

Bab Knudson

THE
ANNUAL REPORT
ON
LEGISLATORS
1973



RATING OF YOUR LEGISLATOR

\$2.00

AN ANALYSIS

By

LEA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. What does LEA do?
- II. Goals of LEA.
- III. Purpose of this report, introductions, voting & spending
- IV. The bills used in vote rating.
- V. House vote record.
- VI. Senate vote record.
- VII. House introduction scores.
- VIII. Senate introduction scores.
- IX. The ranking of the Legislators.

- IX* The ranking of the subgroups
- XIII* General introduction notes
- XII* Notes introduction notes
- VI* General notes notes
- V* Notes notes notes
- IV* The notes notes in notes notes
- III* Notes of notes notes notes notes notes notes notes notes
- II* Notes of notes
- I* Notes notes notes

NOTE ON NOTES

RATING OF YOUR LEGISLATOR

LEA is a non-profit, multi-partisan group of citizens who donate their services to keep the legislative process on a high level of performance. Each member pays his own way and expects nothing in return except opportunity of participating in a better picture of Minnesota legislation than is otherwise seen.

ANNUAL REPORT

WHAT DOES LEA DO?

The Legislative Evaluation Assembly of Minnesota examined all bills introduced in the Minnesota Legislature in 1973, evaluated those of political importance and determined the overall thrust of the legislative process in terms of the stated, implicit and unintentional meanings of legislation introduced, whether or not acted upon in the current year. LEA is also concerned with the cumulative and interactive effect of the many laws created by individual pieces of legislation. The total impact, as well as the separate provisions, is assessed.

The 1973 session of the Legislature saw over 2000 bills introduced into each House. Several hundred were identified as having fundamental political importance. These were sorted into seven categories: American Form of Government; Private Property; Religion, Justice and Morality; Taxes; Education; Welfare; and Control of the Individual.

The Legislative Evaluation Assembly

The LEA analysis, drawing upon some of the source documents behind the bills, is published in the LEA report. The report leads and forces events and legislation along the path away from self government and respect for the individual and his freedom.

LEA will release two major reports, one rating the legislators on their introductions, spending and votes in the 1973 session, in accordance with procedures outlined in the pages to follow and one on the 1973 legislation. Titled "Trends in Legislation" it reports the principal thrust of the bills introduced and analysis of typical bills.

The

1973

AN ANALYSIS

by

30 West Baker St. St. Paul, Minn. 55107

WHAT IS LEA?

LEA is a non-profit, multi-partisan group of citizens who donate their services to keep the public informed on Minnesota legislation. Each member pays his own way and expects nothing in return except the opportunity of presenting a better picture of Minnesota legislation than might otherwise be seen.

WHAT DOES LEA DO?

The Legislative Evaluation Assembly of Minnesota examined all bills introduced in the Minnesota Legislature in 1973, evaluated those of political importance and determined the overall thrust of the aggregate in seven major issue areas. LEA has evaluated the legislation trends in terms of the stated, implicit and unintentional meanings of legislation introduced, whether or not acted upon in the current year. LEA is also concerned with the cumulative and interactive effect of the many laws created by individual pieces of legislation. The total impact, as well as the separate provisions, is assessed.

The 1973 session of the Legislature saw over 2500 bills introduced into each House. Of these, several hundred were identified as have fundamental political importance. These were sorted into seven categories: American Form of Government; Private Property; Religion, Justice and Morality; Taxes; Education; Welfare; and Control of the Individual.

The LEA analysis, drawing upon some of the source documents behind the bills introduced, identifies some of the groups leading and forcing events and legislation along the path away from self government and respect for the individual and his freedom.

LEA will release two major reports, one rating the legislators on their introductions, spending and votes in the 1973 session, in accordance with procedures outlined in the pages to follow and one on the 1973 legislation. titled "Trends in Transition" it reports the principal thrust of the bills introduced and analysis of typical bills.

LEA HAS THREE PRIMARY OBJECTIVES:

To keep Minnesota citizens informed in a timely manner of legislation which has been introduced in the State Legislature and is of high importance to individual freedom; a free economy; justice and order; national security; and limited, constitutional government. Information is distributed by LEA in the form of Legislative Releases containing facts citizens can use in acting to support or oppose the bills at question.

To produce carefully reasoned analyses, study reports, position papers, suggested amendments to legislation, and model bills or portions thereof. Specific suggestions for specific bills as well as analysis of broad issue areas from which legislation might arise are produced.

To rate each Senator and Representative of the Minnesota Legislature on his performance from a number of viewpoints: his voting record (the way ratings are conventionally made); and the amount of spending and the number of spending bills in which the appropriation is not specified he introduces. These in depth profiles will be consolidated in a booklet produced at the end of the legislative session or during a pause of several months or more in the session.

Purpose: This report is published to provide Minnesota citizens with specific information about the performance of their Senators and Representatives in the Minnesota Legislature. The criteria used in evaluating performance are shown on a following page.

Approach: LEA set out to provide a more thorough, detailed, and truly meaningful type of report than has been prepared up to now by any organization. We felt that what a legislator introduces is just as important as how he votes. We know also that his votes in committee are as important as his votes on the floor, but because the resolution to record committee votes was defeated in both houses, we do not have all committee vote information available to us. On the other hand, we have compiled a record of all the bills introduced by every legislator in 1973, whether as chief author or as co-author. This report uses that information in evaluating and quantifying performance. Three kinds of performance data are presented for each legislator as follows.

Introductions: Every bill selected by LEA as being important on political principle was given a rating of 2, 3, or 4, with a plus or minus sign attached depending on whether LEA judged it to be a good bill or a bad one. Furthermore, the bills were sorted into legislative categories A through H (the meanings of the categories is discussed later). Each legislator's bills were also, therefore, sorted out in categories A through H. If a legislator introduced a bill with a rating of 3+, and he was first author, the rating would be multiplied by two, and he would score six "+" points. If a co-author, he would score three + points. The + and - points for each legislator are tabulated by legislative category and the points for all categories are then summed up. All these data are presented in this report. They will reveal not only the total amount of good and bad legislation he introduces, but also indicate the categories in which he places his emphasis.

The reader can rightly ask the question, "What about the legislator who introduces few bills, or bills of a 'neutral' character? Won't this scoring method penalize him?" In reply, we must state that we have a great deal of respect for the Senator or Representative who sponsors those many 'neutral' bills that get the necessary work of state government done. Such legislators are essential to viable government. We also respect the legislator who authors few bills (who needs more laws?), and we look with suspicion at those who seem to think they are in a contest to create the most new laws. The neutral and

small volume introducers get their due from our rating system, because the majority of rated bills are undesirable, and zero points will, therefore, rank in the upper half on the relative (percentage) scale used.

We must explain why we see most rated bills as being undesirable. The reason is simply this: most bills seek to expand or intensify government control over people, either directly in the form of regulations, or indirectly by taking his money from him in taxes to fund some "public" program, thus depriving him of the opportunity to use his money as he sees fit. Some bills, fortunately, counter this tendency.

Spending: The appropriations each legislator introduced were summed and are presented in this report, providing a second dimension to his performance profile. For the 1973 report, however, we are not satisfied that we have accurately identified the spending (and, therefore, taxing) each has caused. Certainly, the total of what we have listed does not approach the total State budget. Most of this spending is wrapped up in the general appropriation bills, and it is difficult to assign individual spending responsibilities for these. The reader is advised, therefore, to use the "spending" scores with caution. We retain them in the report because we hope to improve our techniques for developing spending data.

Voting: This is the usual method of scoring, the one employed by many groups including ACU, ACA, ADA, and COPE. We chose a fairly large sample of votes in order to yield reliable data. Some of the votes were for passage of the bill, some for amendment, and one to return to committee. Some votes were much more important than others, so we assigned them weights of 1, 2, or 3. A correct vote is represented by the weight preceded by a "+" sign, an incorrect vote by a "-".

