of having legislative input and the other. Frankly, this was one of the things that we wanted to give great time to, and at the tail end of the session we did throw in a bill establishing a commission to be appointed by the Supreme Court in respect of party leaders, we never carried it to a hearing or anything else. We just thought it ought to be thrown in so we didn't have the time to do that in the last session. The second point is my involvement. I found this, in a sense, to be distasteful, I guess. My involvement in Palmer and both reapportionment problems in one session put me right in the eye of the hurricane, and as I've said to some of my friends it's a remarkable thing

that I got out of there with any feathers on at all. Believe it or not, I think I'm still held in responsible respect by men from both sides of the isle. But that's a tough political hurricane to be put into, and frankly, it disturbed me because it kept me from what I considered substantive legislative effort that I would rather have been involved in. Obviously, in the last session one of the really significant substantive legislative efforts I was involved in was the tax credit bill. I'm not going to go into any lengthy explanations of this, but it's a tax credit for parents of students studying in a private school. It's a controversial issue, of course. I think in the long run, history will record that duplicity in education is a good thing not a bad thing. I think some educators have some doubts about this sometimes. I think we have to be careful in just squandering our resources, but there is nothing to be gained necessarily in a monolithic education system. As long as we can do it in a fair way, I think it has great merit and I feel that way about St. Paul's grade school and Trinity Lutheran school in Sauk rapids and I feel that way about St. John's and Gustavus. I don't say that because I dislike St. Cloud's public schools or St. Cloud State or anything else but a way to preserve some diversity is healthy. That that, of course, was a very significant piece of legislation. We were the first state in the union to pass the tax credit bill. We were not the first state in the unions to pass that kind of major legislation in terms of private primary and secondary education. Pennsylvania had passed legislation as had New York and Rhode Island different than the tax credit system, however. It is very interesting; I was very close to the drafting of the bill. I authored the bill, of course it's one of those things like the State Department of Human Rights where I had more than a passing interest and involvement in it. It was carefully drafted to give the best possible shot at the constitutionality of the issue, and it's interesting now that this remains open as perhaps the only avenue left in this area. It remains the avenue that the federal government is exploring and Nixon is exploring and everything else—the

tax credit avenue, rather than any other kind of auxiliary or direct aid or the purchase services type plans that they tried in Pennsylvania. Once again that was a very major piece of legislation. I remember a very well arguing that on the floor of the Senate in the morning, coming back at about 4:00 or 5:00 in the afternoon, and I got out of that debate in just enough time to go down to Galvins and have one stinger before I went to bed. I was so completely emotionally, physically and psychologically drained, because it was at the tail end of that regular session. I was very exhausted but very pleased with the end result. Many of my fellow Senators said that, that was the longest extended debate on one subject that they had ever been aware of in the legislature. One final comment on legislative reapportionment. My five Senate conferees, as I said before, were myself, Bob Brown, Bob Ashbach, Gene Mammenga and Dick Parrish. I chose not to seek reelection; and incidentally, reapportionment had nothing to do with that. Senator Parish was badly reapportioned out of his district by the federal district court plan that he had to seek a seat in the House which he did and won. So Dick Parish is now back in the House where he started from before he came to the Senate. He was chairman of the House Judiciary committee. Gene Mammenga was so badly carved up in the reapportionment that he got beat by a fellow liberal legislator from Pelican Rapids. So as I remarked to Gene after the election, "there ain't no justice."

Gower: Are you going to run again for any office, do you think?

Hughes: If I had to answer that question and live by it, I don't know but any kind of a fair answer under the present sort of circumstances is, no I said earlier that I never designed a political career when I was in school and first starting, and I meant that seriously. Yet, I got involved in it and I suppose one never knows what happens in politics. There might be an opportunity opening up in the 6th District. I'm not likely to avail myself of that. If a person really

wanted a political career, it strikes me that that is where you would start. That might be a rather inviting place to begin if Representative Zwach decided not to run again. But I'm not looking to that at all. In fact there is no possibility of my doing it. I think not. I like public service and I have a deep interest in something above and beyond the myopic practice of law and so what I'd ever do in later years I don't know. I certainly would like to serve in some of these capacities but I think by the time I ever get around to running for office again, youth will have prevailed and I'd be too old anyway. It's a serious question of priorities. As I said to some of my friends, if you want to know why I didn't run for office, go back and read the front page of the Daily Times. People don't believe that, but I come from that kind of a background where my family means a great deal to me. I have five children presently that's a big job. I've got a law office with partners and a future in other respects. I don't live off a trust fund. It became a complete consumption is what happened to it, and it just kept me from doing too many other things that I felt – at least for the time being and probably for all time for – have a higher priority. People are different. I don't know what will ever happen to my youngsters but if my oldest who is twelve years old, walks out the nest and gets all fouled up at eighteen or nineteen, maybe I can't do anything about that but at least I want to be able to say I tried to reach that kid and tried to give her what I had and what I thought would help her. I'd be a most unhappy person if that happened to me and I was sitting in Washington D.C. or some other place knowing that I was doing something that nobody else could do. One other observation, I've never had any ambition to go to Washington. Interestingly enough. At age 37 and involved in politics, I've never been inside the walls of Washington, D.C. – not even on a family or something, which I think would be interesting sometime, but I've never done it. So obviously, there is not great intrigue there. I think that if the time should ever come I think that I would find more preferable and more desirable a position in

state government, that at the federal level. I wouldn't want it to sound presumptuous and there are good men in Congress, but I don't find it particularly inviting.