



1993 REPORT on the MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

by the

L E G I S L A T I V E
E V A L U A T I O N
A S S E M B L Y

of MINNESOTA, INC.

for an
INFORMED CITIZENRY



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 evaluations 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.

❖ SENATORS ❖



Joanne Benson



Terry Johnston



Gen Olson



Pat Pariseau



❖ REPRESENTATIVES ❖



Hilda Bettermann



Tim Commers



Steve Dehler



Jim Girard



Bob Haukoos



Gene Hugoson



LeRoy Koppendrayner



Warren Limmer



Arlon Lindner



Carol Molnau



Mark Olson



Tony Onnen



Alice Seagen



Steve Viggum



Bob Waltman



Gary Worke

Honorable Mention...

Senators: Duane Benson, Dick Day, Dennis Frederickson, Arlene Lesewski, Ed Oliver, Dan Stevens.

Representatives: Jerry Dempsey, Don Frerichs, Dave Gruenes, Gil Gutknecht, Mark Holsten, Jerry Knickerbocker, Teresa Lynch, Bill Macklin, Robert Ness, Dennis Ozment, Steven Smith, Doug Swenson, Barb Vickerman, Ken Wolf, Tom Workman.



EDUCATION IN MINNESOTA: WHENCE?

Omnibus Education Bill (HF350). Authors: Vellenga and Pogemiller. Since statehood our Minnesota constitution has said, "The legislature shall make such provision by taxation or otherwise as will secure a thorough and efficient system of public schools throughout the state." Our forefathers were direct and succinct.

House File 350 is the 1993 legislature's education bill. It fills 355 legal size pages. Reading it one has an urge to strike all our education statutes and their confusions and make a fresh start. Educators' professional jargon and a complication of state aids has made education law a contortion. For example, try to follow the convoluted language of this subdivision the legislature added -

Subd. 3b (Referendum Allowance Reduction.) A district's referendum allowance under subdivision 1c is reduced by the amounts calculated in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c).

(a) The referendum allowance equals the amount by which a district's supplemental revenue reduction exceeds the district's supplemental revenue allowance for fiscal year 1993.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), if a district's initial referendum allowance is less than ten percent of the formula allowance for that year, the reduction equals the lesser of (1) an amount equal to \$100, or (2) the amount calculated in paragraph (a).

Continued on page 7

KEY VOTES

Y = Yes d = Democratic - Farmer - Labor
 N = No r = Independent - Republican

- Indicates legislator excused, absent, or not voting.

* denotes vote favored by LEA.

1993% means percentage of legislator's votes favored by LEA in the 1993 session.

C% means legislator's career average LEA score.

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

1. **STATE SALARIES (HF15).** Author: Sviggum. Among other provisions, this bill, which LEA supports, provided for a one-year freeze on the salaries of State legislators. That is, the 1993 salaries would be the same as 1992 salaries. It was defeated in the House 60 - 70 and in the Senate 23 - 43.

2. **GENDER BALANCE ETC. (HF31).** Authors: Kahn, Pappas. This bill painstakingly and arrogantly shows the way in which certain legislators more and more ignore the needs of the public they are to serve, but instead put first the "politically correct" apportionment of government employment according to gender and, to the extent possible, according to "racial, ethnic, geographic, and socioeconomic diversity". Do they actually care about providing the best possible services for the public? Is the government workforce to be primarily a vehicle for social experimentation?

Say, for example, that a government agency employs seven women and six men, and is seeking one more employee. Under this law it would be illegal to hire a woman for the new position, even if she were clearly the most qualified applicant. In HF31, gender quota becomes the decisive "qualification" that overrides all other qualifications. (HF74 makes place of residence [Minneapolis] decisive over all other qualifications and considerations.) Compounding this affront to the public is another provision of HF 31 that states, "persons of an underrepresented gender may constitute less than half of the membership if...the agency serves the needs or addresses the concerns of a specific gender-defined population..." It would be hard to imagine legislation that would be more culturally divisive and conducive to inefficient and costly government. Government should, instead of quota engineering such as the above, have realistic job descriptions for all positions and pick the best qualified persons to fill them. This bill passed the House 77 - 54 and the Senate 37 - 29.

3. **MINNEAPOLIS EMPLOYMENT RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT (HF74).** Authors: Jefferson, Flynn. For reasons similar to those given regarding HF31, except that

 Please send me _____ copies of this 1993 Annual Report.

Copies from most years back to 1978 are also available.

They are 50¢ each, 12/\$5.00, or 100/\$35.00, rates for larger quantities available.

_____ I am interested in working with LEA.

An order or contribution will place you on the LEA's mailing list.

A contribution of \$10 or more will give you the voting rights of an annual membership.

SEND TO:

LEA
 20900 Dubarry Trail
 Farmington, MN 55024

phone: (612) 437-6473

residency is the decisive criterion instead of gender, this law is undesirable. However, there is one fairly logical reason for its enactment: Minneapolis employees will have to live in the situation they maintain. Regardless of the possible benefits or losses from such restrictions, the matter should be decided locally, by Minneapolis, not by the State. HF74 passed the House 76 - 53 and the Senate 40 - 27.

