



# 2007 REPORT on the MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

by the  
LEGISLATIVE EVALUATION ASSEMBLY  
of MINNESOTA, INC

for an  
INFORMED CITIZENRY



established 1972

[www.mnlea.org](http://www.mnlea.org)

**CREDO** — *The Legislative Evaluation Assembly of Minnesota, Incorporated (LEA) is a non-profit, non-partisan corporation established to keep the citizens of Minnesota informed of both important legislation and the voting performance of each Senator and Representative in the Minnesota State Legislature. LEA bases its evaluation on the traditional American principles of constitutionalism, limited government, free enterprise, legal and moral order with justice and individual liberty and dignity. LEA encourages the use of the material in this Report, in whole or in part by any group or individual.*

## 2007 HONOREES

### HOUSE



Anderson, B.



Buesgens, M.



DeLaForest, C.



Dettmer, B.



Eastlund, R.



Emmer, T.



Erickson, S.



Hackbarth, T.



Holberg, M.



Kohls, P.



Olson, M.



Shimanski, R.



Seifert, M.



Sviggum, S.



Zellers, K.

### HONORABLE MENTION

**Senate:**

Gerlach, C. , Vandever, R.

**House:**

Dean, M., Finstad, B., Hoppe, J., Simpson, D.

## 2007 LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

The political response in the wake of the I-35W bridge collapse has provided another example of legislators' unwillingness to focus government efforts on the most essential priorities. The growing numbers of special-interest bills which get packed with pork to get them passed are outweighing priorities related to the state's infrastructure and other bills that serve the citizens of the state as a whole. The unwillingness to reserve all tax collection from automotive revenues for road construction and maintenance has made fixing structurally deficient bridges or washed-out or outdated roads that much more difficult.

Meanwhile, opportunistic politicians seek to expand the use of the words "priority infrastructure" to include more spending on parks, subsidies for mass transit, and other items most citizens would consider as infrastructure options or luxuries. And, of course, there is the one special-interest group that always demands "priority" attention, the education lobby. Our legislature approved \$11.2 billion in education-related funding this year, with \$784 million in new spending. The per-pupil funding gap widened dramatically between the more rural and urban school districts, with big increases for Minneapolis, St. Paul, and St. Cloud. And there is still no yardstick to measure whether these increases will improve education.

If LEA were to grade on a historical curve the performance

of Minnesota state government this year, based on the ability to control its appetite for new spending, taxes, and regulation, the results would be mixed. With the help of the Governor, some level of restraint emerged in the final product, enabling our state government to turn in an average performance on spending in a time of budget surplus. On taxes, the results were better than average, considering that no tax increases were enacted, but the results could have been even better, since a budget surplus should have enabled some real tax cuts.

The worst performance was in the area of regulation. Although the push for much more insurance regulation didn't make it through, the nanny state grew exponentially with onerous new energy, smoking, and consumer-protection regulations that violate constitutional principles. It is not too late to more effectively unmask the excesses of such innocuous-sounding themes as "predatory lending prohibitions," "freedom to breathe," and "renewable energy standards." In many cases we need to follow the money to see which groups will benefit from legislation proposed in the name of some social good that has citizen attention. To be seen as legitimate, our government should protect the constitutional rights of citizens and provide the necessary services for all citizens. It is too often abused as a cash cow for some groups to milk at the expense of others.

## 1. Omnibus Capital Investment/Bonding Bill

HF 886. Rep. Hausman; Sen. Langseth. Not so long ago, bonding bills in odd-numbered years in Minnesota legislatures were small or nonexistent, addressing only needs universally agreed to be of an “emergency” nature. Unfortunately, this tradition has recently lapsed. Beginning in 2003 the legislature repassed local porkbarrel measures Governor Ventura had vetoed in 2002. The Senate’s refusal to rein in its bonding requests led to no bill passing in 2004, a traditional bonding year. Therefore, we saw the passage of back-to-back bonding bills in 2005 and 2006 that totaled almost \$2 billion.

