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COMMITTEE ON ETHICS
REP. ELAINE HARDER, CHAIR

MEETING: Monday, March 20, 2000
8:00 A.M. and 15 minutes following session
Room 10, State Office Building

AGENDA

I. Overview of House ethics process - Deb McKnight, House Research
   - Flowchart
   - Question and answers

II. Presentation by Complainants

III. Presentation by Respondent

Questions | Cross Exam
Recess and continuation 15 minutes after session

IV. Rebuttals

V. Committee discussion

1 - Questions of Committee 1st

2 - ?

Cross Exam
Rebuttals

Jeanne suggested moving the chair through the door. I told her you already said they needed it...
Did Alan say can't be here?

Rhodes

Members of Comm
February 28, 2000

Rep. Elaine Harder
487 State Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Representative Elaine Harder:

Pursuant to Permanent Rules of the House, 6.10, I am forwarding to you, an ethics complaint regarding Representative Arlon Lindner, and accompanying materials which I received today. As you know, House Rules require that I forward any complaints to the Committee within seven days for your consideration. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Representative Steve Sviggum
Speaker of the House

cc: Members of the Ethics Committee (w/out enclosures)
   Representative Bob Milbert, Vice-chair
   Representative Greg Davids
   Representative Mary Murphy
   Representative Jim Rhodes, alternate
   Representative Jean Wagenius, alternate
February 28, 2000

The Honorable Steve Sviggum
Speaker of the House
463 State Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Speaker Sviggum:

Pursuant to House Rule 6.10 we request that the House Committee on Ethics convene for the purpose of investigating the conduct of Representative ArIon Lindner. The subject of this ethics filing is contained in the enclosed complaint.

It is our request that a preliminary hearing be held on this complaint immediately, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on Ethics.

Representative Ann H. Rest
Representative Matt Entenza
Representative Wes Skoglund
Representative Robert Leighton

Enclosure

cc: Representative Arlon Lindner
FORMAL NOTICE OF COMPLAINT AGAINST
REPRESENTATIVE ARLON LINDNER FOR VIOLATION
OF THE RULES OF THE MINNESOTA HOUSE

NOTICE OF COMPLAINT

The undersigned, members of the Minnesota House of Representatives, in furtherance of their responsibilities to uphold the Constitution and Rules of the House, hereby notify the Speaker of the House of their filing of a complaint against Representative Arlon Lindner.

Representative Lindner's violation of Rule 6.10 of the House, promulgated pursuant to the Minnesota State Constitution, Article IV, Section 7, and the formal Rules of the House, adopted on January 11, 1999, requires the immediate convening of the House Ethics Committee for a preliminary hearing as provided by House Rule 6.10.

The complaint is hereby enclosed and contains, with specificity, the allegations sworn by the undersigned Representatives.

We swear the statements in the complaint are true, so help us God.

Dated this 28th Day of February, 2000.

Representative Ann H. Rest
Representative Matt Entenza
Representative Wes Skoglund
Representative Robert Leighton
ETHICS COMPLAINT
AGAINST REPRESENTATIVE ARLON LINDNER
FOR VIOLATION OF MINNESOTA HOUSE RULE 6.10

COMPLAINT

The Minnesota State Constitution, Article IV, Section 7, provides that each house may determine the rules of its proceeding and for the punishment of members. The House adopted on January 11, 1999, rule 6.10 which provides in relevant part:

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that violates a rule or administrative policy of the House, that violates accepted norms of House behavior, that betrays the public trust, or that tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute.

During the debate on proposed changes to House Rule 1.01 on February 23, 2000, Representative ArIon Lindner violated Rule 6.10.

Representative Lindner speaking to Representative Michael Paymar, a Jewish member of this House, said, "don't impose your irreligious left views on me."

This statement violates accepted norms of House behavior and tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute. We are compelled to bring the following two counts to the attention of the House Committee on Ethics:

Count 1

Pursuant to House Rule 9.01 the Rules Committee has established a code of conduct for members, officers and employees of the House. The statement by Representative Lindner violates Rule 6.10. The rule states in part:

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that... violates accepted norms of House behavior.

Representative Lindner’s derogatory remarks about the Jewish faith clearly violates accepted norms of conduct. This is further verified by the provisions of the House Code of Conduct.
(Attachment 1) that require a State Representative to treat everyone with respect, fairness and courtesy; and be respectful of the House of Representatives as a fundamental institution of civil government.

**Count 2**

Pursuant to House Rule 9.01 the Rules Committee has established a code of conduct for members, officers and employees of the House. The statement by Representative Lindner violates Rule 6.10. The rule states in part:

_A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that . . . tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute._

The statement by Representative Lindner defamed people of the Jewish faith by calling them irreligious and impugning the sincerity of their religious beliefs. As evidence of this, members filed a formal protest and dissent as a result of the remarks of Representative Lindner. (Attachment 2)

**Conclusion and Request for Relief**

We, the undersigned, believe that the following two counts require immediate consideration by the House Committee on Ethics. We respectfully request that the Committee find that probable cause exists for the violation of these rules and that the Committee, in open hearing, recommend an appropriate sanction for the violation of our rules.