4. **TAX THE RICH (HF443).** Author: Pogemiller. This "replace everything" amendment by Sen. Pogemiller was a "last-ditch" attempt by the majority to increase the income tax rates for Minnesota's "wealthiest" taxpayers, purportedly using the proceeds to provide statewide school district property tax relief and to reduce class sizes. For persons earning \$85,000 per year, the tax increased from 8.5% to 10% of income. This is actually an increase in taxes of 17.6% (i.e., 10% divided by 8.5%). LEA opposes this discrimination against investors and job providers, which passed the House by a vote of 73 to 59, after the Senate approved it 43 to 22. In keeping with his promise of "No new taxes", Gov. Carlson vetoed the bill.

5. **WHOSE RIGHTS? (HF585).** Authors: Clark, Spear. This bill, now law, provides a number of importantly mitigating provisions that lessen, but still retain, its impact on the public's freedom to choose. It adds "sexual orientation" to statutes that forbid discrimination in housing, employment, etc., on the basis of race, color, age, religion, disability, national origin, sex, or marital status. It must be recognized that sexual preference is a behavioral characteristic, whereas certain others listed in this statute are not. In light of this law, one must rejoice to be neither an employer nor a landlord.

The bill states the following, "Sexual orientation" means having or being perceived as having an emotional, physical, or sexual attachment to another person without regard to the sex of that person or having or being perceived as having an orientation for such attachment, or having or being perceived as having a self-image or identity not traditionally associated with one's biological maleness or femaleness. "Sexual orientation" does not include a physical attachment to children by an adult." Neither this law nor any other can change the fact some persons of the type protected by this bill do have a physical and sexual attachment to children.*

Webster defines homosexual more clearly than does this bill as "of or characterized by sexual desire for those of the same sex". HF85 seems to support Insanitary Insanity (once more to Webster: "Insanitary - 'unclean enough to endanger health').

As with most laws, HF585 deals with competing rights, privileges, and desires. One person or group gains at the expense of the other. Some rights, such as those in the Bill of Rights, the right to trial by jury, for example, do not lessen the rights of others. However, statutes such as that created by HF585, codify rights for some at the expense of others. The question is whether or not justice is served and whether or not the well-being of the citizenry is promoted. This law prescribes whom an employer must hire. By that very fact it rules out others from being hired. And likewise in housing. However desirable it may be in some respects, anti-discrimination law of this kind necessarily becomes preference law. It infringes on the rights of some by giving preference to others. It mandates the kind of discrimination it purports to eliminate. This bill passed in the House 77 - 53 and in the Senate 37 - 30.

6. **WHERE SHALL YOU LIVE, COMRADE? (HF671).** Authors: Orfield, Novak. Communism is dead everywhere in

SENATE

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	1993	C
															%	%
d ADKINS, B. (St. Michael 19)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	Y	-		N	Y	N*	Y			28	36
d ANDERSON, E. (St. Paul 66)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	9
d BECKMAN, T. (Bricelyn 26)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	N*	Y			45	37
r BELANGER, W. (Bloomington 41)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	Y	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	Y	N*			73	64
r BENSON, D. (Lanesboro 31)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	Y	N*			82	72
r BENSON, J. (St. Cloud 16)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	N*	N*			91	60
d BERG, C. (Chokio 13)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	N*			73	60
d BERGLIN, L. (Minneapolis 61)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		-	Y	Y	Y			-2	12
d BERTRAM, J. (Paynesville 14)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			36	50
d BETZOLD, D. (Fridley 48)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	0
d CHANDLER, K. (White Bear Lake 55)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		Y*	Y	Y	Y			18	18
d CHMIELEWSKI, F. (Sturgeon Lake 8)	N	-	Y	-	N*	-	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			32	40
d COHEN, R. (St. Paul 64)	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			-2	6
r DAY, D. (Owatonna 28)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*	N	Y*	Y	N*	Y	N	N	82	63
r DILLE, S. (Dassel 20)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	-	Y*		Y*	Y	N*	Y			68	68
d FINN, H. (Cass Lake 4)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y*	Y	Y	Y			9	18
d FLYNN, C. (Minneapolis 62)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	O	Y*	Y	Y	Y	O	O	9	12
r FREDERICKSON, D.R. (New Ulm 23)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	N*	Y			82	60
d HANSON, P. (Ham Lake 50)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			45	45
d HOTTINGER, J. (Mankato 24)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	21
d JANEZICH, J. (Chisholm 5)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	-	Y	Y			-2	-2
r JOHNSON, D.E. (Willmar 15)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*	Y*	S	N	Y	Y	Y	S	S	45	57
d JOHNSON, D.J. (Cook 6)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		-	-	Y	Y			-4	17
d JOHNSON, J. (North Branch 18)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	9
r JOHNSTON, T. (Prior Lake 35)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*	E	Y*	Y	N*	N*	E	E	91	74
d KELLY, R. (St. Paul 67)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		-	Y	Y	-			-4	9
r KISCADEN, S. (Rochester 30)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	Y	N*	-		Y*	Y	Y	Y			58	58
r KNUTSON, D. (Burnsville 36)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*	N	Y*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	73	73
d KRENTZ, J. (Stillwater 51)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		Y*	Y	Y	Y			18	18
d KROENING, C. (Minneapolis 58)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			27	24
r LAIDIG, G. (Stillwater 56)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*	A	Y*	-	Y	Y	A	A	78	63
d LANGSETH, K. (Glyndon 9)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	-	N*	Y			43	33
r LARSON, C. (Fergus Falls 10)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	-	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			68	64
r LESEWSKI, A. (Marshall 21)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	N*	Y*	T	Y*	Y	N*	N*	T	T	82	82
d LESSARD, B. (International Falls 3)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			45	33
d LUTHER, W. (Brooklyn Park 47)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		Y*	Y	Y	Y			18	16
d MARTY, J. (Roseville 54)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	E	Y*	Y	Y	Y	E	E	9	11
r McGOWAN, P. (Maple Grove 33)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	Y	Y			64	65
d MERRIAM, G. (Coon Rapids 49)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y*	-	Y	N*			18	23
d METZEN, J. (South St. Paul 39)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	23
d MOE, R. (Erskine 2)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	11
d MONDALE, T. (St. Louis Park 44)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	V	Y*	Y	Y	Y	V	V	9	8
d MORSE, S. (Dakota 32)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	25
d MURPHY, S. (Red Wing 29)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	O	Y*	Y	Y	Y	O	O	18	18
r NEUVILLE, T. (Northfield 25)	Y*	N*	Y	-	N*	N*	Y*		-	Y	N*	N*			74	62
d NOVAK, S. (New Brighton 52)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	12
r OLIVER, E. (Deephaven 43)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*	T	Y*	Y	Y	N*	T	T	82	82
r OLSON, G. (Minnetrista 34)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	N*	N*			91	67
d PAPPAS, S. (St. Paul 65)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	8
r PARISEAU, P. (Farmington 37)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*	E	Y*	Y	N*	N*	E	E	91	67
d PIPER, P. (Austin 27)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	5
d POGEMILLER, L. (Minneapolis 59)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	6
d PRICE, L. (Woodbury 57)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	9
d RANUM, J. (Minneapolis 63)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			0	16
d REICHGOTT, E. (New Hope 46)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		-	Y	Y	Y			8	16
d RIVENESS, P. (Bloomington 40)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	9
r ROBERTSON, M. (Minnetonka 45)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	Y	N*	-		Y*	Y	Y	N*			68	68
r RUNBECK, L. (Circle Pines 53)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	Y	Y*		Y*	Y	Y	N*			64	64
d SAMS, D. (Staples 11)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	N*	N		Y*	Y	N*	Y			45	36
d SAMUELSON, D. (Brainerd 12)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			45	34
d SOLON, S. (Duluth 7)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N		-	-	Y	Y			-6	15
d SPEAR, A. (Minneapolis 60)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y*	Y	Y	Y			9	9
r STEVENS, D. (Mora 17)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	N*	Y			82	82
d STUMPF, L. (Thief River Falls 1)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			36	31
r TERWILLIGER, R. (Edina 42)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*	Y*		Y*	Y	Y	Y			55	63
d VICKERMAN, J. (Tracy 22)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y*		N	Y	N*	Y			36	38
d WIENER, D. (Eagan 38)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N		N	Y	Y	Y			9	9