This year the eagerness of the new legislative majority to fund projects for members’ districts led to an omnibus bill of nearly \$160 million in bonding and \$164 million in general-fund appropriations emerging from conference committee. The bonding included \$14.4 million for a U of M biomedical research facility and \$40 million for the Central Corridor Transit Way. The general-fund appropriations, which required no payback to the state, included \$30 million for Itasca County infrastructure and \$10 million for the National Hockey Center at St. Cloud. LEA favored a “NO” vote on this bill, which passed the House 84-49 and the Senate 45-18. Thankfully, Gov. Pawlenty vetoed the bill in its entirety, noting that “the DFL majority exercised no restraint in passing this bill.” The cost of the bill would have been four times greater than the Governor’s original budget proposal.

## 2. Omnibus Jobs, Economic Development, and Housing Finance Bill

SF 62. HF 122. Sen. Tomassoni; Rep. Rukavina. This began as a bill to prohibit the sale of American flags not made in the United States. Passage of this bill even brought our Minnesota legislature to the editorial attention, negative, of the *Wall Street Journal* (7-6-07). Such an attempt to regulate commerce is misguided. Another 130 items were tacked onto it, turning it into an omnibus spending and regulation bill. It included paying people to attend board meetings about regulating high-pressure pipes, and establishing fees and requirements for people who braid hair for compensation. It also included \$100 million in indefinable “work force development.”

Bills of this nature remove government accountability from the people and their elected representatives. They are submitted to legislators by a state bureaucracy that has included enough pork to assure passage of many items that could not pass on their individual merit. LEA thanks the Governor to the extent he used the line item veto on this poorly constructed bill. LEA favored a “NO” vote. It passed in the Senate: 53-10 and in the House 110-24.

## 3. Deficiency Funding for Agencies (A euphemism for pork and waste)

SF 846. HF 958. Sen. Cohen; Rep. Solberg. This spending bill easily captures the worst aspects of all larger omnibus bills. It manages to reward those agencies that are least judicious with other people’s money, and there is no reward for the most prudent. There are no standards or penalties to prevent the mismanagement of government funds. Worse, there is no plan to return private enterprises back to the private sector. Agencies that exceeded their budgets had them replenished with no concomitant requirement to control their budgets within the appropriation.

The Metro Transit should receive no deficiency funding for capital, maintenance or operating funds. Subsidizing ridership at a rate of twice the costs of private transportation is a flagrant redistribution

of wealth. Turning public transportation over to the private sector would be a solution that is both moral and economical, for a wealth of problems. LEA favored a “NO” vote. It passed in the Senate 62-0 and in the House 105-29.

## 4. Renewable Energy Standards

SF 4. HF 4. Sen. Anderson; Rep. Peterson, A. The bill mandates what the consumer and marketplace cannot sustain and requires electrical energy to be produced from a variety of unproven, unreliable and costly sources (wind/sun/bio-mass). The bill requires that 30 percent of the electricity produced by the major suppliers come from the aforementioned sources by 2020.

This is another badly misguided energy bill, appealing on the surface, but rife with deceit. The rhetoric of the proponents is long in ideals but so lacking in pragmatism that its failure is certain. While supporters assure all of a cleaner environment with wind-generated energy, they are unable to guarantee the efficient delivery of sustainable power.

The lack of local energy sources means that energy will have to be transmitted to Minnesota customers from long distances, other states, and Canada. The backers of this plan are so uncertain that any providers could competitively deliver the power in compliance with artificially imposed timetables that they rejected an amendment which would have suspended this program if costs became excessive. This decision means that consumers will bear the additional costs, the building of reliable plants will be curtailed, and uninterrupted energy sources will be uncertain. This problem should have been turned over to private firms which could compete in an open market. This always provides the best solutions for the consumers and all citizens. LEA favored a “NO” vote. It passed in the Senate 64-4 and in the House 123-10.

## 5. Metropolitan Land Planning Act and Related Statutes Modified

SF 981. HF 881. Sen. Rest; Rep. Hilstrom. The bill gives increased planning and oversight legal authority to the Metropolitan Council. The Council serves as a bureaucratic layer of government to coordinate metropolitan regional planning among the city governments and the state. However, it is not directly responsible to the citizens of that region nor do most of its funds come from the entities it oversees.

The democratic principles underlying our society require larger government units to be built upon smaller ones, not imposed upon them. While regional coordination might be desired for the greater metropolitan area, it should freely emerge from the entities it serves and be supported by them, not imposed from above. It smacks of totalitarianism. HF881 is seen as contributing to the power of this bureaucratic Leviathan. LEA favored a “NO” vote. It passed in the Senate 60-4 and in the House 78-56.