We feel that failure to vote, except in the case of an excused absence, is undesirable, and we so indicate by an "n", which counts as a minus one in the scoring. An excused absence is indicated by an "A", and does not count in the tabulations.

We regret that LEA had to approve of so many "no" votes this (1973) session, but very few of the good and significant bills introduced, and there were many of them, got to the floor for a vote.

The Legislative Categories: Eight categories, "A" through "H". "H" represents "Other" or "Miscellaneous". All bills used in making the ratings in this report are in "A" through "G", none in "H" being as important. Each of the legislative categories is fully described in LEA's recent report on 1973 legislation, entitled "The Annual Report on Legislation". Therefore, merely skeleton descriptions of the categories are, listed below.

Cat. A. American Form of Government. Consists of legislation which primarily affect the nature of government itself.

Cat. B. Private Ownership of Property. Concerns housing, free enterprise business, control or restrictions on free use of personal abilities.

Cat. C. Religion and Morality. This category groups legislation on the interrelated topics of religion, morality, justice, and order.

Cat. D. Taxes. Spending and taxes.

Cat. E. Education.

Cat. F. Welfare.

Cat. G. Control of the Individual.

BILLS USED IN RATING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CATEGORY A

H.F. 2 Party Designation of Legislators. Although party designation for elections for the state legislature is used in most states and is not objectionable in itself, this bill is very bad because it rules out the opportunities to run in the primary elections. Officially, there are only two parties in the State of Minnesota, the Democratic-Farmer-Labor (not Democratic alone) party and the Republican Party. It takes 5 percent of the vote in the previous statewide election for a "party" to become an official party in the State. Independents can still run in the general election, being placed on the ballot by petition. This bill, passed into law, is doubly bad in that the candidates of the majority party are always listed first, and independent studies have shown that being first on the ballot is worth several percent of the vote cast. The vote in the house was for final passage. A "no" scores 3 points.

H.F. 515 Elected Metropolitan Council. This bill would both provide for an elected Metropolitan Council. Elective office over appointive office is much to be preferred in most cases, and the members of the Metro Council are now appointed to their offices. Election of the Council would, however, legitimize and ratify Regional/Metropolitan Government. Passage of the bill would constitute acceptance of the destruction of local self-government. An elected council would also have greater power to tax and rule than would an appointive power, or, at least, it would solidify those powers sooner. As the imposition of regional government upon the people and the accompanying abolition of local self-government is a crisis of freedom, anything which would tend to "permanentatize" the Metro Council is bad. The vote in the House was for passage. It passed the House but was defeated in the Senate. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 308 Department of Finance. This legislation creates a Department of Finance, concentrating the powers of the State Treasurer and the State Auditor in a single department. The

The Commissioner of Finance would be appointed by the Governor.

nor rather than elected. As the audit function would be part of the unified department, the Auditor would be in no position to check up on the department (his boss). This would remove some healthy cross checks which now exist.

Equally important, these new super-departments, of which Finance is one (others are Transportation, Consumer Affairs, Human Resources) would not be directed by elected persons. This bill became law. It is part of the plan to abolish the elective state officers of Auditor, Treasurer, Attorney General, and Secretary of State. The vote in the House was for passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

S.F. 736. The Anti-Stenvig Act. This bill would require party designation for candidates for office in cities of the first-class, as well as for State offices. Furthermore, only the DFL and Republican Parties exist officially (according to Minnesota law) because a 5% or greater vote in the previous Statewide election is needed to officially be a party. Only an official party can use the polling system for primary elections, place candidates on the ballot without petition, etc. This bill, therefore, precludes true Independents from running in the primaries in cities of the first-class. It is specifically and obviously designed to prevent Charles Stenvig from running in the mayoral primaries in Minneapolis, and has succeeded in preventing him from doing so. It is generally known as the "Anti-Stenvig Act." The vote is on the final passage. A "no" scores 2 points.

S.F. 2016. This bill, which unbelievably became law, requires the state planning office to make grants, without monetary limit, from available appropriations, to the Regions. Furthermore, it permits the governing bodies of the Regions to issue tax anticipation certificates of indebtedness (bonds). This would not only strengthen the power of the Regions, while at the same time weakening local self-government, but it would add to our already intolerable tax burden. Vote was on final passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

S.F. 1246. Multiple Voting. This bill, now law, allows any person to register and vote at the polls on election day, no previous registration being required. One need merely to present identification as a resident at the polls. And amazingly, oral identification by a person previously registered is all that is required. It is entirely possible for one dishonest person to cast his vote in many precincts on election day. The opportunity for mass voting fraud is unlimited. Invalidation of his extra votes is theoretically possible by investigation and legal action after the election. If his party wins the election, however, they will hold office, and the investigation will never occur, or will find no significant evidence of fraud. This is an incredibly bad law. Its proponents are obviously

those who expect to have the most dishonest voters on their side. An investigation has strongly indicated that several thousand invalid votes were cast, as a result of this law, in the recent defeat of Charles Stenvig as mayor of Minneapolis. Vote is on final passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1508. To Conquer, Divide and Subdue the Citizens of Seven Counties. This law directs the Metropolitan Council to develop a plan to (1) consolidate by annexation the local governing units in the metropolitan area, and (2) subdivide the consolidated area into administrative subdivisions according to the Council's plan. Furthermore, the legislation provides that the Minnesota Municipal Commission would plan an orderly annexation of an area anywhere in the State by a municipality whenever the PCA or any other State Agency orders a municipality to extend service to the area. In addition, the petition of 20% of the landowners, or 100 landowners, whichever is less, can petition the Commission for annexation. Councils of the affected municipalities or towns may not reject consolidation if it is directed by the Commission.

Needless to say, these bills state that their purpose is the "strengthening of local government," while their obvious, true intent is the opposite. The Commission would also be empowered to order the County Auditor to revise tax records and re-spread levies, or to order the County Treasurer to re-distribute taxes. This is remarkable legislation in that it does not attempt to hide its contempt for the rights and freedom of individuals. The vote is on final passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

S.F. 681. Limiting Citizens' Choice for Sheriff. would require sheriffs, whether appointed or elected, to have attended and graduated from the Peace Officer School. Sheriffs in office as of 1 August 1973 would be exempted. The people would be deprived of the ability to make their own choice of sheriff. Although training and minimal standards are good, these provisions could be used to control the composition of "peace officer" forces along ideological lines. The potential benefits do not seem to warrant taking this risk. The bill became law. Vote is on final passage. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

CATEGORY B

H.F. 2007. MTC to Complete Mass Transport Program ASAP. This bill would direct the Metropolitan Transit Commission to complete its program for the development of a mass transportation system as soon as possible. No price tag is specified, but it assuredly would be staggering. There is doubt that MTC has a feasible, much less good, plan for mass transport. This bill shows extremely poor judgement and total disregard for the taxpayer. The vote in the House was on final passage. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

H.F. 246. Continue Subsidized Housing, Etc. This was a bill to transmit a memorial to the President and Congress to continue subsidised housing, model cities, and related activities by release of funds. Because the Legislature does not have the power to create law in this instance, the vote is not of the highest importance, but it is an excellent indicator of political philosophy. Vote in the House is on final passage. A "no" vote scores 2 point.