HOUSE

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	1993	C
															%	%
r ABRAMS, R. (Minnetonka 45A)	Y*	Y	N*	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	67	52
d ANDERSON, I. (International Falls 3A)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	8	14
d ANDERSON, R. (Ottetail 10A)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	41
d ASCH, M. (North Oaks 53B)	Y*	Y	N*	N*	Y	N*		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	42	42
d BATTAGLIA, D. (Two Harbors 6A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	N	8	4
d BAUERLY, J. (Sauk Rapids 17B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	17	26
d BEARD, P. (Cottage Grove 57B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	-	-2	19
d BERGSON, B. (Osseo 48A)	Y*	Y	Y	N*	Y	Y		Y*		Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	42	42
d BERTRAM, J. (Paynesville 14B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	38
r BETTERMANN, H. (Brandon 10B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	78
r BISHOP, D. (Rochester 30B)	Y*	N*	Y	-	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	Y	-	Y*	46	44
r BLATZ, K. (Bloomington 40B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	75	64
d BROWN, C. (Appleton 13A)	Y*	-	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	N	16	30
d BROWN, K. (Northfield 25A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	17
d CARLSON, L. (Crystal 46B)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	17
d CARRUTHERS, P. (Brooklyn Center 47B)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	12
d CLARK, K. (Minneapolis 61A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	12
r COMMERS, T. (Mendota Heights 38A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
d COOPER, R. (Bird Island 15B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	O	N	O	Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	26
d DAUNER, M. (Hawley 9B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	Y		Y*		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	50	43
r DAVIDS, G. (Preston 31B)	N	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	Y	Y*	Y*	75	74
d DAWKINS, A. (St. Paul 65A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	10
r DEHLER, S. (St. Joseph 14A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
d DELMONT, M. (Lexington 51A)	N	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	H	N	H	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	7	7
r DEMPSEY, J. (Hastings 29A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	-		Y*		Y	N*	Y	Y*	Y*	80	80
d DORN, J. (Mankato 24A)	N	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y*		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	25
r ERHARDT, R. (Edina 42A)	Y*	Y	N*	N*	Y	N*	O	N	O	Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	67	60
d EVANS, G. (New Brighton 52B)	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	17
d FARRELL, J. (St. Paul 67A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	16
r FRERICHS, D. (Rochester 31A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	U	Y*	U	Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	83	84
d GARCIA, E. (Richfield 63B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	14
r GIRARD, J. (Lynd 21A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	73
r GOODNO, K. (Moorhead 9A)	Y*	Y	Y	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	75	75
d GREENFIELD, L. (Minneapolis 62A)	N	-	Y	Y	Y	-	S	N	S	-	Y	Y	N	N	-6	7
d GREILING, M. (Roseville 54B)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	17
r GRUENES, D. (St. Cloud 16B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	N*		Y*		-	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	89	66
d GUTKNECHT, G. (Rochester 30A)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	83	81
r HASSKAMP, K. (Crosby 12A)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	E	N	E	Y	Y	Y	-	Y*	16	34
r HAUKOOS, B. (Albert Lea 27A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	81
d HAUSMAN, A. (St. Paul 66B)	N	Y	-	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	7	10
r HOLSTEN, M. (Stillwater 56A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	83	83
d HUGOSON, G. (Granada 26A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	82
r HUNTLEY, T. (Duluth 6B)	N	N*	N*	Y	Y	Y	V	N	V	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	25	25
d JACOBS, J. (Coon Rapids 49B)	N	Y	N*	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	33	20
d JAROS, M. (Duluth 7B)	N	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	8	5
d JEFFERSON, R. (Minneapolis 58B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	O	N	O	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	8
d JENNINGS, L. (Harris 18B)	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y*		Y	Y	Y	-	Y*	25	41
d JOHNSON, A. (Spring Lake Park 48B)	N	Y	Y	N*	-	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	16	11
d JOHNSON, R. (Bemidji 14A)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	T	N	T	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	18
r JOHNSON, V. (Caledonia 32B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	Y	Y*	Y*	75	72
d KAHN, P. (Minneapolis 59B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	-	N	-2	9
d KALIS, H. (Walters 26B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	E	N	E	Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	40
d KELLEY, R. (Hopkins 44A)	Y*	Y	N*	N*	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	33	33
d KELSO, B. (Shakopee 35B)	Y*	Y	Y	N*	Y	N*		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	42	28
d KINKEL, A. (Park Rapids 4B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	21
d KLINZING, S. (Elk River 19B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	Y	Y		Y*		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	58	58
r KNICKERBOCKER, J. (Minnetonka 43B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	-		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	80	55
r KOPPENDRAYER, L. (Princeton 17A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	77
r KRINKIE, P. (Shoreview 53A)	Y*	N*	-	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	N	71	77
d KRUEGER, R. (Staples 11B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		Y*		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	33	31
d LASLEY, H. (Cambridge 18A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		-		Y	Y	Y	N	-	6	16
r LEPPIK, P. (Golden Valley 45B)	Y*	Y	-	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	53	51
d LIEDER, B. (Crookston 2A)	N	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	25
r LIMMER, W. (Maple Grove 33B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	79
d LINDNER, A. (Corcoran 33A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
r LONG, D. (Minneapolis 60A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	9
d LOUREY, B. (Kerrick 8B)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		-	Y	Y	N	Y*	16	17
d LUTHER, D. (Brooklyn Park 47A)	Y*	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	25	25