## 6. Automatic increases of minimum wage

SF 875. Sen. Anderson. Two years after passing a bill that increased the state’s minimum wage by nearly 20 percent, Sen. Ellen Anderson came back with another bill to increase the minimum wage to \$6.75 per hour, an increase of nearly 10 percent. More ominously, it would have eliminated the training wage exemption for new employees, and done away with the need for future votes to raise the minimum wage by requiring Minnesota’s Commissioner of Labor to automatically adjust the minimum wage annually according to the rate of inflation.

LEA has opposed bills that raised the minimum wage in the past because they interfere with employers' ability to hire entry-level, low-skilled workers. This creates inflation from many public-employee contracts whose wages are linked to changes in the minimum wage, and because there is no need for one minimum wage job to support an entire household when such a generous safety net is provided by the modern welfare state. This bill is even worse than past bills because it would have circumvented the legislative process. It would also have put our state at a competitive disadvantage by raising the minimum wage above the federal and other states. LEA favored a "NO" vote. Though it passed in the Senate 40-23, it did not become law because there was no House floor vote.

## **7. Refusal to accept the Real ID Act**

SF 984. HF 1438. Sen. Moua; Rep. Mariani. In order to promote the security and well-being of the people of Minnesota, and to preserve the principles of federalism embodied in the 10th amendment of the U.S. constitution, the Commissioner of Public Safety would be prohibited from taking action to implement, or plan the implementation of Public Law 109-13, known as the Real ID Act.

The Federal Real ID Act requires the Department of Homeland Security to establish national minimum standards for state-issued driver's licenses and ID cards as recommended by the 9/11 Commission. Although well meaning, such an ID could eventually include much personal and health information in a violation of individual privacy rights. According to the 10th amendment, states can prohibit such legislation. LEA favored a "YES" vote. The bill passed in the Senate 51-14. There was no formal vote in the House.

## **8. Indoctrination with Anti-American Curriculum/ International Baccalaureate Program**

Olson Amendment to HF 6 (Omnibus early childhood, family, adult, and pre-kindergarten through grade 12 education finance bill). There were many excellent conservative amendments proposed for this omnibus bill. Unfortunately, most of them did not pass. LEA chose to score this amendment because it would have eliminated state funding for the International Baccalaureate Program. This program has started to receive lots of attention this year because the IB program promotes a one world socialist form of government. Taxpayers' dollars should not be used to indoctrinate the children of Minnesota with anti-American ideology. LEA favored a "YES" vote. The amendment failed 28-102.

## **9. Taxpayer Funding of Abortion**

Sen. Neuville Amendment; Rep. Otremba Amendment to SF 2171(Omnibus Health and Human Services Appropriations bill). Abortion continues to be a fundamental issue in our culture and legislature. The first right named in the Declaration of Independence is "Life". Since inception, LEA has upheld in its Credo "legal and moral order and justice and individual liberty for all." Citizens may wonder whether lawmakers who vote to destroy the lives of innocent unborn babies can be entrusted with other facets of our personal and civic lives. The amendment would have prohibited state-sponsored health programs from using their funding to provide abortions. Minnesota taxpayers have participated in this hideous practice since 1995. LEA favored a "YES" vote. The amendment failed in the Senate 26-39 and in the House 64-68.

## **10. Statewide Smoking Ban**

SF 238. HF 305. Sen. Sheran; Rep. Huntley. The bill establishes policy aimed to protect employees and the public from hazards of secondhand smoke. It prohibits persons from smoking in most public areas. Public safety is an important role of government, but we cannot allow an arbitrary definition of public health to create policy. We must objectively define a public health risk that requires government intervention before we ban the use of a legal product. No study of second-hand smoke has shown statistical scientific significance of any threat from low levels of smoke found today in any ventilated bar or restaurant.

Owners of businesses have property rights as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. The deceptively named "Freedom to Breathe" Act also allows Indian Casinos another monopoly. This taxpayer funded and supported propaganda, under the guise of public health, will lead to closed businesses and cause lost revenues and lost jobs. LEA favored a "NO" vote. It passed in the Senate 43-21 and in the House 85-45.