Submitted with this complaint (as required by Rule 6.10) is a copy of the Transcript from the House Floor Session from February 23, 2000, and a copy of the recording log from that day's session.

We swear that the statements in this complaint subscribed to us are true, so help us God.

Dated this 28th Day of February, 2000.

/Representative Ann H. Rest/

/Representative Wes Skoglund/

/Representative Matt Entenza/

/Representative Robert Leighton/
Representative Michael Paymar:

I'm a little surprised at the Majority Leader for bringing this change of rules to this body today. This is a short legislative session. We have pressing items that we should be debating. And now this is the second time that members of your caucus have brought this to the body to consume more time, more energy, talking about what kind of prayer we should have to start each session. Rep. Leppik, I thought gave a really beautiful speech last time this was brought up, explaining the reason and the purpose for the language that we currently have in rules, that allows for non-denominational prayer that respects the religious diversity of the House. And how anyone could support the notion of deleting, striking that language out of the rules that respects the religious diversity of the House is beyond me. So not only am I concerned about the time that this is going to take away from the busy work when we should have been doing Minnesota's work, but I'm concerned about the intent behind it. Because it was only last year. Mr. Speaker, I can't hear. It was only last year, Mr. Speaker and Members that I remember Rep. Lindner getting up before the House and saying to this body that the Christian religion is the majority in this House, that the Christian religion is the majority of this House so why can't we have the kind of prayers we want in this body? Now is that your intent? I know that that is not in your heart to be disrespectful of those members who aren't Christians, Rep. Lindner and others who are going to support this rule change, but it is disrespectful. It is highly disrespectful. You are imposing your own religious beliefs on the rest of this body and the minority members here. Minority religious members here, in my view. I know that's not in your hearts and I know what your intent is, but I have expressed to you before how this makes certain members feel who are not Christians. Now I know that some of you have Christian prayers throughout the week. I get them on my e-mail. You invite people to your fellowships. Fine, do it. Do it whenever you want. Do it before Session starts if you feel like you want to have prayer before the House starts its deliberations. But I would like to be part of that moment where a religious leader gets up before us and has a prayer. But I would like that to be non-denominational and I would like it to be respectful of who I am. And I think this is disrespectful. I would hope the body would reject the Majority Leader's position, we vote down this rule change.

Representative Arion Lindner:

Rep. Paymar, I don't know for sure what you're talking about. If you're talking about wasting time, did you sit there and listen to Rep. Kahn waste all that time just a few minutes ago? I think prayer is very important. You know we're told there's one God and one mediator between God and man. The man Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn't be left, not able to pray in the name of our God when we have an opportunity to pray. That's disrespectful of the Majority's rights. Now if you don't want to be here for prayer, as the Speaker has said before, this isn't mandatory, the prayer happens before session begins. And I don't know why you're looking at me all this time, you know while you're talking. I'm very happy this is coming back up and I think all we're doing is putting the order of the day, the order
for prayer and the way we do prayer back like it was for hundreds of years before this session.
And if you don't like it, you may have to like it. Or just don't come. I don't come sometimes
for some prayers here. There's some groups that pray in here that I stay out of the room. We
have that privilege. And you need to exercise it. But don't impose your irreligious left views on
me.

Tape Counter 3454
Representative Barb Haake:
Members, I don't know about the rest of you, but I really don't care what God everybody
prays to. They're all praying to one God. And as far as I'm concerned, I need all the help I can
get. I really appreciate the prayers from everybody's God. Thank you.

Tape Counter 3473
Representative Betty McCollum:
Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members. I'm going to vote against it for a couple of
reasons. The paramount one is that the two times this has been discussed on the floor, it was
within the way the Rules of the House are adopted. And its more than a simple majority. And I
voted against this amendment in the Rule Committee. What we've done here is we've said, 'OK,
there's a majority who would like the prayer to be conducted in a certain way. And we can't win
when it's a simple majority. So we'll amend the rules going through the rules committee, where
simple majority can win.' And the reason why we have a higher standard for adopting the rules
as we do in the first weeks of session, is so that the minority is heard. And we lost that in the
way that the rules are adopted. And that's why I voted against it in the rules committee. I'm
very concerned about the tenor of discussion. I'm a Christian, I'm a Catholic. And I'm not here
trying to out-Christian anybody else. And when I want to pray a Catholic Creed, I do it at
church. And I enjoy the fellowship of the many denominations in this hall. And I enjoy the
fellowship of praying together when everybody feels included. And the comments just don't
come. Well, you know, if you just don't come for the prayer, you just don't get to say the Pledge
of Allegiance either. Because the doors are closed for that. So Members, I would encourage you
not to vote for this amendment. And Rep. Paymar, one of my favorite religious songs is, "They
know we are Christians by our Love".

Tape Counter 3570
Representative Matt Entenza:
Mr. Speaker I think the issue today is whether or not we're going to show the respect that
the present rule has. And Rep. Lindner, I hope that perhaps you want to rethink the last remark
that you made. We have members in this body who come from different religious traditions.
And to suggest that someone who comes from the Jewish tradition, a tradition that we should all
certainly honor, that somehow is an irreligious one, suggests to me that it is very important to
vote against this motion from the rules committee.