HOUSE

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	1993	C
															%	%
r LYNCH, T. (Andover 50B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	83	67
r MACKLIN, B. (Lakeville 37B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	83	65
d MAHON, M. (Bloomington 40A)	Y*	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	-	Y*	25	25
d MARIANI, C. (St. Paul 65B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		-	Y	Y	N	Y*	7	14
d McCOLLUM, B. (North St. Paul 55B)	Y*	Y	N*	N*	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	33	33
d McGUIRE, M. (Falcon Heights 54A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	10
d MILBERT, R. (South St. Paul 39B)	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	7	22
r MOLNAU, C. (Chaska 35A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
r MORRISON, C. (Burnsville 36B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	58	57
d MOSEL, D. (Gaylord 23B)	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y*		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	25	25
d MUNGER, W. (Duluth 7A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	9
d MURPHY, M. (Hermantown 8A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	19
d NEARY, P. (Afton 56B)	-	Y	N*	N*	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	23	23
d NELSON, S. (Sebeka 11A)	N	N*	Y	N*	N*	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	42	47
r NESS, R. (Dassel 20A)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	-	Y*	Y*	80	80
d OLSON, E. (Fosston 2B)	N	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	27
d OLSON, K. (Sherburn 22B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	28
r OLSON, M. (Big Lake 19A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
r ONNEN, T. (Cokato 20B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	O	Y*	O	Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	73
d OPATZ, J. (St. Cloud 16A)	Y*	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	42	42
d ORENSTEIN, H. (St. Paul 64B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	15
d ORFIELD, M. (Minneapolis 60B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	-	N	Y*	16	19
d OSTHOFF, T. (St. Paul 66A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	-		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	7	25
d OSTROM, D. (St. Peter 24B)	N	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y	H	N	H	Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	17	25
r OZMENT, D. (Rosemount 37A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	Y		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	83	64
r PAULY, S. (Eden Prairie 42B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	67	62
r PAWLENTY, T. (Eden Prairie 38B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*	O	Y*	O	Y	Y	N*	-	Y*	62	62
d PELOWSKI, G. (Winona 32A)	N	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	29
d PERLT, W. (Woodbury 57A)	Y*	Y	Y	N*	Y	N*		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	25	25
d PETERSON, D. (Madison 13B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	U	N	U	Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	24
d PUGH, T. (South St. Paul 39A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	24
d REDING, L. (Austin 27B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	15
d REST, A. (New Hope 46A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	-	N	Y*	16	22
r RHODES, J. (St. Louis Park 44B)	-	Y	N*	N*	Y	Y	S	Y*	S	Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*	43	43
d RICE, J. (Minnapolis 58A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		-		Y	-	Y	-	-	-8	14
d RODOSOVICH, P. (Faribault 25B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N*		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	24
d RUKAVINA, T. (Virginia 5A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	8
d SARNA, J. (Minneapolis 59A)	N	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	E	N	E	Y	-	Y	N	Y*	6	20
r SEAGREN, A. (Bloomington 41A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
d SEKHON, K. (Anoka 50A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	8	8
d SIMONEAU, W. (Fridley 52A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		-	Y	Y	N	N	-2	10
d SKOGLUND, W. (Minneapolis 62B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	15
r SMITH, S. (Mound 34A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	V	Y*	V	Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	83	77
d SOLBERG, L. (Bovey 3B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	15
d SPARBY, W. (Theif River Falls 1B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	-	Y	N	7	29
r STANIUS, B. (White Bear Lake 55A)	Y*	Y	Y	N*	N*	N*	O	Y*	O	Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	67	73
d STEENSMA, A. (Luverne 21B)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	33	33
r SVIGGUM, S. (Kenyon 28B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	80
r SWENSON, D. (Forest Lake 51B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*	T	Y*	T	Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	83	64
d TOMASSONI, D. (Chisholm 5B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	0
r TOMPKINS, E. (Apple Valley 36A)	-	N*	Y	N*	-	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	76	74
d TRIMBLE, S. (St. Paul 67B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	E	N	E	Y	Y	Y	N	-	-2	6
d TUNHEIM, J. (Kennedy 1A)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	8	27
r VAN DELLEN, H. (Plymouth 34B)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	67	67
d VELLENGA, K. (St. Paul 64A)	N	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	-	6	15
r VICKERMAN, B. (Redwood Falls 23A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	Y	Y*	Y*	83	83
d WAGENIUS, J. (Minneapolis 63A)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	8	13
r WALTMAN, B. (Elgin 29B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	81
r WEAVER, C. (Champlin 49A)	Y*	N*	Y	N*	Y	N*		Y*		Y	Y	N*	Y*	Y*	67	58
d WEJCMAN, L. (Minneapolis 61B)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	N	0	4
d WELLE, A. (Willmar 15A)	N	-	-	Y	-	Y		N		-	Y	Y	N	Y*	5	20
d WENZEL, S. (Little Falls 12B)	N	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	N*	Y	N	Y*	25	29
d WINTER, T. (Fulda 22A)	N	N*	Y	Y	N*	Y		N		Y	Y	Y	N	Y*	25	28
r WOLF, K. (Burnsville 41B)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		N		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	83	83
r WORKE, G. (Waseca 28A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	N*	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	92	92
r WORKMAN, T. (Chanhasen 43A)	Y*	N*	N*	N*	-	N*		Y*		Y	N*	N*	Y*	Y*	89	89