H.F. 491 OSHA. This bill, passed into law, reflects the national Occupational Safety and Health Act. While the safety and health of all working men and women (which includes LEA members) is of concern to us all, this law has several extremely bad features which are of doubtful constitutionality. It permits an OSHA inspector to enter a private business premises without prior notice and without a warrant. It empowers the inspector to arbitrarily levy fines (large ones) based on his arbitrary dictates of requirements and time for compliance. Furthermore, it violates the constitutional right of the accused to face his accuser in that the person reporting real or alleged safety or health hazards will not be made known to the accused. Surely it would have been possible to construct a health and safety law which did not trample on so many constitutional rights. The vote was on final passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

S.F. 1283. Commission on Cable Communication. The Federal Communication Commission regulates radio and TV broadcasting; and such regulation is necessary because the radio frequency spectrum is a limited resource, there are only so many channels or transmission slots available. They must be allocated equitably, and transmissions must be regulated so as not to interfere with others. The methods to be employed in solving the allocation-interference problem can certainly be argued, but the problems must be faced by some kinds of controls.

Cable transmission, on the other hand, does not radiate appreciably from the cable. More than one cable system can go to users of cable communication. While there are economic deterrents to obtaining all the communications capacity by cables that one could possibly want, there are no inherent or natural limits. Furthermore, the variety of uses to which cable networks and systems can be put have not been tapped. As for technical standards to assure compatibility of components, these can be derived far better by industry and the technical societies than by government.

Ways to enhance competition between cable systems and among users within the capacity of competing cables should be fostered by government. Here, at this early stage in what is certain to become a vast industry supplying many services to individuals and organizations, is an opportunity to open the gates to innovative and cost saving competition rather than the stultifying regulation that goes with monopoly franchise such as the current telephone systems and utilities enjoy.

A clear need for this commission has not been demonstrated. One medium of mass electrical communications should have been left unregulated and unfranchised, so that the benefits of a free, competitive system can be had. A golden opportunity for good was crushed by passage of this act. The vote was on final passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

SF. 454. Businesses Can't Move to Escape Environmental Laws. This bill, which was enacted and signed by the Governor, memorializes the U.S. Congress to enact laws which would prevent industries from moving from states in order to escape the provisions of environmental laws enacted in individual states. This is not only bad economics, in that such a national law would cause even higher prices for all the goods we need, but it carries with it the strong implication that a state government owns the industries located in it. It says, in effect, to industries, "You must stay here even if your costs of production rise so high that you are unable to compete in the national and world marketplace and thus go out of business." Altogether a bad and economically ignorant piece of legislation. The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1681. All Income HRA. Housing and Redevelopment Authority housing projects have been justified as providing housing for low income families or sometimes for low and middle income families. The taxpayer subsidizes this housing in order to bring its cost within range of those it is intended to house. To date, HRA has spent enormous amounts of your money -- and it has destroyed more dwelling units than it has built. And those it has built have either been of poor conception and construction or have been very expensive to build, and sometimes both. They have been foisted upon the taxpayer as providing decent housing for those who would otherwise not afford it. Although the results and the methods have been poor, and the projects have usually been used to benefit special interests, there has at least been ostensibly good intentions. H.F. 1681 doesn't even make this pretense. It permits, in cities of the first class (Mpls., St. Paul, Duluth) HRA development of housing for persons of all incomes. This would put government into unfair competition with all private housing developers (along with all other citizens) in order to use their money in competing with them. The builders who get

the contracts will profit heavily. Might the opportunity for graft exist here? Everyone who is not an advocate of socialism must deplore this one. It became law. The vote is on passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 23. Drug Price Advertising Permitted. The bill, enacted into law, permits pharmacists and drug stores to advertise prices of prescription drugs. We believe that this law will benefit the public by allowing persons to know where they get their prescriptions filled at lowest prices. We believe firmly in free competition in goods and services, and discount the assertions of those saying that lower quality will result. The vote was on passage. A "yes" vote scores 2 points.

CATEGORY C

H.F. 3. Ratify Equal Rights Amendment. The Minnesota Legislature hastily, without due consideration or adequate public testimony, voted to ratify this truly revolutionary amendment. There are at least a dozen basic reasons for opposing ERA, all of which are well documented and will not be described here. It is sufficient to state that it will be harmful to woman, destructive of the family, and extremely erosive of that civilization which even the backers of ERA depend upon for their physical, social, and spiritual sustenance. And the stated aims of ERA can be obtained by ordinary legislation and, indeed, already have been. A hasty and ill judged action by those who voted for ratification. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 371 Minimum Sentence for Crime with Gun. This bill would provide that a person convicted of a crime while having a firearm in his possession would be sentenced to a minimum of three years, without stay of sentence, stay of execution, or probation. This bill faces the gun problem squarely and comes up with the right answer; penalizing those who misuse guns, not the vast number of law abiding citizens who constitutionally own guns. The vote in the House was for passage. A "yes" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1293 No Limits on Parole For Murderers. The authors of this bill apparently are concerned that Minnesota's murder rate does not come up to that of other states, and they are out to do something about it. What better way to up the murder rate than by keeping known murderers in circulation. This bill would remove limitations on parole of persons sentenced to life for murder. The advocates of capital punishment argue that there really isn't such a thing as life imprisonment, that proven murderers are turned loose to kill again. This bill certainly gives weight to their argument. The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

CATEGORY D

S.F. 1397. State Housing Loans. The 1971 Legislature created the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency to put the state into the finance business (using the taxpayers money, of course). The 1973 Legislature has given the Agency orders to evade the free enterprise housing construction business. The Agency will loan money to low income persons (the Agency's ostensible reason for existence), and to non-profit and limited profit organizations. Whether under contract to provide technical services to government, or for any other purposes, the products of non-profit corporations always cost substantially more than the same products from competitive profit seeking firms. This is certain to be true for housing also - more expensive housing. We can expect the taxpayers will be called upon to subsidize this inefficiency. We must ask the proponents of this law, "Why not free enterprise housing? Who gave you permission to take our money from us by force to use for this purport?" The vote is on passage. A "no" scores 2 points.

S.F. 2113. Lower Tax on High Rise Apartments. This bill, passed into law, gives a 20 percent tax break to apartment buildings 5 stories high or higher. Why the move to encourage ant hill housing? The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

S.F. 1872. Removal of Most County Tax Limits. This law (it was passed and signed into law) allows counties to tax without limit. When the sales tax was enacted, and again when it was raised to four percent, we were told that property taxes would go down. That commitment was not honored for even one session by our Legislature. Another example of disdain for the taxpayer. The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

CATEGORY E

S.F. 926. Environmental Education Council. This bill, signed into law, creates a Minnesota Environment Education Council, consisting of 13 members appointed by the Governor and 12 from the Regional Councils. Permits employment of staffs (appropriations and taxes follow). The council promotes coordination of environmental education and develop educational materials. This is one more measure to strengthen regional government and erode local self-government, this time using an aspect of education as the means. The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 878. Fund Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This memorial would ask the U.S. Congress and the President to fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The Corporation (Non-profit, of course) pays its staff very highly and functions as a major communications/indoctrination agency of pseudo-liberalism. It also (incidentally, one can say) presents some education courses. It's creation in the first place was a great disservice to the cause of freedom and the American taxpayer. Its termination would be a good thing. The vote in the House was on passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 2160. Activity Fund for Legal Services. This one, signed into law, allows the Mankato State student association to use the student activity fund to provide legal services for students. MPIRG wrongfully (but legally because of a law similar to this one) appropriates a large proportion of student activities at the University of Minnesota, ostensibly (but not actually) for noble purposes. This act does not even have the pretence of a noble motive. It is designed to protect militant activists from the consequences of their deliberate acts. The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1779. Teacher Standards and Certification Commission. This bill created Commission of 16 members appointed by the Governor. The Commission has power to certify, or refuse to certify, public school teachers in the State. This power currently resides in the State Board of Education. The Commission would be comprised entirely of educationists as described in the introductory part of this category. The State Board would retain a time-limited (30 days) power of disapproval over the standards set by the Commission. This bill is designed to exclude private citizens from any voice in the selection of teachers. The vote was on passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

CATEGORY F

S.F. 2118. County Human Services Board. This bill, signed into law, authorizes counties with population of 75,000 or more, or contiguous counties with combined population of that much, to create "human services" boards, which will be subsidized by the State. This act uses the pull of subsidization to establish uniformity throughout the State and to establish the idea that the government is responsible for "human services." The vote is on final passage. A "no" vote scores a point.