## **11. Medical use of Marijuana**

SF345. Sen. Murphy. After several failed attempts, and in defiance of federal law, the Senate passed legislation authorizing Minnesota citizens to use marijuana for medical purposes. States do not have the authority to pick and choose which federal laws they follow. Although supporters claim the bill is needed to alleviate suffering, its actual effect would encourage the use of illicit substances, and make it more difficult to properly enforce U.S. drug laws in Minnesota. The use of illegal drugs is never acceptable for persons of moral character; nor is the purposeful disregard of laws. LEA favored a "NO" vote. There was no House vote. The bill passed in the Senate 35-29.

## **12. Free Market Health Insurance**

Olson and Emmer Amendment to Omnibus Health and Human Services Finance Bill. SF 2171 Sen. Berglin. This amendment was offered to delete the health insurance exchange, which would have eliminated the right to buy health insurance privately. The exchange would have been a new bureaucracy with control over health insurance. LEA supports policies that advance individual freedom for citizens and favored a "YES" vote. The amendment failed in the House 12-119. This amendment was not offered in the Senate.

Fortunately, the Governor vetoed the final bill.

## **13. Big Brother Oversight for the Medical Industry**

SF 967. HF 1078. Sen. Berglin; Rep. Huntley. While the health insurance exchange and genetic research on newborn baby DNA were not included, too many other questionable features were included to gain the support of LEA. These features included the record location service website that puts all medical records online, "representation of consent," which allows patient data to be accessed without actual patient consent, a stated goal of universal health care by 2011, electronic surveillance of patients/doctors by the health department, intrusive home-visiting surveillance on families of newborns, bureaucratic reporting programs for doctors and hospitals, prescription surveillance on patients and doctors, expanded non-health uses of Minnesota Provider tax and far more. LEA favored a "NO" vote. LEA appreciates the Governor using his line item veto in this bill. The Health and Human Service Bill passed in the Senate 43-23 and in the House 95-38.

## SENATE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	07%	C%
D	66	Anderson, E.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	7	9
D	6	Bakk, T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	+	-		-	-	-	-	A	12	20
D	61	Berglin, L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	7	12
D	51	Betzold, D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	-	-	7	8
D	43	Bonoff, T.	-	A	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	5	6
D	38	Carlson, J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
D	50	Chaudhary, S.	-	-	A	-	-	-	+	E	-	-	-	E	+	-	-	-	-	12	15
D	15	Clark, T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
D	64	Cohen, R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
R	26	Day, D.	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	T	+	+	+	T	-	A	+	-	A	36	63
D	60	Dibble, S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	A	-	A	4	6
R	18	Dille, S.	A	+	-	-	-	+	+		+	-	A		-	-	+	-	A	36	56
D	40	Doll, J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
D	31	Erickson Ropes,S	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
R	14	Fischbach, M.	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	T	+	-	+	T	+	-	+	-	-	40	66
D	47	Foley, L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	-	7	17
R	21	Frederickson, D.	A	-	-	-	-	+	+		+	-	+		+	-	+	-	-	41	55
R	37	Gerlach, C.	+	+	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	+		+	-	A	+	+	77	82
R	13	Gimse, J.	+	-	A	-	-	+	-		+	-	+		-	-	+	-	-	34	34
R	42	Hann, D.	+	-	-	+	A	A	-		+	+	+		+	-	+	-	+	58	66
D	58	Higgins, L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	A	-	-	5	9
R	11	Ingebrigtsen, B.	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	N	+	+	+	N	+	-	+	-	+	60	60
R	49	Johnson, D.	A	+	-	-	+	+	-	O	+	+	-	O	+	-	+	-	+	55	61
R	48	Jungbauer, M.	+	+	-	-	-	+	+		+	+	+		+	-	+	-	-	66	61
R	19	Koch, A.	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	S	+	+	+	S	-	-	+	A	+	55	58
R	12	Koering, P.	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	E	+	+	-	E	-	-	-	-	-	27	50
D	20	Kubly, G.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	-	-	13	15
D	9	Langseth, K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	+	-	+	A	-	-	-	-	-	20	31
D	63	Larson, D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	T	A	-	-	T	-	-	-	-	-	5	28
D	44	Latz, R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	-	A	5	11
R	32	Limmer, W.	+	A	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	+		+	-	+	+	-	69	82
D	8	Lourey, T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
D	30	Lynch, A.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	O	-	-	+	O	-	-	-	-	-	13	13
D	54	Marty, J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	T	-	-	-	T	+	-	-	-	-	13	11
D	39	Metzen, J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	E	-	+	-	E	-	-	-	-	-	13	23
R	41	Michel, G.	+	-	-	-	-	+	-		+	-	-		+	-	+	-	+	40	53
D	67	Moua, M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		+	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	13	11
D	28	Murphy, S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		+	-	-	A	-	12	15
R	25	Neuville, T.	+	-	-	-	-	+	-		+	+	+		+	-	+	-	-	47	61