the world except in some third world countries, in many American universities and, it seems, in the Minnesota Legislature. Rep. Orfield wants the Metropolitan Council to coerce (withhold sewer and road improvements) your local government into patterning housing to fit his concept of a just society. He probably means well. He addresses real problems. But he apparently holds to the antiquated concept that poverty causes crime - rather than the other way around. So, he seems to reason, if the dwellers in the inner cities are moved into the suburbs (in public housing) the criminals among them will mend their ways.

Of course, only a small minority of the people in crime-ridden areas are criminals. The rest are the victims of crime in one way or another. One can see many old people fearfully walking the formerly safe streets where they in the past bought their houses and raised their families. And people who live in the suburbs would like to be able to frequent without fear the inner cities and to enjoy the shops, theaters, music halls, museums, and so forth. But dictatorial policies about who shall live where (or else!) are not acceptable if we want to keep our most precious inheritance as Americans, a free society. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that the population distributions he seeks will solve, or even mitigate, the situation.

An article in the Star Tribune of July 11, 1993, states, "inner-ring suburbs and central cities, he [Orfield] says, should coalesce to demand (emphasis added) that affluent areas share their wealth metrowide and should accept more metrowide responsibilities, including low-income housing." All must agree with Orfield's desire to help those who live in high crime, and consequently degraded, areas. But his method could generate long-term consequences of great harm to all.

Apart from its mostly-harmful content, this bill is fatally marred by obfuscating euphemisms and other obstacles to clear thought and understanding such as "comprehensive choice housing". This bill makes real the public's greatest fear of the Metro Council - its dictatorial power over elected government officials. HF671 passed in the House 82 - 48 and in the Senate 34 - 29. Fortunately, Gov. Carlson vetoed the bill.

7. **KNOWING TRANSMISSION OF HIV.** The general public is facing an increasing epidemic of HIV infection because of the reprehensible behavior of a small minority. Senator McGowan moved to amend HF1585, the omnibus crime bill, making it a felony punishable by fine and a prison sentence of up to life for a diagnosed HIV-infected person to engage in sexual intercourse without first disclosing the fact of being infected. This crime would also have included knowingly giving HIV-infected blood or semen to a person, blood bank, or medical facility for the purpose of transfusion or insemination. The fact is that the AIDS problem would significantly diminish if sexual relations were kept in heterosexual marital fidelity. Regrettably, Sen. McGowan's amendment failed on a 32 - 32 tie vote.
8. **60% VOTE FOR TAX INCREASE (HF1735).** Rep. Smith moved to amend HF1735, the omnibus State Government Operations bill, by adding the following to the appropriate section, "Any law that would increase the rate of a tax or enlarge the class of objects that are subject to the tax shall not take effect without the affirmative vote of 60 percent of all the members of the house of representatives." This highly beneficial amendment failed to pass 47 - 80.
9. **ABOLISH THE LOTTERY.** Sen. Dille offered an amendment to SF103 to abolish the State lottery. This was

another proposal to deal with the problems brought on by legalized gambling in Minnesota. It might seem to some as if gambling, legal or illegal, manufactures money or grows it on trees. It is not so. The money that is spent in gambling comes out of the pockets and checking accounts of people, as do other payments for the necessities of life. LEA strongly favors this amendment. It failed on a 30 - 31 vote.