Tape Counter 3580
Representative Wes Skoglund:
Mr. Speaker will Rep. Lindner yield to a question? Did I hear you say, 'Don't impose
your irreligious views on me?' Is that your quote to Rep. Paymar? Mr. Speaker, apparently I'm
not speaking loudly enough. Rep. Lindner, did you say 'Don't impose your irreligious views on
me?' to Rep. Paymar?
Representative Arlon Lindner:

It was something like that.

Representative Wes Skoglund:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm embarrassed, quite frankly for what Rep. Lindner said. And as a Christian, who does Bible devotions almost every night with his family, I apologize to you, because most of us don't feel that way, Rep. Paymar. I apologize, I'm embarrassed on behalf of we Christians.
Complaint Speaker

Complainants may withdraw; proceedings end unless committee finds complaint frivolous.

Committee may dismiss as frivolous.

Committee sends complainants public reproval letter; may recommend other discipline for complainants.

At any time, a majority of the whole Committee can decide a violation was inadvertent, technical, de minimus or may not warrant discipline. May:
- attempt voluntary remedial or other action by the subject of the complaint without discipline
- recommend clarifying a law, rule, policy, or behavior norm and may caution members about it.

Ethics Committee

Probable cause hearing within 21 days.

If a majority of the whole committee finds facts more probably true than not, dismiss complaint.

Process ends.

If a majority of the whole committee fails to find facts more probably true than not, notify Speaker and member complained of.

Process ends.

Hearing to take and evaluate evidence for/against discipline and make a final determination on the complaint.

If a majority of the whole committee finds clear and convincing evidence for disciplinary action, notify Speaker and member complained of.

Process ends.

If a majority of the whole committee finds clear and convincing evidence for discipline, recommend final disposition with or without comment:
- Reprimand
- Censure
- Expulsion

House Floor
March 10, 2000

TO: Representative Elaine Harder  
Chair, Ethics Committee

I would like to have by Thursday, March 16, 2000, a list of relevant evidence which the complainants will use to prove their charges that my statement to Representative Paymar, “don’t impose your irreligious left views on me,” was derogatory remarks about the Jewish faith, thereby violating accepted norms of House behavior and bringing the House into dishonor or disrepute.

1. Any matter of fact evidence.
2. Names of witnesses who will give sworn testimony.
3. Written copy of testimony of each witness.
4. Copy of exhibits to be used.

Thank you for your help in obtaining this information for me.

Sincerely,

Arlon W. Lindner  
State Representative

cc: Rep. Ann Rest  
Rep. Matt Entenza  
Rep. Wes Skoglund  
Rep. Robert Leighton
March 15, 2000

Representative Elaine Harder
Chair, Ethics Committee
487 State Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Representative Harder,

As I look at our Minnesota State Constitution, Article 4, Sec.10 which states in part, "For any speech or debate in either house they (the members of each house in all cases...) shall not be questioned in any other place," I question whether being brought before the Ethics Committee because of my words used in a debate on the House floor possibly is in violation of my Constitutional rights.

I ask that you obtain a ruling from the Attorney General pursuant to Article 4, Sec.10 prior to the scheduled hearing at 8:00 am, March 20, 2000, the time I will be questioned.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Arlon W. Lindner
State Representative
March 15, 2000

TO: Representative Elaine Harder
Chair, Ethics Committee

I would like to have by Friday, March 17, 2000, at noon, a list of relevant evidence which Representative Lindner will use to refute the charges that his statement to Representative Paymar, "don't impose your irreligious left views on me," was a derogatory remark about the Jewish faith, thereby violating accepted norms of House behavior and bringing the House into dishonor or disrepute.

1. Any evidence he or his assistants have that bears on this matter.
2. Names of witnesses, their addresses and phone numbers who will give sworn testimony.
3. Written copy of testimony of each witness.
4. Copy of exhibits to be used.
5. The names and phone numbers of his counsel (if any).

Thank you for your help in obtaining this information.

Sincerely,

Matt Entenza
State Representative

cc: Representative Arlon Lindner
Representative Arlon Lindner
417 S.O.B.
100 Constitution Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Representative Lindner:

This letter is to confirm your availability and intent to attend the House Ethics Committee hearing, Monday, March 20, 2000, 8 to 10 a.m., room 10 State Office Building. The agenda will be to consider the ethics complaint filed by Representatives Rest, Entenza, Skoglund, and Leighton. The committee may also reconvene immediately following session that day to continue its work if necessary. The agenda and any other materials the Ethic Committee possesses will be provided to you today.

I would appreciate your response to confirm that this arrangement is satisfactory. If you have any immediate questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Representative Elaine Harder
Chair, Ethics Committee

I confirm that I plan to attend the House Ethics Committee hearing Monday, March 20, 2000, in room 10 of the State Office Building, from 8 to 10 a.m. and immediately following the House legislative session, if necessary.