H.F. 4. Unemployment Compensation for Non-Strikers. This bill was signed into law. It provides that unemployment compensation be paid to non-striking working people who are unemployed because of a strike. This includes persons who decline to cross a picket line. This law requires employers not involved in a strike to help subsidize it. The vote in the House was on an amendment (which did not pass) to delete the provision that persons choosing not to cross a picket line would be eligible. A "yes" vote scores 1 point.

CATEGORY G

H.F. 342. Licensing of Textbook Distributors. Licensing is a common way of providing economic advantage to the "ins" by holding down the number of competitors. It is a form of monopoly and is almost always accompanied by price fixing (witness plumbers, barbers, liquor stores, etc.). This bill goes farther by adding the element of state control over educational materials to be used, instead of leaving this to local school boards. This procedure could be used as a vehicle for political and philosophical indoctrination or thought control. The vote in the House is on passage. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 295. Compulsory Union Membership for Public Employees. This bill establishes compulsory unionism for all public employees. Employees who do not join the union, which has exclusive bargaining rights, will nevertheless be required to pay dues by the check-off procedure. Money from union dues has been used flagrantly by union leaders, often against the wish of or without the knowledge of the members, to elect officials who are leading this state into collectivist government. Corporations are forbidden to make contributions to political candidates, but unions are not. The freedom of public employees is transgressed by this legislation, and the ability of union leaders to buy elections (as in the recent Minneapolis elections) is greatly enlarged. This act also increases the numbers and kinds of employees which must pay dues. Additionally, it provides for compulsory binding arbitration on request of the Union, but not, apparently, the employer. It also requires that additional tax levies be made to pay for wage and other cost increases resulting. In addition to reducing the employee's freedom, the taxpayer and the user of public services are held hostage by the union leadership. The vote was on final passage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

VOTES USED IN SENATE SCORING

Category A

H.F. 2. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 515. Vote on returning bill to committee. A "yes" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 308. Vote on repassage. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

S.F. 736. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

S.F. 2016. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

S.F. 1246. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1508. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

S.F. 681. Vote on reconsideration after the bill had failed to pass earlier. It passed this time. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

Category B

H.F. 491. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

S.F. 1283. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

S.F. 454. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1557. Same as House. A "NO" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1681. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 23. Same as House. A "yes" vote scores 2 points.

Category C

H.F. 3. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

H.F. 1293. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

CATEGORY D

H.F. 1581. Same as House. A "no" scores 2 points.

S.F. 2113. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

Category E

S.F. 926. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 2160. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

H.F. 1779. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 3 points.

Category F

S.F. 2118. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

H.F. 4. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 1 point.

Category G

H.F. 295. Same as House. A "no" vote scores 2 points.

CONCURRENCES

The following individuals, who are members of the organizations indicated, have concurred in the selection of the bills used in determining the Legislator's vote rating.

MINNESOTA CONSERVATIVE UNION

EQUAL RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON COUNTY REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB

BELTRAMI COUNTY REAL ESTATE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

MINNESOTA COMMITTEE TO RESTORE THE CONSTITUTION

DEMOCRATS FOR AN INDEPENDENT CAUCUS

YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM

HENNEPIN COUNTY REPUBLICAN CLUB

UNITED NEIGHBORS OF MINNESOTA

ANOKA COUNTY "T" PARTY

PEOPLE'S REFORM MOVEMENT

CONSTITUTION PARTY OF MINNESOTA

CHISAGO COUNTY REAL ESTATE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

CITIZENS COORDINATING COUNCIL
FOR UNITED COMMUNITY ACTION

AMERICAN PARTY OF MINNESOTA

BROOKLYN PARK TAXPAYERS CLUB

RAMSEY COUNTY "T" PARTY

CONCERNED TAXPAYERS OF MINNESOTA

MINNESOTA CITIZENS LEGISLATIVE LEAGUE

RAMSEY COUNTY WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB

BENTON COUNTY PROPERTY OWNERS LEAGUE

LEGISLATIVE EVALUATION ASSEMBLY

James H. Blilie
Donald May
Lillian H. Newman
H. O. Ford
Fred Wiener
John C. Leach
Kelly S. Ruck
Frank C. Litherland S.K.
Mrs. Alex Wenz
m m mahurin
Robert J. Schmitz
Leo S. Gurn
Leonard V. Dietz
Charles A. Rausch
Ernest E. Gustafson
Leonard Palmer
Wilfrid M. Weber
Joan Van Poperin
Daniel J. Slater
Viola Macken
Mrs. Lawrence Trilammer
Herman H. Helager

HOUSE VOTES

[illegible]

NAME _____

[illegible]

HOUSE VOTES

[illegible]

HOUSE VOTES

NAME	A								B								C				D				E				F		G		Total	Correct Vote																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
	3n	2n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n			2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n	3n	2n

NAME	A								B				C	D	E				F	G	+	-	% CORRECT VOTE		
	HF 2 3N	HF 515 2Y	HF 302 2N	SF 736 2N	SF 2016 3N	HF 1508 2N	SF 681 3N	HF 491 3N	SF 1283 2N	SF 454 2N	HF 1557 3N	HF 1681 2N	HF 23 3N	HF 3 2N	HF 1581 2N	SF 2113 1N	SF 926 2N	HF 2160 2N	HF 1779 3N	SF 2118 1N				HF 4 2N	HF 295 2N
A = Excused Absence N = Not Voting																									
ANDERSON, JERALD C.	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	A	-	-	-	N	N	+	A	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	6	37	14
ARNOLD, NORBERT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	+	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	40	8
Ashbach, Robert D.	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	N	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	23	22	51
Bang, Otto T., Jr.	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	N	+	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	15	33	31
Berg, Charles	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	32	21	60
Bernhagen, John	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	24	28	46
Blatz, Jerome V.	+	+	+	+	-	N	+	-	+	+	A	-	+	+	-	A	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	23	48
BORDEN, WINSTON W.	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	42	7
Brown, Robert J.	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	N	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	21	26	45
CHENOWETH, JOHN C.	-	-	-	-	-	N	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	46	6
CHMIELEWSKI, FLORIAN	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	35	34
COLEMAN, NICHOLAS D.	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	+	-	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	5	44	10
CONZEMIUS, GEORGE R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	+	-	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	3	47	6
DAVIES, JACK	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	-	+	-	N	+	-	N	-	-	-	-	4	45	8
DOTY, RALPH R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	+	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	46	6
Dunn, Robert	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	38	28
Fitzsimons, Richard W.	A	+	+	+	-	N	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	18	28	39
Frederick, Mel	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	N	+	N	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	21	27	44
GEARTY, EDWARD J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	48	9
HANSEN, BALDY	A	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	17	32	35
Hansen, Mel	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	N	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	33	45
Hanson, Rodger	-	+	+	+	-	N	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	36	29
HUGHES, JEROME M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	-	-	-	N	+	-	A	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	3	42	7
HUMPHREY, HUBERT H., Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50	6
Jensen, Carl A.	-																								

ANDERSON, JERALD C.

Ashbach, Robert

Berg, Charles

Blatz, Jerome V.

Brown, Robert J.

CHMIELEWSKI, FLORIAN

CONZEMIUS, GEORGE F.

DODDY, RALPH R.

Fitzsimons, Richard

GEARTY, EDWARD J.

Hansen, Mel
Hanson, Rodger

HUGHES, JEROME M.
HIMPHREY HUBERT H

Josefson, Carl A.