### KEY

**R** – Republican  
**D** - Democratic-Farmer-Labor  
**IP** – Independence

+ Vote favored by LEA

-- Vote not favored by LEA

A indicates legislator excused, absent, or not voting

**07%** = % of legislator's votes favored by LEA in 2007 session

**C%** = legislator's career average LEA score

LEA calculates the voting percentages using votes actually cast by each legislator and then deducting two percentage points for each time that legislator did not cast a vote.

**Honorees** for 2007 scored **85% or higher**, those receiving honorable mentions scored at least **70%**.

## SENATE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	07%	C%
D	17	Olseen, R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	+		-	-	-	-	-	13	13
R	33	Olson, G.	+	-	A	-	A	A	-		+	+	+		+	-	+	-	-	44	73
D	4	Olson, Mary	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	+		-	-	-	-	-	13	13
R	34	Ortman, J.	+	-	-	A	-	+	-		+	+	A		+	-	+	+	A	52	60
D	63	Pappas, S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	7	6
R	36	Pariseau, P.	+	A	-	-	-	+	-		+	+	+		+	-	+	-	-	48	67
D	59	Pogemiller, L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	7	6
D	7	Prettner Solon, Y	-	-	-	-	-	A	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
D	45	Rest, A.	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	A	-	-	12	18
R	35	Robling, C.	+	+	-	-	-	+	-		+	-	+		+	-	+	-	-	47	62
R	24	Rosen, J.	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	S	+	-	+	S	-	-	A	-	A	34	51
D	53	Rummel, S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	E	-	-	+	E	-	-	-	-	-	13	13
D	56	Saltzman, K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	7	7
D	3	Saxhaug, T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	A	-	+	+	A	-	-	-	-	-	20	18
D	46	Scheid, L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	T	-	A	-	T	-	-	-	-	-	-4	13
R	29	Senjem, D.	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	E	+	-	+	E	+	A	+	-	+	55	54
D	23	Sheran, K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	+		-	-	-	-	A	12	12
D	57	Sieben, K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	V	A	-	-	V	-	-	-	-	-	5	16
D	2	Skoe, R.	-	-	A	+	-	-	+	O	-	+	+	O	+	-	-	-	-	34	20
D	10	Skogen, D.	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	T	-	-	+	T	+	-	-	-	-	27	27
D	27	Sparks, D.	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	E	-	+	-	E	+	-	-	-	-	27	21
D	1	Stumpf, L.	A	A	A	-	A	A	+		-	A	A		A	-	-	-	A	-1	27
D	5	Tomassoni, D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	+	-		-	-	-	-	-	13	17
D	62	Torres Ray, P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	7	7
R	52	Vandever, R.	+	+	-	-	+	+	+		+	A	+		+	+	+	+	-	77	79
D	22	Vickerman, J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		+	+	+		-	-	-	-	-	27	38
R	16	Wergin, B.	+	+	-	-	-	+	-		+	+	+		+	-	+	-	+	60	62
D	55	Wiger, C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	7	20

## HOUSE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	07%	C%
R	48B	Abeler, J.	+	-	-	-	+			-	+	A		-	-	-		-	-	23	50
R	19A	Anderson, B.	+	+	+	+	+			A	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	98	92
R	43A	Anderson, S.	+	-	+	-	+			-	+	+		-	+	+		-	+	62	62
D	03A	Anzelc, T.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	8	8
D	39B	Atkins, J.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	14
R	35A	Beard, M.	+	+	-	-	+	N	N	+	+	+	N	-	+	-	N	-	+	62	61
D	43B	Benson, J.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	0
R	33B	Berns, J.	+	+	+	-	+			-	+	-		-	+	+		-	+	62	62
D	57A	Bigham, K.	-	-	-	-	-	H	H	-	-	-	H	-	-	-	H	-	-	0	0
D	25B	Bly, D.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	0
R	25A	Brod, L	+	-	+	-	+	U	U	+	+	+	U	-	+	-	U	-	-	54	56
D	27A	Brown, R.	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	0	0
D	23B	Brynaert, K.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	0	0
R	35B	Buesgens, M.	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	100	91
D	56A	Bunn, J.	-	-	-	-	+	V	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	8	8
D	45B	Carlson, L.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	18
D	61A	Clark, K.	-	-	-	-	-	T	T	-	-	-	T	-	-	-	T	-	-	0	13
R	24B	Cornish, T	+	+	-	-	+	E	E	+	+	-	E	+	+	-	E	A	-	56	60
D	62A	Davnie, J.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	14
R	52B	Dean, M	+	+	+	+	+			-	+	+		-	+	A		+	+	81	78
R	49A	DeLaForest, C	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+		-	+	+		+	+	92	83
R	29A	Demmer, R	+	+	-	-	+			-	+	+		-	+	+		-	+	62	60