Signed this day, March 16, 2000

Representative Arlon Lindner

Please promptly remit to Representative Elaine Harder, 487 SOB. Thank you.
The House Ethics Committee will meet Monday, March 20, 8-10 a.m. in room 10 SOB to consider the ethics complaint regarding Rep. Arion Lindner. If necessary, the committee may also meet immediately following session that day to continue its work (session begins at 1 p.m.). **An agenda and all materials in possession of the Ethics Committee will be provided to you and other interested parties no later than this Thursday.**

If you have additional materials for the hearing, the committee requests that you supply them in advance of Monday's hearing so that staff has time to duplicate and assemble folders. You may direct materials or information requests to Sarah Berkowitz (485 SOB, 296-7168), LA for the Ethics Committee. If you have any immediate questions, please feel free to contact me or Ms. Berkowitz. Thank you.

Brenda Elmer  
Staff to the Ethics Committee  
448 SOB  
297-5602

**CC:** Dave Easterday; Doris Ocel; Michelle Kibiger
I have attached the Ethics Committee Report regarding the ethics complaint against Representative Arlon Lindner for your information. Please let me know if you require any other materials or information about this issue. Thank you.
TO: Speaker Steve Sviggum  
CC: Representative Tim Pawlenty, Rules & Legislative Administration Committee  
FROM: House Ethics Committee  
Representative Elaine Harder, Chair  
Representative Bob Milbert, Vice Chair  
Representative Greg Davids  
Representative Mary Murphy  
Representative Jim Rhodes  
Representative Jean Wagenius  
DATE: March 24, 2000  
RE: Request to Recommend Revisions to House Rules  

As Ethics Committee members who have contemplated speech in debate issues during consideration of a recent ethics complaint, we pass along the following request to you today.

We believe that the current House Rules relating to speech in debate are contradictory in some places and we recommend revision. We are requesting authority from you to study the issue and make recommendations to the Rules and Legislative Administration Committee. The Rules and Procedures of the House Ethics Committee limits our committee's jurisdiction to reviewing and disposing of ethics complaints against members; adopting written procedures for handling complaints; considering complaints about open meeting requirements as referred by the Speaker; and considering matters referred to it by the Committee on Rules and Legislative Administration or the House. Specific jurisdiction to study and prepare recommendations in this instance would provide clarification to allow us to proceed.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter. Thank you.
March 17, 2000

TO: Representative Elaine Harder, Ethics Committee Co-chair
    Representative Bob Milbert, Ethics Committee Co-chair

FROM: Deborah K. McKnight, Legislative Analyst (651-296-5056)

RE: Speech and Debate Clause in Legislative Ethics Proceedings

You asked me to review case law on whether the speech and debate clause affects the legislature’s ability to discipline a member for speech in the legislative process.

I found no case law indicating that the speech and debate clause prevents a legislature from hearing an ethics complaint against a member arising out of speech. However, there is some case law indicating that the federal Constitution limits sanctions that may be imposed on a legislator for pure speech.

Speech and Debate Clause

The Minnesota Constitution contains the following provision, the last sentence of which is commonly known as the speech and debate clause:

The members of each house in all cases except treason, felony and breach of the peace, shall be privileged from arrest during the session of their respective houses and in going to or returning from the same. For any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place. Art. IV, sec. 10.

The above provision is similar to a federal constitutional provision that relates to Congress. Because there is no case law under the Minnesota speech and debate clause, it is reasonable to rely on cases construing the federal Constitution and the constitutions of other states with similar provisions.

The United States Supreme Court has explained the history and purpose of the federal clause in United States v. Johnson, 383 U.S. 169, 86 S.Ct. 749 (1966). The provision was adopted at the Constitutional Convention. It is almost identical to the English Bill of Rights. The purpose of the
another member. *Whitener v. McWatters*, 112 F.3d 740 (CA4, 1997). The discipline imposed was to remove the member from all standing committees and appointments to outside committees and commissions for a period of one year. The court found that the board had absolute legislative immunity against a federal civil rights suit brought by the disciplined member. It held that "a legislative body's discipline of one of its members is a core legislative act." 112 F.3d at 741.

Exclusion is an action that can only be taken against a member at the time he or she initially takes a seat in the body. Thus, the effect of the above cases is that there is no controlling authority addressing the possible range of actions the Ethics Committee might take in the matter pending before it at this time. "Controlling authority" would be a decision of the United States Supreme Court, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, the federal District Court in Minnesota, or the Minnesota state courts. The committee may, of course, be persuaded by the policy stated in either branch of the decisions cited above.

DM/ks
Exchange during Debate on March 16, 2000 on Krinkie Amendment to Omnibus Crime bill

Rukavina: Representative Broecker, we listened to that bunch of BS here a few years back about a statewide systems project. Representative Kahn, how much was it supposed to save.

Skoglund: Representative Rukavina, Representative Skoglund

Skoglund: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order on proper words and debate and I think Representative Rukavina should not use certain language on this floor, even though the comments weren’t directed to me I think the decorum of this House should be kept.