10. **SELECTIVE FINANCING (SF338).** Authors: Bauerly, J.B. Johnson. This legislation establishes Minnesota Business Finance, Inc., which is the legal successor to Opportunities Minnesota, Inc., which in turn was one of the four successor organizations of the erstwhile Greater Minnesota Corporation of ill repute. All assets and liabilities are included in the transfer. It is intended to provide dollar-for-dollar matching funds to a collaborative network or association of over 50 dues-paying firms having fewer than 300 employees and having diversity of goods and services. This legislation looks like it was written and adopted to accommodate a specific group of commercial and/or industrial enterprises. Who? Very interesting. SF338 passed the House 128 to 0 and the Senate 61 to 0.
11. **DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ABORTION PROTESTORS (SF1046).** Authors: Orenstein, Pappas. Since 1973, millions of anti-abortion women and men have demonstrated all across the country with a remarkably low number of violent incidents. Yet, pro-abortion advocates were able to push through a new law that singles out pro-life protesters for harsh criminal and civil penalties that are not applied to people protesting other issues. Those convicted under this law are subject to gross misdemeanor penalties - up to a year in jail and a \$3,000 fine. Also, abortion "clinics," and their employees, can bring civil suits to harass pro-life who do sidewalk counseling or who exercise their Amendment rights to protest abortion. We strongly oppose this new law, which passed on final votes of 84 - 47 in the House and 43 - 24 in the Senate.
12. **THE VETOED OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL (SF1613).** Authors: Kroening, Rice. This omnibus Jobs, Housing, and Economic Development appropriations bill contained some worthwhile things, but it was \$26 million above the spending target, and would have been a major cause of an unbalanced State budget. The State Constitution requires that the budget be balanced. This bill passed the House 92 - 39 and the Senate 53 - 13. The Governor then correctly vetoed it.
13. **BUDGET BALANCING RULE REJECTED (HOUSE RULES).** Representative Sviggum moved to amend The Permanent Rules of the House by inserting a section reading, "Any amendment raising appropriation or taxes must be balanced with an equal amendment of appropriation or tax increase or decrease to keep the bill within the budget resolution. Amendments may provide for the appropriation decrease or increase from other bills that are being considered by the House." Despite the concern about spending and taxing restraints expressed by virtually all legislators, hypocrisy prevailed, and the proposal was defeated by a 52 - 80 vote.
14. **NO PAY FOR LOBBYING (HOUSE RULES).** Molnau offered a sensible motion to amend House Rules by adding this language: "No member may accept compensation for lobbying." It passed the House 109 - 20.

LIGHT RAIL FOR MINNESOTA METRO (SF414)

Author: Flynn. This bill relates to procedures for design, approval, and construction. The only rail corridor mentioned is that between downtown Minneapolis and downtown St. Paul. Provision is made for coordination with bus lines and other modes of transportation.

The idea of a light rail system to serve the Metro Area here in Minnesota is appealing. The expenditure of two important resources, time and fuel, is enormous in the seven or nine county area just in going to and from work. Could an affordable and practical rail system be constructed that would significantly reduce these expenditures?

LEA favors a good, affordable rail system. However, before the construction of even a test corridor, the feasibility of a light rail system for the Metro Area must be determined. The first step must be to define a system that would do the job, including best-estimate costs. This should have been done years ago. Here are some things to be considered:

1. A very small percentage of the people in the Metro Area live in downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul. Only a small minority work there. Most people live in the suburbs, the residential parts of cities, and the "ex-burbs". Most people work in these same kinds of locations in which they live.
2. It is unreasonable, and would be unjust, to produce a rail system that served just the downtown areas, and at the same time expect the entire populace of the Metro Area to pay for it, even if they might receive some incidental benefits.
3. Of course, rail and bus transportation must be fully coordinated. As previously stated, current planners are doing this under the provisions of SF414.
4. The Metro Area is roughly 30 miles square - and growing.
5. To be adequate, a rail system should be capable of serving all the people in this area and be expandable as well. To even intend to do less would be unacceptable.
6. Essentially "one-dimensional" cities such as New York and Zurich are served well by rail systems. But the Minnesota Metro Area is definitely two-dimensional. Furthermore, it is not city center oriented; rail "spokes" radiating from city centers will not do the job needed.
7. The Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system in the San Francisco, Oakland, etc. area, built about 20 years ago, cost about \$45 million per mile. It is reasonable to expect that a Minnesota Metro Area rail system would cost \$100 million per mile, or more.

8. It would be reasonable for a rider within the Metro Area to have to go no more than one mile to reach the rail line (not necessarily a station), and no more than one mile from the rail line to his or her place of work. Most riders should have to make no more than one transfer. In the downtown areas the access points should generally be reachable by shorter walks.

9. The criteria of 8 above could be satisfied by a grid of rails spaced two miles apart, half running east-and-west and half running north-and-south. For the 30-mile by 30-mile Metro Area, this would require about 900 miles of track. At \$100,000,000 per mile, this would total \$90,000,000,000 construction cost. For the 2.5 million people in the metro area, this would equate to about \$36,000 from every man, woman, and child.