# HOUSE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	07%	C%
R	52A	Dettmer, B.	+	+	+	-	+			+	+	+		-	+	+		+	+	85	85
D	06A	Dill, D	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	+		-	-	-		-	-	15	32
D	47A	Dittrich, D.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	+		-	-	15	26
D	58B	Dominguez, A.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	0
D	12B	Doty, A.	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	+	+	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	23	23
R	17A	Eastlund, R.	+	+	+	-	+	O	O	-	+	+	O	+	+	+	O	+	+	85	71
D	02A	Eken, K	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	+		-	-	-		-	-	15	40
R	19B	Emmer, T.	+	+	+	+	+	H	H	+	+	+	H	+	+	+	H	+	+	100	91
R	41A	Erhardt, R.	+	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	8	48
R	16A	Erickson, S.	+	+	+	-	+	U	U	+	+	+	U	+	+	+	U	+	+	92	79
D	08B	Faust, T.	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	+	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	8	8
R	21B	Finstad, B.	+	+	+	-	+	E	E	+	+	+	E	-	+	-	E	+	+	77	75
D	26B	Fritz, P.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	17
D	53A	Gardner, P.	-	-	-	-	+	V	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	8	8
R	36B	Garofalo, P.	+	-	+	-	+	O	O	-	+	+	O	-	+	+	O	-	+	62	57
R	15A	Gottwalt, S.	+	-	-	-	+	T	T	+	+	-	T	-	+	-	T	+	+	54	54
D	54A	Greiling, M.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	0	17
R	24A	Gunther, B.	+	-	-	-	+			+	+	+		-	+	-		+	+	62	63
R	48A	Hackbarth, T.	+	+	+	-	+			+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	92	69
R	22B	Hamilton, R.	+	-	-	-	+			+	+	+		-	+	-		-	+	54	55
D	39A	Hansen, R.	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	0	16
D	66B	Hausman, A.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	7
D	15B	Haws, L.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	19
R	13A	Heidgerken, B.	+	-	-	-	+	H	H	+	+	+	H	+	-	+	H	-	+	62	62
D	46B	Hilstrom, D.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	A	O	-	-	-2	20
D	08B	Hilty, B.	-	-	-	-	-	U	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	0	16
R	36A	Holberg, M.	+	+	+	+	+	S	S	+	+	+	S	-	+	+	S	+	+	92	88
R	34B	Hoppe, J.	+	+	+	-	+	E	E	-	+	+	E	-	+	+	E	+	+	77	71
D	60B	Hornstein, F	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	9
D	47B	Hortman, M.	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	0	15
D	14B	Hosch, L.	-	-	-	-	+	O	O	-	+	A	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	15	32
R	04B	Howes, L.	+	-	-	-	+	T	T	+	+	A	T	-	-	-	T	-	-	31	56
D	07A	Huntley, T.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	0	17
D	07B	Jaros, M.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	8	8
D	67B	Johnson, S.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	14
D	13B	Juhnke, A.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	35
D	59B	Kahn, P.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	A		-	A	-4	9
D	17B	Kalin, J.	-	-	-	-	+	N	N	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	15	9
D	60A	Kelliher, M.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	16
D	50B	Knuth, K.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	0
D	20B	Koenen, L	-	-	-	-	-	H	H	-	+	+	H	-	-	-	H	-	-	15	41
R	34A	Kohls, P	+	+	+	+	+	O	O	-	+	+	O	-	+	+	O	+	+	85	78
D	51A	Kranz, S.	-	-	-	-	+	U	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	8	8
D	50A	Laine, C.	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	0	0
R	09A	Lanning, M.	+	-	-	-	+	E	E	-	+	-	E	-	+	-	E	-	+	38	48
D	40B	Lenczewski, A.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	45
D	66A	Lesch, J.	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	0	14
D	30A	Liebling, T.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	10
D	01B	Lieder, B.	-	-	-	-	-	T	T	-	-	+	T	-	-	-	T	-	-	8	29
D	55A	Lillie, L.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	0	14
D	59A	Loeffler, D.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	6
D	37A	Madore, S.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	+	-		-	-	8	8
R	22A	Magnus, D.	+	-	+	-	+			+	+	+		-	+	-		+	+	69	63
D	67A	Mahoney, T.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	8	21
D	65B	Mariani, C.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	8
D	09B	Marquart, P.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	+		-	-	-		-	-	15	48
D	38A	Masin, S.	-	-	-	-	+			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	8