Skoglund: Representative Rukavina, we will strike those words. Representative Rukavina

Rukavina: Well, at least I didn’t use the actual full words. Mr. Speaker. Representative Skoglund ........
Minnesota House of Representatives

HOUSE ETHICS COMMITTEE HEARING
March 20, 2000

Presentation by the Complainants
Rep. Paymar was respectful to Rep. Lindner

House Floor February 23, 2000 (emphasis added)

Paymar: “I’m a little surprised at the majority leader bringing this change of rules to this body today. This is short legislative session. We have pressing items we should be debating. Now this is the second time that members of your caucus have brought this to the body to consume more time, more energy talking about whether, what kind of prayer we should have to start each session. Rep. Leppik, I thought, gave really a beautiful speech the last time this was brought up explaining the reason and purpose for the language that we currently have in rules that allows for nondenominational prayer that respects the religious diversity of the House. And how anyone could support the notion of deleting, striking the language out of rules that respects the religious diversity of the House is beyond me. So not only am I concerned about time that this is going to take from the busy work of doing Minnesota’s work, but I’m concerned about the intent behind it, because it was only last year, Mr. Speaker, (Paymar said he can’t hear, Sviggum said it’s not that loud). It was only last year, Mr. Speaker and members, that I remember Rep. Lindner getting up before the House and saying to this body that the Christian religion is the majority in this House, that the Christian religion the majority of this house, so why can’t we have the kind of prayers that we want in this body. Now is that your intent? I know that it’s not in your heart to be disrespectful of those members who are not Christians Rep. Lindner and others who are going to support this rule change. But it is disrespectful. It is highly disrespectful. You are imposing your own religious beliefs on the rest of this body and the minority members, the minority religious members here. In my view. I know that’s not in your heart and I know what your intent is. I have expressed this to you before how this makes members feel who are not Christians. Now, I know that some of you have Christian prayers throughout the week, I get them on my e-mail, you invite people to your fellowships. Fine, do it. Do it whenever you want. Do it before session starts if you feel you want prayer before the House starts its deliberations. But I would like to be a part of that moment where a religious leader gets up before us and has a prayer. But I would like that to be nondenominational and I would like it to be respectful of who I am. And I think this is disrespectful. I would hope the body would reject the Majority Leader’s position and we vote down this rule change.”
For his part, Lindner allowed that his remark to Paymar "probably wasn't maybe the best choice of words," but said that Paymar, during his remarks on the House floor, "looked right at me, and started using my name..."

Lindner said that he should not have expected "to just stand still and take the kind of crap, basically, that Rep. Paymar was dishing out and then not respond to it."
Lindner then responded to Paymar: "You know we’re told there’s one God and one mediator between God and man. The man Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn’t be left, not able to pray in the name of our God. . . . And if you don’t like it, you may have to like it. Or just don’t come. I don’t come sometimes for some prayers here. . . . We have that privilege, and you need to exercise it. But don’t impose your irreligious left views on me."
During the Feb. 23 debate, I told Rep. Paymar, who opposed this restoration of the House rules, not to impose his "irreligious left" views on me.
**Dictionary definitions:**

**Irreligion**... 1. Want of religion: hostility to or disregard of religious principles... 2. False or perverted religion. *obs*

---from Oxford English Dictionary, 1961

**ir•re•lig•i•ous** \(-+\) adj [L *irreligiosus*, *ir* in - 'in +religiosus religious more at RELIGIOUS] 1: Lacking recognized religious emotions, doctrines, or practices: UNGODLY 2: of our constituting irreligion: PROFANE <~speech> 3 *obs*: relating to, believing in, or practicing a false religion...

---from the Merriam Webster-Dictionary, 1961

**ir•re•lig•i•ous** (ir. i-lij øs) *adj*. Hostile or indifferent to religion; ungodly...

---from the American Heritage Dictionary, 1992
Pursuant to House Rule 6.10, Representative Arlon Lindner violated accepted norms of House behavior.

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that . . . violates accepted norms of House behavior. *Permanent Rules of the House 6.10.*
During the debate on the proposed changes to House Rule 1.01, February 23, 2000, Representative Arlon Lindner violated specific provisions of the Code of Conduct of the Minnesota House of Representatives

- Treat everyone with respect, fairness and courtesy.

- Accept public office as a public trust and endeavor to be worthy of that trust – by respecting the principles of representative democracy, by exemplifying good citizenship and high personal integrity, and by observing the letter and spirit of laws and rules.

- Use the power and facilities of office only to advance the common good.

- Be respectful of the House of Representatives as a fundamental institution of civil government.
Count #2:

Pursuant to House Rule 6.10, Representative Arlon Lindner brought the House into dishonor and disrepute.

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that . . . tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute. *Permanent Rules of the House 6.10.*
PROTEST AND DISSENT

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 11, of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota the following members of the Minnesota State House of Representatives file a formal dissent and protest as a result of the remarks of Representative Arlon Lindner on February 23, 2000.

On this day Representative Lindner defamed people of the Jewish faith by calling them irreligious and impugning the sincerity of their religious beliefs.

Article I, Section 16, of the Minnesota State Constitution protects the freedom of religion in the State of Minnesota. Representative Lindner’s remarks do damage to the tradition of religious tolerance that we enjoy in the State of Minnesota and we must forcefully protest and dissent.