The issuance of municipal bonds yielding 5 percent interest would require \$4,500,000,000 per year to pay bondholders. This would equate to \$1,800 from every man, woman, and child each year for construction alone (except as the bonds mature and have to be redeemed.)

10. Of course, a perfect rectangular grid is only hypothetical - existing buildings, the terrain, the rivers, and other factors would necessarily force significant changes.

11. If service was degraded to two mile distance from the track instead of the one mile mentioned in point 8, cost would be reduced. But so would usage and revenues.

12. Passenger revenues reasonably should pay for all operating costs (payroll, rail maintenance, vehicle maintenance, energy/fuel, etc.) as well as a significant proportion of construction costs.

LEA believes that the twelve points above represent reasonable conjectures that can be altered as experience and wiser heads suggest. It would take many years to complete such a system, spreading out but perhaps also increasing costs. It is clear that a system that serves the whole area would be very expensive indeed, probably more than can be afforded.

The main point to be made is that it is foolish to spend a lot of money until a reasonably accurate idea of complete system configuration and cost is determined.

The approach specified in SF414 is a fairly cautious one that takes into account a number of techno-economic factors as well as political ones. Its focus is primarily on the political aspects. No indication of projected costs is given. SF414 passed the House 104 - 25 and the Senate 63 - 1. It was not used in the ratings in this report.

Education in Minnesota continued from page 1...

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (a) or (b), a school district's referendum allowance reduction equals (1) an amount equal to \$100, times (2) one minus the ratio of 20 percent of the initial referendum allowance limit minus the district's initial referendum allowance limit to 20 percent of the formula allowance for that year if:

- (i) the district's adjusted net tax capacity for assessment year 1992 per actual pupil unit for fiscal year 1995 is less than \$3000;
- (ii) the district's net unappropriated operating fund balance as of June 30, 1993 divided by the actual pupil units for fiscal year 1995 is less than \$200
- (iii) the district's supplemental revenue allowance for fiscal year 1993 is equal to zero; and
- (iv) the district's initial referendum revenue authority for the current year divided by the district's net tax capacity for assessment year 1992 is greater than ten percent."

LEA regrets using space in this report to repeat all this, and apologizes for the consequent abuse to readers, but it illustrates our point. The law is full of such gobbledygook.

LEA is not using HF#350 in its 1993 ratings. The bill does many good and necessary things, like providing core monies so that our schools can operate, repealing many parts of the law in which the state made certain requirements of local districts but provided no money for implementation, and facilitating greater parent participation in determination of local school policy and teaching practices. The new law tries to limit the lower grade classes to 17 pupils - and compensate for the fact that most districts have neither the personnel nor facilities to comply with this desirable ideal.

The state has long provided "basic" (changed to "core" in the bill) aids to all local school districts. The Department of Education informs us that there are, in addition to core aids, about 59 other types of aids - the "Referendum Allowance" that is "clarified" above is just one of them. Bureaucrats in the Department administer all of this. They control Minnesota education.

Permeating both the Minnesota education atmosphere and the omnibus bill is a sense of failure of our system. Sensing this failure the hierarchy grasps at any "innovation." We have been aware of the "new" outcome based education (OBE) (of which more later). The 1993 law provides still another "new" program. It is this:

"Sec. 49. (Change-Oriented Schools.)

Subdivision 1. (Establishment; Purpose)

- (a) A five-year pilot project is established to permit up to three project participants selected by the commissioner of education to develop and implement substantive changes* in a school's educational program and operational structure.
- (b) The purpose of the pilot project is to identify innovative* educational strategies which effectively (Surely we don't want them to be ineffective, do we?) improve public education by:
 - (1) increasing students' academic and vocational abilities and educational opportunities through relevant readily measurable, and clearly defined (Who's talking?) interdisciplinary subject matter and skills-oriented outcomes and performance standards;
 - (2) promoting innovative* approaches to teaching through meaningful, site-based decision making; and
 - (3) developing a service-oriented management and operational structure that allows school staff at the school site to identify students' educational needs and effectively allocate resources to meet those needs."

Now maybe all the legislators who voted for this bill understand exactly what all this education jargon means and can translate it into understandable English for all of us. "Promoting innovative* approaches to teaching through meaningful, site-based decision making." Does it mean teachers are supposed to discard all the ages-proven methods of effective teaching? Does it mean teachers are supposed to be aware of the educational levels reached by their pupils and what is still needed to raise those levels? Now really!! Haven't good teachers and good schools been doing their job? Or have we none such? The legislature says we must spend millions more money "to develop and implement substantive changes in our schools' educational programs and structures." Innovation! Change! Sometimes people worship innovation and change in themselves, whether for good or ill.

This law follows close upon the heels of the law of two years ago, still in effect, establishing pilot "outcome based schools." Increasingly we've been hearing of discussions of outcome based education (OBE) but polls indicate that most people have little idea of what OBE entails. Reading this will not enlighten one. Attendance at orientation meetings on the subject seems of no help. People come away knowing little more than before.

The 1991 legislature was so addled and unsure over what OBE means that after providing millions of our dollars for experimental purpose, as sort of an afterthought, it instructed the State Department of Education to define it. What really is the legislative intent? So much for legislative leadership.

EDUCATION IS IN CRISIS IN MINNESOTA - AS IT IS THROUGHOUT THE NATION.