# HOUSE

Pty	Dist	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	07%	C%
R	53B	McFarlane, C.	+	-	-	-	+			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	23	23
R	57B	McNamara, D.	+	-	+	-	+			-	+	+		-	+	-		-	-	46	48
D	04A	Moe, F.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	+		-	-	-		-	-	8	23
D	40A	Morgan, W.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	0
D	23A	Morrow, T.	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	0	0
D	58A	Mullery, J.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	21
D	64A	Murphy, E.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	0
D	06B	Murphy, M.	-	-	-	-	-	H	H	-	+	-	H	-	-	A	H	-	-	6	23
D	46A	Nelson, M.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	14
R	10A	Nornes, B.	+	-	-	-	+	U	U	+	+	+	U	-	-	+	U	-	+	54	60
D	29B	Norton, K.	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	0	0
D	01A	Olin, D.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	+	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	8	8
R	16B	Olson, Mark	+	+	+	+	+			A	+	+		+	+	+		A	+	96	92
D	11B	Otremba, M.	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	+	+	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	15	48
R	37B	Ozment, D.	+	-	-	-	+	O	O	A	A	+	O	A	-	-	O	-	A	25	60
R	42B	Paulsen, E.	+	+	+	-	+	T	T	+	+	+	T	-	+	-	T	-	+	69	81
D	64B	Paymar, M.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	A	E	-	-	-2	15
D	31A	Pelowski, G.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	36
R	32A	Peppin, J.	+	-	+	-	+			-	+	+		-	+	+		+	+	69	80
D	20A	Peterson, A.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	28
R	41B	Peterson, N.	+	-	-	A	+	N	N	-	+	-	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	23	36
D	46A	Peterson, S.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	10
D	27B	Poppe, J.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	11
D	05A	Rukavina, T.	-	-	-	-	-	H	H	-	-	+	H	-	-	-	H	-	-	8	16
R	26A	Ruth, C.	+	-	-	-	+	O	O	-	+	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	23	48
D	42A	Ruud, M.	-	-	-	-	-	U	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	0	20
D	02B	Sailer, B.	-	-	-	-	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	-	S	-	-	0	22
D	54B	Scalze, B.	-	-	-	-	+	E	E	-	-	A	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	6	18
R	21A	Seifert, M.	+	+	+	-	+			+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	92	77
D	5B	Sertich, A.	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	+	V	-	-	-	V	-	-	8	25
R	14A	Severson, D.	+	+	-	-	+	O	O	+	+	-	O	+	+	-	O	-	+	62	66
R	18A	Shimanski, R.	+	+	+	+	+	T	T	+	+	+	T	+	+	-	T	+	+	92	92
D	44A	Simon, S.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	0	8
R	10B	Simpson, D.	+	-	+	-	+			+	+	+		-	+	+		+	+	77	62
D	55B	Slawik, N.	-	-	-	-	-			A	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-2	21
D	63B	Slocum, L.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	0
R	33A	Smith, S.	+	-	-	-	+			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	23	75
D	03B	Solberg, L.	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	8	20
R	28B	Sviggum, S.	+	+	+	-	+	O	O	+	+	+	O	-	+	+	O	+	+	85	75
D	56B	Swails, M.	-	-	-	-	+			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	8
D	65A	Thao, C.	-	-	-	-	-	H	H	-	-	-	H	-	-	-	H	-	-	0	5
D	63A	Thissen, P.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	0	15
D	51B	Tillberry, T.	-	-	-	-	-	U	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	-	U	-	-	0	0
R	49B	Tingelstad, K.	+	-	+	-	+	S	S	-	+	-	S	-	+	-	S	+	+	54	59
D	31B	Tschumper, K.	-	-	-	-	-	E	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	-	E	-	-	0	0
R	18B	Urdahl, D.	+	-	-	-	+			+	+	-		-	-	+		+	+	54	56
D	62B	Wagenius, J.	-	-	-	-	-	V	V	-	-	-	V	A	-	-	V	-	-	-2	12
D	61B	Walker, N.	-	-	-	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	O	-	-	-	O	A	-	-2	13
D	12A	Ward, J.	-	-	-	-	-	T	T	-	+	-	T	-	-	-	T	-	-	8	8
R	38B	Wardlow, L.	+	-	+	-	+	E	E	-	A	-	E	A	+	-	E	+	+	51	61
D	30B	Welti, A.	-	-	-	-	-			-	+	-		-	-	-		-	-	8	21
R	11A	Westrom, T.	+	-	-	-	+			+	+	A		-	A	+		-	-	41	65
D	44B	Winkler, R.	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	0	0
D	28A	Wollschlager, S.	A	-	-	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-2	-2
R	32B	Zellers, K.	+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+		-	+	+		+	+	92	80