Submitted by:

TOM PUGH
BETTY FOLLARD
MINDY GREILING
STEVE WENZEL
BILL HILTY
TIM MAHONEY
DALE SWAPINSKI
ROB LEIGHTON
MARY MURPHY
TOM OSTHOFF

MATT ENTEZNA
STEVE TRIMBLE
KAREN CLARK
ALICE JOHNSON
WES SKOGLUND
TOM HUNTLEY
GENE PELOWSKI
GARY KUBL
DAVID TOMASSONI
JOHN DORN

SHARON MARKO
JEAN WAGENIUS
LEN BIERNAT
LOREN SOLBERG
LUANNE KOSKINEN
LOREN JENNINGS
BETTY MCCOLLUM
BOB MILBERT
DOUG PETERSON
ALICE HAUSMAN

LYNDON CARLSON
ANN LENCZEWSKI
IRV ANDERSON
GREGORY GRAY
JOE OPATZ
ANN H. REST
LEE GREENFIELD
JOE MULLERY
RON ERHARDT
JIM RHODES
HARRY MARES
JULIE STORM

PHYLIS KAHN
ROD SKOE
BERNIE LIEDER
DARLENE LUTHER
MYRON ORFIELD
M. JAROS
MARY MCGUIRE
PEG LARSEN
RON ABRAMS
DAN DORMAN
TONY KIELKUCKI

SATEVE CHAUDHARY
MICHAEL PAYMAR
DAN LARSON
KRIS HASSKAMP
CARLOS MARIANI
ANDY DAWKINS
HENRY KALIS
PEGGY LEPPIK
DAVE BISHOP
BILL KUISLE
JIM CLARK

ADJOURNMENT

Pawlenty moved that when the House adjourns today it adjourn until 3:00 p.m., Thursday, February 24, 2000. The motion prevailed.

Pawlenty moved that the House adjourn. The motion prevailed, and the Speaker declared the House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m., Thursday, February 24, 2000.

EDWARD A. BURDICK, Chief Clerk, House of Representatives

*Reps. Storm & Kielucki have since withdrawn their names.
What other legislators think:


"I think they were outrageous," Abrams said. "I think they were offensive to the body, and I believe they represented the views solely of Rep. Lindner."

Rep. Tom Pugh in the Star Tribune, February 25, 2000:

House Minority Leader Tom Pugh, DFL-South St. Paul, said Lindner's remarks were "one of the most shocking displays of insensitivity and intolerance that any of us can remember."
Pursuant to House Rule 9.01 the Rules Committee has established a code of conduct for members, officers and employees of the House. Representative Lindner violated Rule 6.10 by indicating that members of this House should be excluded from participation in the business of the House after the House has been called to order pursuant to Rule 1.01. Rule 6.10 states in part:

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that ... violates accepted norms of House behavior.

By suggesting that Jewish members were not welcome during session Representative Lindner violated Rule 6.10. No member should be made unwelcome during session on the basis of their religious belief.
**Dictionary definitions:**

**Exception**... 6. Objection, demur, faultfinding; an instance of this, an objection, adverse criticism, complaint...

--from Oxford English Dictionary, 1961

**exception** \( \text{i}'k\text{sep}\text{shən} \)... 3 a: something offered or offerable as objection or as a ground of objection or taken as objectionable...

--from the Merriam Webster-Dictionary, 1961

**exception** \( \text{ik} \text{ sep} \text{shən} \) n...5. take exception, a. to make an objection; demur: They took exception to several points of the contract. b. to take offense: She took exception to what I said about her brother...

--from the Random House Dictionary, 1987

**exception** \( \text{ik-sep-shən} \) n...3. an objection or a criticism...4.

--from the American Heritage Dictionary, 1992

Good Morning, Madam Chair, members and visitors.

We are witnessing a historic day at the beginning of this 21st century here in Minnesota when an elected state official fulfilling his duties and debating issues in committees or on the House floor is allowed to be intimidated by false charges until silenced. Members, I won't be silenced.

I have served as a state representative for eight years and it never entered my mind that I would someday have to appear before this Ethics Committee. In the past, I only knew of members who had Ethics complaints filed against them because of investigations for gross misdemeanor or felony type charges pending outside this body. Here I am, before you, because I exercised my first amendment rights in a debate on the House floor. Actually, I'm charged for what someone thought I said instead of what I actually said.

The seriousness and nature of these charges have brought forth scores of people from my district and elsewhere who have offered their support and vote of confidence for me. This past Saturday, I was unanimously endorsed at our Republican District 33 convention in running for my fifth term. I want to publicly thank all our many friends for their support.
The complaints about me center around my referring to Rep. Michael Paymar's views toward my Christian faith as that of the "irreligious left," a term sometimes used like "religious right" is used, only in reverse. I would like to briefly state the charges and refute them.

Count 1. is that I made derogatory remarks about the Jewish faith.

I was addressing Representative Paymar's views about the Christian faith and did not mention anything about the Jewish faith. Rep. Paymar said, "I know that that's not in your heart, to be disrespectful of those members that aren't Christians, Representative Lindner, and those others who are going to support this rule change. But it is disrespectful. It is highly disrespectful. You are imposing your own religious beliefs on this Body..."

This quote by Representative Paymar means that everyone that voted against the rule change was highly disrespectful to him but I am the only one charged today.

Count 2. is that I defamed people of the Jewish faith by calling them irreligious and impugning the sincerity of their religious beliefs.