KEEFE, STEPHEN

KLEINBAUM JACK I.

Kowalczyk, A.

SENATE VOTES

NAME	A								B				C		D		E				F	G	+	-	%		
	HF 2	HF 515	HF 302	SF 736	SF 2016	SF 1246	HF 1508	SF 681	HF 491	SF 1283	SF 454	HF 1557	HF 1681	HF 23	HF 3	HF 1293	HF 1581	SF 2113	SF 926	HF 2160						HF 1779	SF 2118
A = Excused Absence N = Not Voting	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	14	32	31
	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	24	25	48	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	2	48	4		
	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4	48	8		
Krieger, Harold G.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	2	49	4	
Larson, Lew W.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	7	36	16	
LAUFENBURGER ROGER	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	44	6	
LEWIS, B. ROBERT	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	48	6	
LORD, JAMES	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	12	38	24	
McCutcheon, Bill	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	46	6	
MILTON, JOHN	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	35	20	
MOE, ROGER D.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4	43	9	
Nelson, Rolf	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	6	47	11	
NORTH, ROBERT D.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	48	6	
NOVAK, EDWARD G.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	15	33	31	
Ogdahl, Harmon T.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	29	17	63	
OLHOFT, WAYNE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	15	31	33	
OLSON, ALEC G.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	19	30	39	
OLSON, HOWARD D.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	49	6	
Olson, John L.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4	41	9	
O'Neill, Joseph T.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	16	35	31	
Patton, John M.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	43	10	
PERPICH, A. J.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	26	27	49	
PERPICH, GEORGE F.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4	49	8	
Pillsbury, George S.	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	13	37	26	
PURFEERST, CLARENCE M.	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	14	26	35	
Renneke, Earl W.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	48	6	
SCHAAF, DAVID D.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	2	49	4	
SCHROM, ED	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	13	39	26	
Sillers, Douglas H.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	A	14	26	35	
Solon, Sam G.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	3	48	6	
SPEAR, ALLAN H.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	2	49	4	
Stassen, J. Robert	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	13	39	26	
STOKOWSKI, EUGENE	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	1	50	2	
TENNESSEN, ROBERT J.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	N	3	48	6	
THORUP, STANLEY N.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	9	42	18	
Ueland, Arnulf, Jr.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	21	31	40	
WEGENER, MYRTON O.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	7	44	14	
WILLET, GERALD L.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	7	44	14	

DFL = ALL CAPS
Rep = Upper/Lower

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
ADAMS, J.	60A	3 6	4 25	0 3	0 6	0 0	0 0	8 0	0 2	15 42	-27	—	25	3
Adams, S.	42B	0 6	0 0	0 3	2 5	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 2	2 16	-14	8,800,000	33	36
Andersen, R.A.	48A	2 9	3 6	0 0	4 18	0 0	0 0	0 7	0 0	9 40	-31	1,144,000	42	25
Anderson, D.	15A	0 0	0 2	0 0	2 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 5	-3	—	58	78
ANDERSON, G.	15B	6 3	0 4	0 0	0 2	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0	6 12	-6	—	N	19
ANDERSON, I.	3A	3 15	0 9	0 4	0 16	0 0	0 3	0 2	0 0	3 49	-36	165,000	33	6
Becklin,	18A	0 0	0 3	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 2	2 5	-3	—	N	46
Belisle,	50A	2 4	0 2	0 12	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 0	5 21	-16	270,000	N	38
Bell	48B	0 6	0 14	0 0	0 3	0 0	4 3	0 7	0 0	4 33	-29	30,000	25	5
Bennett	66B	0 3	3 3	3 3	4 6	0 0	0 0	0 5	0 0	10 20	-10	—	33	23
BERG	56B	0 12	0 7	0 9	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 10	0 6	0 44	-44	15,000,000	17	3
BERGLIN	59A	0 5	0 7	0 6	3 6	0 2	0 3	3 6	0 0	6 35	-29	—	N	3
Biersdorf	32A	3 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 3	0 0	5 6	-1	—	36	24
Boland	50B	0 14	6 0	0 3	0 6	0 4	0 0	3 2	0 3	9 32	-23	54,759,000	25	5
Braun	1A	0 0	0 3	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 0	3 0	0 0	5 3	+2	—	N	16
Brinkman	16B	0 0	0 7	2 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 10	-8	—	42	15
Carlson, A	58B	3 9	0 12	0 15	4 0	0 2	0 0	0 8	0 0	7 46	-39	—	17	11

Scores in top position (0) indicate + points and scores in bottom position (1) indicate - points.

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
CARLSON, B	14B	03	06	03	03	02	00	00	03	020	-20	15,480,000	33	3
Carlson, D	14A	00	23	00	00	00	00	00	03	26	-4		42	48
CARLSON, L.	44A	00	01	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	-11		n	6
CASSERLY	56A	544	010	20	015	00	33	00	00	972	-63	7000	n	3
Cleary	38A	64	20	62	02	00	00	03	03	1414	0		n	37
Clifford	44B	04	00	03	00	00	00	00	00	07	-7		n	37
CONNORS	46B	08	07	00	00	00	20	00	00	219	-15		33	6
CULHANE	24B	00	05	00	00	00	00	03	00	08	-8		25	44
CUMMISKEY	29A	518	00	00	08	02	00	03	04	535	-30		n	3
DAHL	22B	00	06	00	03	00	00	30	00	39	-6	4,000,000	n	6
DeGroat	10A	00	00	20	00	00	00	23	30	73	+4		50	56
DIETERICH	62A	23	1014	09	09	00	00	03	04	1242	-30	8,000,000	n	14
Dirlam	21B	316	67	00	33	00	00	00	70	1926	-75		33	37
ECKSTEIN	28B	04	23	06	04	00	00	04	00	221	-19	493,000,000	33	37
EKEN	2B	33	06	00	40	00	00	00	40	119	+2		25	26
ENEBO	60B	36	437	03	04	04	20	00	00	954	-45		17	6
Erdahl	30A	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0		50	60
Erickson	26B	00	00	20	00	00	00	00	00	20	+2		58	49

Scores in top position (0) indicate + points and scores in bottom position (1) indicate - points.

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
Esau	28A	33	00	20	00	00	00	04	00	57	-2		n	60
FARICY	63A	02	27	39	35	22	07	00	03	1055	-45		17	9
Ferderer	64A	338	35	20	40	02	08	06	00	999	-90		n	28
Fjoslien	11B	120	00	00	04	00	00	00	00	134	+8		n	57
Flakne	61A	015	25	05	04	00	03	02	03	237	-35		33	20
Forsythe	39A	03	05	20	30	00	00	02	00	510	-5		n	40
FUDRO	55A	316	07	00	02	04	20	06	03	537	-32		25	6
FUGINA	5A	06	13	00	017	43	05	33	03	750	-43		8	8
GRABA	10B	26	36	00	22	00	00	00	02	716	-9		33	8
Graw	38B	310	34	30	00	00	00	00	03	917	-8	5	50	50
GROWE	40A	09	09	06	22	00	00	24	06	436	-32		n	11
Hagedorn	27B	60	04	00	00	00	00	20	20	104	+6		42	52
HANSON	62B	021	15	103	62	05	02	00	04	1652	-36		17	9
HAUGERUD	35A	00	16	00	00	00	00	50	30	710	-3		25	15
Heinitz	43A	129	04	00	03	03	06	06	04	1235	-23		50	37
Hook	41A	00	00	23	03	00	00	00	00	36	-4		25	42
JACOBS	47A	06	12	110	00	04	20	30	06	1628	-12	5,190,000	n	5
JAROS	7B	517	03	03	07	07	00	03	00	550	-46		n	5

Scores in top position(☒) indicate + points and scores in bottom position(☐) indicate - points.