The 1991 law authorized ten OBE "pilot" schools, but the program was to be generally promoted beyond that by the Department. In keeping with this directive, in mid-August 1993, the Commissioner held a conference with all school superintendents further encouraging and explaining to them the blessings of OBE. The next day he was summarily fired by the Governor. He wasn't doing enough to promote OBE. The word from the Governor's office: "We're now in a struggle for the soul of the entire (education) industry." (A revealing application of the word, industry.) According to news reports the commissioner's replacement was picked by the Governor's wife, (St. Paul Pioneer Press, August 14th). This may signal a new (innovative?) approach to education and executive government in Minnesota.

The education establishment says that in OBE a student must have learned certain prescribed things before being promoted and graduated, a backhanded admission that a high school diploma has not been meant by the professionals to be more than an attendance certificate. Advocates of the new approach say that maybe 20 percent of what shall be required of students are the basics of academic subjects such as history, language and math. In hearing explanations of OBE one never hears such things as at what grade level a child is to be able to add three-digit numbers, or do square root in math; when he shall know the states of the Union, the nations of Asia or Africa; our Presidents. One OBE advocate said recently,

*LEA has underlined some words in this report for emphasis.

Education in Minnesota continued...

"If I teach American History I would leave Chester Arthur and James Garfield alone." Does he propose to leave Washington, Lincoln, Wilson and the Roosevelts alone too? The advocate continues, "Instead I would engage students individually." Does this mean students need not learn any facts? Unless we learn the lessons of the past how can we escape repeating the mistakes of the past?

One state's OBE program provides, "Students are to function as caring and responsible individuals," though as is typical in "the industry" nowhere are the words caring and responsible defined, nor is it stated as to who shall determine what is caring and responsible.

Much of the concern and skepticism - and there are indications that folk, especially parents, are becoming more and more concerned - is as to what the 80 percent of non-academic curriculum is to be about. Values? What kind? A major Minnesota daily newspaper recently chided a legislator for wanting to require that family values be taught in all schools of the state, implying that the paper's publishers and editors do not believe in family values and do not want them taught. But shall teen-age and premarital sex, and sodomy, be encouraged and taught? The '91 legislature required the State Board of Education to formulate a "graduation rule". The '93 legislature expanded on this and decreed the rule shall encompass "the basic knowledge and skills determined necessary by the board for graduates to become productive employees, parents and citizens". (No entrepreneurs and employers? Is everyone to be employed by the state? Who defines productive parents? Planned Parenthood?)

The graduate, or the dropout, has always been the product, the outcome, of the education process. The idea of "outcome" is neither innovative nor novel.

Some recall that for many years, into the 1930s, rural elementary school students were given examinations prepared and administered by the State Board of Education. These "state boards" came in six subjects: Spelling, Geography, History, Civics, Grammar and Arithmetic. They were given in March and May of each year. Teachers had a pretty good idea of what would be covered in these exams. They kept a file of past tests. Very frequently the exact question of an exam two or three years back was repeated. Unless a pupil received a passing grade in five of the subjects he never received an eighth grade diploma. On the other hand, possession of such a diploma entitled one to admission into any high school in the state. The public had a general understanding of the diploma holder's academic skills. Would a state board of education of the '90s consider this idea sufficient of an innovation to reapply it?

Buried within HF350 is a provision which has not been publicized. It requires the establishment of a 24-person "coalition" "to promote public understanding of and support for policies and practices that help Minnesota students attain world-class education outcomes and succeed in the 21st century. The coalition shall promote innovation and substantial reform in education. (This) includes (1) developing a strategic plan and corresponding target date for implementing major reform goals and practices; (2) encouraging and supporting policies to bring systematic change into the state's public schools".

Jargon aside, the unfocussed wording of HF350 cited in this directive leaves open the possibility of a constructive revolution in Minnesota education. That will be in the hands of the 24 coalition members. WHO ARE THEY TO BE?

The coalition "must include eight people directly involved in public education". That is only one third of them. Beyond that? Six, including one appointed by the Senate committee on committees and one by the speaker of the House (which two shall also be on the panel appointing the coalition), shall represent state and local governments. The other ten shall be "public members, including parents, business leaders, labor leaders, government leaders, educators, journalists and others who have demonstrated a commitment to excellence in Minnesota public schools".

Here we go again. "Excellence". "Excellence in education" is a term which has been bandied about in "scholarly" circles for decades. But neither law, nor legislature, nor "industry" hierarchy ever define or explain what "excellence" means in this context. For example, WHO IS, AND WHO ISN'T, DEEMED TO BE "COMMITTED TO EXCELLENCE"? Only those who have the blessing of the Department?

In addition to the two named by the Senate committee on committees and the House speaker to serve on the four-member panel to make appointments to the coalition, an appointee of the Governor and the Commissioner of Education, who shall chair the panel, shall comprise the appointment group. In the August uncertainty over who is speaker and who is commissioner, and the directive in the law that some of the 24 must be appointed before September 1, 1993 (now past) - - well, there could be confusion in this process too.

But there is the remote possibility that enough of the "public members" and the representatives of local government could really call for responsible and sensible "major reform". The coalition could even call for striking all existing education statutes from the books and make a fresh start, which was suggested as a palpable idea at the beginning of this discussion. But maybe that would not be considered innovative.

LEA

20900 Dubarry Trail
Farmington, MN 55024

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
ST. PAUL, MN
PERMIT NO. 4722