I was talking to one person, Representative Paymar, and no one else. How anyone could have misconstrued this to mean all Jewish people is beyond me. Again, I was referring to Rep. Paymar's view of my faith, the Christian faith, which I said was that of the irreligious left.
Count 3. is that I suggested that Jewish members are not welcome during session.

This charge is absurd! Majority leader, Tim Pawlent, said "prayers are before session, that no one is excluded." I agree with his statement, "You can choose to not come and come after the prayer or wait out wherever you like if you want."
Different members do this on a regular basis all the time and no one thinks any different of them.

Madam Chair and Members, I hereby declare that I am innocent of all three charges.
Dear Representative Lindner:

I write in support of your actions with respect to the "House prayer" dispute that erupted recently. As a Jew (and coincidentally, a constituent of Rep. Paymar), I agree with you that the "irreligious left" has used demonization and ridicule to marginalize anyone who disagrees with their statist agendas, particularly those of faith.

Although I do not much care how the House regulates its prayers, I understand and share your frustration.

I offer no solution, but hope you stand on principle and not buckle under to those who would label you a "right-wing" crank.

Sincerely,

David Siegel
1704 Bohland Ave
St. Paul
Dear Representative Lindner,

I would like to thank you for standing up for your beliefs and articulating your thoughts in such a clear and concise manner. I am of the same opinion that the only groups that can be criticized with impunity are conservatives, Christians of all denominations, the "Religious Right", and even our political leaders. It is quite amazing that if you are liberal you can level charges of intolerance against anyone you disagree with for the simple reason that they do not hold the exact same views. It appears that the only people who are intolerant are the liberals when you disagree with them.

Please keep up the good work and know that there are a lot of Minnesotans praying for you (gasp!) and your colleagues.

Joseph R. Seidel
Controller
ProGroup, Inc.
One Main Street S.E.
Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55414

Phone: 612-379-7223 x208
Fax: 612-379-7048

jseidel@progroupinc.com

http://www.progroupinc.com
http://www.connectco-products.com/
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Honorable Arlon Lindner  
Minnesota House of Representatives  
417 State Office Building  
100 Constitution Avenue  
St. Paul, MN 55155  
VIA FAXSIMILE

Dear Representative Lindner:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us on Monday, March 13, 2000. We appreciate the frank discussion and the opportunity to learn your perspective on the House prayer issue.

We hope we successfully communicated to you our views with regard to the statement that you made on the House floor. While we understand that some may interpret your comment to Mr. Paymar regarding his "irreligious left" views as anti-Semitic, your explanation, that it was a response to the label "religious right," is reasonable and sincere.

At the same time, we were offended by the following comment you made during your floor speech:

You know, we're told there's one God and one mediator between God and man. The man Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn't be left not able to pray in the name of our God.... And if you don't like it, you may have to like it. Or just don't come. I don't come sometimes for some prayers here.... We have that privilege, and you need to exercise it.

Rather than calling for prayer that respects the many religious traditions of your colleagues and the constituents you and they represent, this comment does the exact opposite. The message it sends is not one of inclusion, respect and tolerance but of division, disregard and coercion.

We would appreciate an expeditious response that addresses our concerns. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Steve Hunegs  
President

Stephen R. Silberfarb  
Executive Director
March 19, 2000

Dear Rep. Lindner,

Here is an official statement by Rabbi Daniel Lapin on the subject of public prayer, sectarianism, and tolerance. Feel free to quote from this statement in any way that suits your needs.

1. Public prayer is crucial for the long-term welfare of every community, and invoking God’s blessing on the proceedings of a legislative assembly is particularly important.

2. Prayer is, by its very nature, exclusive and sectarian. Even with a deliberate effort to pray in an ecumenical manner, it is virtually impossible to ensure that everyone hearing the prayer will feel “included.” When one prays on behalf of a group, it is far more important that the prayer reflect a sincere religious conviction than that it satisfy its human audience.

3. The only way to satisfy both the communal need for public prayer, and the individual need to pray from a genuine religious tradition, is to respect religious diversity, and to extend tolerance toward the prayers of others—even when we may disagree with them.

4. The practice of requiring public prayers to conform to a standard of nonsectarian neutrality not only makes a mockery of tolerance and diversity, it is deeply disrespectful toward the very purpose of prayer, and it wrongfully elevates the feelings of listeners above the relationship between man and God that all sincere prayers strive to achieve.

Warmest regards,

Adam Pruzan
Program Director
Testimony of Karen Mathias

Thank you Mr. Chair for allowing me to testify on behalf of Representative Lindner.

My name is Karen Mathias. I was raised as a Jew and I wish to speak to in support of Representative Lindner. If I as a Jew were to be sitting in the House Chambers, I would want my Rabbi to be able to address my God using his name whether referring to him as Adonai, Eloheynu, Ha-Shem or some other common Jewish attestation. I would also like to see a Moslem be able to pray in the name of Allah. Likewise, I would want all religious representatives to be able to pray in their god's name, including Christians to be able to pray in the name of Jesus Christ.