## 14. Requiring Health Insurance Companies to Cover Colorectal Screening

SF 1705. HF 1287. Sen. Sparks; Rep. Davnie. The bill requires health plan companies to provide coverage for colorectal screening tests for men and women. It is micro-regulation of health insurance companies. Government regulation raises prices by placing mandates on health insurance companies and lowers competition in the health insurance market by driving out smaller businesses. The end result is higher prices for consumers and more people without coverage. A market-based health-care system would allow consumers to demand various coverage services and offer more health insurance to a greater number of people based on flexibility and market competition. Governments should eliminate monopolies and trusts and reduce conflicts of interest. There is a legitimate role in providing some safety net for the truly needy, but state mandates on business do not solve this problem. LEA favored a "NO" vote. It passed in the Senate: 64-1 and the House 103-26.

## 15. Benefits for Homosexuals/Domestic Partner Benefits

Pappas' Amendment to SF 1997 (Omnibus State Department Appropriations bill). This amendment would have redefined the word "dependents" to arbitrarily include "others" as defined by governmental units. Minnesota taxpayers would have been required by law to provide benefits to unmarried partners of employees (heterosexuals or homosexuals) for any local-government body that chose to offer those benefits. LEA favored a "NO" vote. The amendment passed in the Senate 42-20. It was not offered in the House.

## 16. Help America Vote Act

SF 103. HF 160. Sen. Higgins; Rep. Hilty. The bill is a bureaucrat's dream. It allocates funds to eleven different efforts and then vaguely defines the efforts so that spending could be funneled to the supervising bureaucrats' project of choice. Here are the most egregious items missing from the bill: it does not mandate citizenship verification, nor compel computer checks of same-day registrants and absentee ballots, nor mandate prosecution for voter fraud. This bill does nothing to insure the integrity of the vote and thus does not prevent disenfranchisement of the legitimate voter. LEA favored a NO vote. It passed in the Senate 61-4 and in the House 106-25.

## 17. Banning service fees or expiration dates on gift cards

SF 69. Sen. Sieben; Rep. Atkins. Minnesota has now passed a law that will make it practically impossible for merchants to charge service fees or include expiration dates when selling gift cards to customers. The law's advocates falsely promised that the value of gift cards would no longer erode (ignoring the reality of inflation). The federal government originally wanted to require that all coupons and gift certificates have an expiration date, lest they become viable substitutes for U.S. currency. Businesses will have to spend resources to make sure that any gift cards sold today will be readable decades from now. In addition, there will not be a way to depreciate the unused gift card balances that are treated as liabilities on the balance sheets of retail companies; the overall value of those companies will be unfairly discounted. LEA salutes the small minority of legislators who voted "NO" on this bill. The Senate vote was 50-8 and in the House 95-37.

Legislative Evaluation Assembly  
1008 1st St. W. Apt. 226  
Hastings, MN 55033-1346  
Ph. (651) 480-1830  
2007 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

CONTACT:  
This report may be copied or purchased.