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
JOHNSON, C.	23B	0 0	2 2	2 3	0 3	0 9	0 0	0 3	2 2	6 32	-26		33	6
JOHNSON, D.	6B	0 18	2 23	0 5	4 18	0 6	6 0	3 3	4 6	19 79	-60		10	3
Johnson, J.	58A	13 21	0 13	2 9	0 3	0 6	0 6	0 0	6 0	25 58	-33		33	25
Johnson, R.	63B	0 6	2 15	0 0	5 6	0 0	0 0	0 2	0 0	7 39	-22		45	35
Jopp	36A	0 4	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 7	-7		42	43
JUDE	42A	3 0	0 3	12 0	0 2	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	15 5	+10		n	8
KAHN	57a	4 35	0 9	0 14	2 9	0 0	0 5	0 9	0 0	6 61	-55	15,000,000	n	3
KELLY	2A	0 3	3 7	0 0	0 8	0 0	0 0	0 6	0 3	3 27	-24		27	3
KEMPE	53A	3 9	3 4	9 0	4 2	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	21 15	+6		n	15
Klaus	25A	8 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0	8 3	+5		n	70
Knickerbocker	40B	0 34	0 7	0 3	0 12	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 2	2 58	-56		n	30
Kvam	22A	0 3	0 4	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 12	0 0	0 0	0 32	-22		42	47
Laidig	51A	6 8	0 2	3 0	0 0	2 0	0 0	0 2	0 3	10 15	-5		n	23
Larson	11A	16 8	6 0	0 0	0 9	0 0	0 5	0 0	0 3	22 35	-3		42	42
LA VOY	8A	0 6	0 13	6 2	8 6	0 2	0 0	0 2	0 0	14 31	-17	2,493,800	25	11
LEMKE	34A	3 0	2 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 4	0 0	5 12	-7		17	8
Lindstrom, E.	27A	15 8	0 5	2 0	0 12	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	17 25	-8		33	36
Lindstrom, J.	21A	2 11	0 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 3	0 3	5 24	-19		n	7

Scores in top position(☒) indicate + points and scores in bottom position(☐) indicate - points.

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
Lombardi	49A	0 5	0 7	2 0	0 0	0 0	4 0	0 0	3 0	8 12	-4		n	33
Long	26A	0 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	2 7	-5		58	68
MANN	27A	0 6	2 12	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 21	-19		25	20
McArthur	45B	4 0	2 9	12 0	3 3	0 0	2 0	6 0	0 0	29 13	+16		n	20
McCARRON	46A	2 6	0 16	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 0	0 3	0 3	6 28	-22	8,681,360	n	5
McCauley	34B	10 0	0 15	8 3	0 6	0 0	0 2	0 0	0 0	18 26	-8	130,000	42	17
McEACHERN	18B	0 2	0 6	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 11	-11		n	12
McFarlin	41B	0 3	0 3	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 0	3 9	-6		n	29
McMILLAN	31B	0 3	0 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 10	-10		25	5
MENKE	36B	0 10	3 2	4 0	3 3	0 4	0 3	0 0	0 0	10 22	-12		25	6
MILLER, D.	32B	0 2	2 3	0 0	0 4	0 0	0 0	0 6	0 0	2 15	-13	15,218	n	9
MILLER, M.	12A	0 0	2 15	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 0	0 5	6 20	-14		n	16
MOE	65B	0 9	0 16	0 3	0 8	0 0	0 8	0 0	0 0	0 44	-44		17	3
Mueller	23A	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	-3		33	26
MUNGER	7A	0 9	0 18	0 0	0 14	0 2	0 7	0 9	0 7	0 66	-66	2,000,000	33	6
Myrah	35B	0 0	0 6	2 0	0 9	0 0	0 3	0 3	0 0	2 21	-19		42	36
NELSON	59B	4 5	2 10	0 8	0 0	0 4	0 0	0 7	0 7	6 41	-35		n	3
Newcome	49B	0 15	0 3	9 0	2 4	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 4	14 26	-12		33	23

Scores in top position(☒) indicate + points and scores in bottom position(☐) indicate - points.

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
Niehaus	16A	00	29	40	00	00	09	40	00	108	-8		42	66
NORTON	65A	018	019	00	03	08	00	00	00	048	-48		18	8
Ohnstad	19A	30	02	50	00	00	00	33	00	115	+6		17	68
OJALA	6A	08	62	03	08	14	06	68	08	127	-85		8	12
PARISH	43B	012	40	211	00	00	00	00	07	641	-35	1,350,000	17	6
PATTON	17A	05	27	03	05	00	00	03	03	226	-24		17	11
PAVLAK, R.	52A	014	26	00	11	00	03	00	00	234	-32	200,000	17	11
Pavlak, R.L.	67A	311	03	05	37	00	00	21	00	828	-10		50	50
PEHLER	17B	016	210	30	10	20	20	06	00	942	-33		17	8
PETERSON	20A	24	00	00	00	00	00	20	04	48	-4		25	6
Pieper	53B	80	62	10	22	00	00	00	20	284	+24		17	65
Pleasant	39B	05	03	30	50	02	20	00	00	1010	0		17	46
PRAHL	3B	33	018	20	03	00	07	00	02	533	-28	130,000	25	19
QUINN	33B	018	49	30	00	05	03	03	00	738	-31	195,218	8	3
RESNER	33A	02	23	00	00	00	00	00	08	213	-11	145,218	17	3
RICE	54B	030	011	03	03	04	12	01	03	069	-69		17	3
RYAN	64B	04	08	00	00	00	00	00	12	117	-16	250,000	25	3
SABO	57B	029	02	03	09	00	00	00	00	043	-43	2,005,000	17	3

Scores in top position(☒) indicate + points and scores in bottom position(☒) indicate - points.

HOUSE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
ST. ONGE	4A	0 0	0 -11	0 0	2 6	4 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	6 20	-14	45,000	N	9
SALCHERT	54A	0 16	2 13	0 3	0 3	0 4	0 6	0 11	12 0	14 56	-52	30,000	25	3
SAMUELSON	13A	3 18	0 5	0 3	0 3	0 0	0 3	0 3	0 3	3 38	-35	151,355	36	10
SARNA	55B	0 8	0 27	2 3	0 2	0 0	0 0	3 4	0 0	5 44	-39	—	N	6
Savelkoul	31A	3 3	0 5	0 3	4 0	0 0	0 0	0 12	0 6	7 29	-22	2,050,000	33	41
Schreiber	45A	2 0	0 3	3 0	4 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	9 6	+3	—	N	33
SCHULZ	25B	0 0	0 6	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 6	-6	—	25	19
Searle	30B	0 0	0 5	0 0	0 3	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 2	0 10	-10	3,731,360	33	47
SHERWOOD	4B	8 7	0 6	0 0	0 5	0 0	0 6	10 3	0 2	18 29	-11	2,000,000	N	6
SIEBEN, H.	52B	0 17	11 16	0 6	4 10	0 4	0 6	3 4	0 0	18 63	-45	—	25	8
SIEBEN, M.	51B	0 6	4 7	6 0	0 4	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	10 17	-7	—	N	6
Skaar	1B	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	—	50	66
SMITH	13B	4 0	0 0	2 0	6 8	0 4	0 0	2 0	2 0	16 12	+4	—	42	21
SPANISH	5B	3 0	0 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 3	3 11	-8	—	N	28
Strangeland	9B	10 6	2 6	0 0	0 5	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	14 17	-3	—	50	47
STANTON	20B	2 6	0 31	0 0	0 0	4 0	0 0	0 2	0 0	6 39	-33	—	N	8
SWANSON	37B	0 22	0 17	4 0	3 3	0 0	2 6	0 8	0 0	9 56	-47	25,000,000	42	14
TOMLINSON	67B	2 33	2 12	0 0	0 15	0 0	0 8	0 0	0 0	4 68	-64	—	N	6

Scores in top position (0) indicate + points and scores in bottom position (1) indicate - points.

[illegible]

00

DFL = ALL CAPS

Rep = Upper/Lower

n = New member

SENATE INTRODUCTIONS

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
ANDERSON	19	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	6	-9	1,000	23	14
ARNOLD	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	-2	--	0	8
Ashbach	48	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	-18	--	23	51
Bang	39	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	-6	10,001,932	n	31
Berg	15	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	-8	--	n	60
Bernhagen	22	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	+1	600	n	46
Blatz	38	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	10	+4	--	38	48
BORDEN	13	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	16	-48	27,400	8	7
Brown	51	22	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	30	-24	31,800	38	45
CHENOWETH	66	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	-52	13,745,000	0	6
CHMIELEWSKI	14	10	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	26	-9	551,550	31	34
COLEMAN	65	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	5	-65	2,621,000	17	10
CONZENIUS	25	3	2	2	3	0	6	0	2	18	-122	569,722	23	6
DAVIES	60	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	-16	--	8	8
DOTY	8	3	1	0	4	0	0	6	0	14	-28	7,970,931	25	6
Dunn	18	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	-27	House	42	28
Fitzsimons	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-4	--	n	39
Frederick	32	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	14	+11	--	31	44

GEARTY	54	0	38	4	0	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	8	2	16	-59	4,075,000	23	9
HANSEN, BALDY	31	6	3	3	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	-5	--	85	35
Hansen, M.	61	3	6	6	4	0	0	0	4	6	2	6	0	4	23	-13	350,000	23	45
Hanson, R.	10	8	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	-6	50,000	33	29
HUGHES	50	3	21	9	0	3	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	-37	25,835,000	0	7
HUMPHREY	44	5	13	6	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	7	-40	--	n	6
Jensen	28	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	-5	--	25	47
Josefson	20	0	0	8	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	10	-1	--	54	40
Keefe, J.	40	6	42	8	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	8	-60	House 1,370,000	42	24
KEEFE, S.	59	4	39	15	0	4	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	-60	--	n	4
Kirchner	37	7	12	6	0	0	0	8	0	0	6	0	0	0	7	-25	--	31	33
KLEINBAUM	17	3	7	11	2	0	0	4	0	0	8	0	3	0	5	-34	--	n	4
Knutson	53	5	10	7	0	0	0	3	4	12	6	3	45	13	39	-32	House	33	39
Kowalczyk	45	2	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	-2	--	n	57
Krieger	33	4	12	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	-2	--	36	31
Larson	35	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	13	-13	--	31	48
LAUFENBURGER	34	6	16	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	-20	15,218	15	4
LEWIS	41	0	3	17	0	10	6	7	0	0	3	5	0	5	51	-46	3,000,000	n	8
LORD	36	0	6	24	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	-40	--	n	4
McCUTCHEON	67	0	24	20	0	3	2	2	3	11	6	3	6	3	71	-65	--	46	16
MILTON	49	0	0	35	0	11	6	17	6	4	6	0	8	17	83	-66	--	n	6

NAME	DISTRICT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SUM	NET	SPENDING	'71 VOTING	'73 VOTING
MOE	2	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	-17	--	15	6
Nelson	43	19	2	6	0	2	2	0	0	31	+5	House	50	24
NORTH	62	8	0	0	0	4	6	6	1	25	-72	House	17	6
NOVAK	64	12	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	20	+2	--	31	20
Ogdahl	58	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	-63	--	23	9
OLHOFT	11	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	-14	--	n	11
OLSON, A.	21	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	4	13	-66	22,091	8	6
OLSON, H.	27	0	4	3	0	0	2	0	0	5	-16	--	42	31
Olson, J. L.	26	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	-4	--	39	63
O'Neill	63	0	2	0	8	3	0	0	4	17	-52	--	15	33
Patton	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	--	n	39
PERPICH, A.	6	4	6	0	3	0	0	0	2	15	-27	--	8	6
PERPICH, G.	5	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	4	10	-62	--	25	9
Pillsbury	42	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	-19	--	15	31
PURFEERST	24	0	8	0	5	0	2	0	1	8	-16	--	23	10
Renneke	23	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	9	-21	--	62	49
SCHAAF	46	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	-65	--	n	8
SCHROM	16	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	-1	--	62	26

Scores in top position (0) indicate + points and scores in bottom position indicate - points (1).

Sillers	9	0	0	2	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	19	-17	--	25
SOLON	7	0	2	0	31	3	0	4	4	0	7	3	0	12	0	14	62			-48	House	25	
SPEAR	57	6	14	0	0	7	29	2	10	0	2	2	0	0	0	10				-53	5,000,000	n	
Stassen	52	5	6	0	0	6	0	0	5	2	12	3	0	0	0	7	34			-27	--	n	
STOKOWSKI	55	3	20	0	5	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	31			-28	--	n	
TENNESSEN	56	12	39	7	29	6	0	12	0	0	3	0	6	3	25	92				-67	--	15	
THORUP	47	4	22	4	15	6	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	10	47				-37	--	38	
Ueland	29	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10				-10	--	n	
WEGENER	12	4	3	4	6	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	6	2	16	18				-2	75,000	15	
WILLET	4	2	2	0	6	3	0	2	0	2	6	0	1	0	10	16				-6	126,000	50	

9
(1)
SENATE SCORES

Introduction			Voting		
DFL		GOP	DFL		GOP
		Frederick +11		Olson, J.	63%
		Nelson +6		Berg	60%
		Blatz +4		Kowalczyk	57%
Novak	+2	Bernhagen +1		Ashbach	51%
		Patton 0		Renneke	49%
		Josefson -1		Blatz	48%
Schrom	-1			Larson	48%
Arnold	-2			Jensen	47%
Willet	-2			Bernhagen	46%
		Kowalczyk -2		Brown	45%
		Krieger -2		Hansen, M.	45%
Wegener	-2			Frederick	44%
		J. Olson -4		Josefson	40%
		Fitzsimons -4		Ueland	40%
Hanson, C.R.	-5			Knutson	39%
		Jensen -5		Patton	39%
		Hanson, R. -6	Hanson, C.R.	35%	Fitzsimons 39%
		Bang -6		Sillers	35%
		Berg -6	Chmielewski	34%	
Chmielewski	-9			Kirchner	33%
Anderson, J.C.	-11			O'Neill	33%
		Ueland -10		Bang	31%
		Hansen, M. -13		Krieger	31%
		Larson -13	Olson, H.	31%	
Olhoft	-14			Pillsbury	31%
Davies	-16			Hanson, R.	29%
Olson, H.	-16			Dunn	28%
Purfeerst	-16		Schrom	26%	
Noe	-17			Stassen	26%
		Sillers -17		Keefe, J.	24%
		Pillsbury -19		Nelson	24%
Laufenberger	-20		Novak	20%	
		Ashbach -21	Thorup	18%	
		Renneke -21		McCutcheon	16%
		Brown -24	Anderson, J.C.	14%	
		Kirchner -25	Wegener	14%	
		Dunn -27	Willet	14%	
Perpich, A.	-27		Olhoft	11%	
		Stassen -27	Coleman	10%	
Doty	-28		Purfeerst	10%	
Stokowski	-28		Gearty	9%	Ogdahl 9%
		Knutson -32	Perpich, G.	9%	
		O'Neill -32	Arnold	8%	
Kleinbaum	-34		Davies	8%	
Hughes	-37		Lewis	8%	
Thorup	-37		Schaaf	8%	
Humphrey	-40		Borden	7%	
Lord	-40		Hughes	7%	
Lewis	-46		Chenoweth	6%	
Borden	-48		Conzemius	6%	
Solon	-48		Doty	6%	
Chenoweth	-52		Humphrey	6%	
Spear	-53		Milton	6%	

(2)
SENATE SCORES

Introduction				Voting			
DFL		GOP		DFL		GOP	
Gearty	-59			Noe	6%		
Keefe, S.	-60	Keefe, J.	-60%	North	6%		
Perpich, G.	-62			Olson, A.	6%		
		Ogdahl	-63	Perpich, A.	6%		
Coleman	-65			Solon	6%		
		McCutcheon	-65	Tennessee	6%		
Milton	-65			Keefe, S.	4%		
Schaaf	-65			Kleinbaum	4%		
Olson, A.	-66			Laufenberger	4%		
Tennessee	-67			Lord	4%		
North	-72			Spear	4%		
Conzemius	-112			Stokowski	2%		
AVERAGES				AVERAGES			
DFL		GOP		DFL		GOP	
Average	= -36	Average	= -15	Average	= 12%	Average	= 38%
Median	= -37	Median	= -10	Median	= 8%	Median	= 39%
All				All			
Average		= -27		Average		= 23%	
Median		= -21		Median		= 22%	

HOUSE SCORES

Introduction				Voting			
DFL		GOP		DFL		GOP	
		Pieper	+24			Anderson, D.	78%
		McArthur	+16			Klaus	70%
		Weaver	+11			Long	68%
Jude	+10					Ohnstad	68%
		Fjoslien	+8			Niehaus	66%
		Hagedorn	+6			Skaar	66%
Kempe	+6					Pieper	65%
		Ohnstad	+6			Erdahl	60%
		Klaus	+5			Esau	60%
		DeGroat	+4			Fjoslien	57%
Smith	+4					DeGroat	56%
		Schreiber	+3 +3			Weaver	55%
Wenzel	+3					Hagedorn	52%
Braun	+2					Graw	50%
Eken	+2					Pavlak, R.L.	50%
		Erickson	+2			Erickson	49%
		Wohlwend	+1			Carlson, D.	48%
		Cleary	0			Kvam	47%
		Erdahl	0			Searle	47%
		Pleasant	0			Stangeland	47%
		Skaar	0			Becklin	46%
		Wigley	0			Pleasant	46%
		Biersdorf	-1	Culhane	44%		
		Esau	-2			Jopp	43%
		Anderson, D.	-3			Larson	42%
		Becklin	-3			Hook	42%
Haugerud	-3					Savelkoul	41%
		Larson	-3			Forsythe	40%
		Lombardi	-3			Belisle	38%
		Mueller	-3			Cleary	37%
		Stangeland	-3			Clifford	37%
		Carlson, D.	-4			Dirlam	37%

(3)
HOUSE SCORES

Introduction

Voting

DFL		GOP		DFL		GOP	
Peterson	-4	Hook	-4	Eckstein	37%	Heinitz	37%
		Forsyther	-5			Wohlwend	37%
		Laidig	-5			Adams, S.	36%
		Long	-5			Lindstrom, E.	36%
Anderson, G.	-6					Myrah	36%
Dahl	-6	McFarlin	-6			Johnson, R.	35%
Schulz	-6	Clifford	-7			Lombardi	33%
		Diriam	-7			Schreiber	33%
		Jopp	-7			Knickerbocker	-30%
Sieben, M.	-7					Wigley	30%
Lemke	-7					McFarlin	29%
Brinkman	-8			Spanish	28%	Ferderer	28%
Culhane	-8			Eken	26%		
		Graw	-8			Mueller	26%
		Lindstrom, E.	-8			Andersen, R.	25%
		McCauley	-8			Johnson, J.	25%
		Niehaus	-8			Biersdorf	24%
Spanish	-8			Kelly	24%		
Graba	-9					Bennett	23%
		Bennett	-10			Laidig	23%
McMillan	-10					Newcome	23%
		Searle	-10			Ulland	23%
Carlson, L.	-11			Smith	21%		
Sherwood	-11					Flakne	20%
McEachern	-11			Mann	20%		
Jacobs	-12					McArthur	20%
Menke	-12					Wolcott	20%
		Newcome	-12				
Voss	-12			Prahl	19%		
Miller, D.	-13			Anderson, G.	19%		
Connors	-13			Schulz	19%	McCauley	17%
Miller, M.	-14						
St. Onge	-14			Braun	18%		
Resner	-15			Miller, M.	16%		
		Belisle	-16	Brinkman	15%		
Johnson, C.	-16			Haugerud	15%		
Ryan	-16			Kempe	15%		
LaVoy	-17			Wenzel	15%		
Eckstein	-19			Dieterich	14%		
Lindstrom, J.	-19			Swanson	14%		
Mann	-19			Voss	14%		
		Myrah	-19	McEachern	12%		
Carlson, B.	-20			Ojala	12%		
						Carlson, A.	11%
Vanasek	-21			Grove	11%		
McCarron	-22			LaVoy	11%		
		Pavlak, R.L.	-20	Patton	11%		
				Pavlak, R.	11%		
		Johnson, R.	-22	Samuelson	10%		
		Kvam	-22	Faricy	9%		
		Savelkoul	-22	Hanson	9%		
Boland	-23			Miller, D.	9%		
		Heinitz	-23	St. Onge	9%		
		Wolcott	-23	Fugina	8%		
Kelly	-24			Graba	8%		

(4)
House Scores

Introduction				Voting			
DFL		GOP		DFL		GOP	
Parish	-24			Jude	8%		
Patton	-24			Lemke	8%		
Adams, J.	-27			Norton	8%		
Prahl	-28			Pehler	8%		
Berglin	-29			Sieben, H.	8%		
		Bell	-29	Stanton	8%		
Cummiskey	-30			Lindstrom, J.	7%		
Dieterich	-30			Anderson, I.	6%		
		Andersen, R.	-31	Carlson, L.	6%		
Quirin	-31			Connors	6%		
Grove	-32			Dahl	6%		
Pavlak, R.	-32			Enebo	6%		
Fudro	-33			Fudro	6%		
Pehler	-33			Johnson, C.	6%		
Stanton	-33			Menke	6%		
		Flakne	-35	Munger	6%		
Nelson	-35			Parish	6%		
Samuelson	-35			Peterson	6%		
		Ulland	-35	Sarna	6%		
Anderson, I.	-36			Sherwood	6%		
Hanson	-36			Sieben, M.	6%		
Johnson, J.	-36			Tomlinson	6%		
		Johnson, J.	-37	Vanasek	6%		
		Carlson, A.	-39				
Sarna	-39					Bell	5%
Salchert	-42			Boland	5%		
Fugina	-43			Jacobs	5%		
Sabo	-43			McCarron	5%		
Berg	-44			McMillan	5%		
Moe	-44			Adams, J.	3%		
Enebo	-45			Berg	3%		
Faricy	-45			Berglin	3%		
Jaros	-45			Carlson, B.	3%		
Sieben, H.	-45			Casserly	3%		
Swanson	-47			Cummiskey	3%		
Norton	-48			Jaros	3%		
Johnson, D.	-60			Johnson, D.	3%		
		Knickerbocker	-56	Kahn	3%		
Casserly	-63			Moe	3%		
Rice	-64			Nelson	3%		
Tomlinson	-64			Quirin	3%		
Munger	-66			Resner	3%		
Kahn	-75			Rice	3%		
Vento	-81			Ryan	3%		
Ojala	-85			Sabo	3%		
		Ferderer	-90	Salchert	3%		
				Vento	3%		
AVERAGES				AVERAGES			
DFL		GOP		DFL		GOP	
Average = -27		Average = -9		Average = 10%		Average = 40%	
Median = -22		Median = -5		Median = 6%		Median = 37%	
ALL				ALL			
Average = -19				Average = 23%			
Median = -13				Median = 15%			