Representative Lindner has been brought before this Ethics Committee and is accused of Anti-Semitism. To me I do not see the Anti-Semitism within his statement. I checked the transcript from the day in question and I also read the newspaper articles from the day in question. First I see no reference to Representative Paymar's being Jewish, or the state of Israel, or to anything that would bring to recollection anything that is a reference to things Jewish. I see no name-calling, not anything as Jew that I would find offensive. Second, I have been a victim of Anti-Semitism, growing up in Brooklyn Park, I was only one of two Jewish people in Anoka Sr.High, and there were several times were I was called a "dirty Jew" and a few times where I was told, "I killed Christ." Additionally, my Grandfather who is a professional businessperson within the Minneapolis Community and a prominent engineer, and he was not allowed to join a certain golf course in the Minneapolis area. My Grandfather was not allowed to join MENSA because of his Jewish background. My Grandfather was also denied many opportunities for employment because of his Jewishness, it was so difficult that he had to create his own firm. I also saw people in my Synagogue who still bore the numbers on their arms from the camps of the Holocaust.

I bring these things up not for pity, not for victim status, but to illustrate a point all of these are in fact Anti-Semitism. These are truly serious problems that need to be dealt with both now and in the future. What Representative Lindner said was not Anti-Semitic or Anti-Semitism. I am sorry from a Jewish view that Representative Paymar would use this discussion on the floor of the House to accuse a fellow House Member of such a charge in light of the real serious incidences of Anti-Semitism that unfortunately still take place today.

This statement is respectfully submitted to the Ethics Committee by Karen Mathias.

Karen Mathias
5436 29th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55417
612-729-6877
E-mail djkemathias@cs.com
March 13, 2000

Rep. Arlon W. Lindner
Minnesota House of Representatives
19508 Country Circle East
Rogers, MN 55374

Dear Rep. Lindner,

Thank you for communicating with Toward Tradition on what has to be a difficult and trying problem for you. Rabbi Lapin is out of town for the next few days, but I will do my best to give you whatever assistance I can.

First, I hope you will clarify and/or confirm the factual situation. Is it really the case that the sole piece of evidence against you is your underlined statement on Page 3 of the transcript you faxed to us (which included your “irreligious left” remark)? If so, it seems to me that your accusers are on very thin ice indeed. That statement was indeed sharp and hard-hitting, but how on Earth does it violate the rules of your House?

Second, I think you did an outstanding job of defending your position in the newspaper op-ed you faxed us. (In fact, when the current unpleasantness is behind us, I hope you will allow me to reprint your article in the Toward Tradition newsletter.) If you hold firm to the points you made in that article, you will not only prevail, but will be making an invaluable contribution to religious freedom for all Americans.

Third, it seems to me absolutely essential that you carefully document, with the appropriate transcripts, the statements of the liberals you mentioned in your article: Rep. Leppik’s admission that the previous rules change was meant to neuter Christian prayer, and Rep. Kahn’s use (unfortunately so typical) of Hitler’s name to intimidate her opposition. In fact, if the rules of your House permit, perhaps it would be appropriate for you to file charges against Rep. Kahn.

Fourth, from the transcript you sent us, it seems that at no point following your allegedly offensive remark did Rep. Paymar—the supposed target of the offense—make any complaint to this effect.
That might be a point worth making in your own defense, as it suggests that what is at issue here is not any affront to another member of your House, but a partisan attack on your political ideas.

Fifth, the second underlined statement of Rep. Paymer on Page 2 goes right to the heart of this dispute: First he says that you are "imposing your religious beliefs on the rest of this body," then he retreats (perhaps without realizing it) and speaks of "how this makes certain Members feel, who are not Christians." Well, which is it? As in the case of sexual harassment laws, we seem to be sliding down a slippery slope, in which some people's subjective feelings start to trump other people's right of free speech.

Sixth, if you would like to be able to quote an explicit statement of Rabbi Lapin's in support of your position, I would be delighted to draft one and to get the rabbi's approval for it. We should discuss exactly what such a statement might contain. I have also enclosed two pages from Tavor Tradition's Winter 1999 newsletter. This material includes a letter that I drafted, which was signed by Rabbi Daniel Greer, Dean of the Yeshiva of New Haven, rebuking the New Haven Jewish Council for their attempt to stop the Board of Aldermen from opening their meetings with prayers.

Please call me at any time if I can be of further assistance.

Warmest regards,

Adam Pruzan
Program Director
March 20, 2000
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Honorable Elaine Harder
Chair
House Ethics Committee
487 State House Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Madam Chair:

During this morning’s consideration of the complaint against Rep. Lindner, a man by
the name of Edward L. Rothman appeared as a witness of Rep. Lindner. Mr. Rothman
considers himself to be a “messianic rabbi.”

Without commenting on the substance of Mr. Rothman’s remarks, we want to alert
you and your colleagues on the panel to the fact that Mr. Rothman is neither a rabbi
nor a member of the Jewish faith. Therefore, his comments should not be regarded as a
Jewish or rabbinical view.

We understand from Rep. Lindner’s counsel that Mr. Rothman was thought to be
capable of offering both Christian and Jewish perspectives regarding the complaint.
Mr. Rothman believes in the divinity of Jesus Christ, which is, of course, a belief
fundamental to the Christian faith that Jews respect but do not follow.

Mr. Rothman is a Christian, who may or may not be qualified to offer a Christian
perspective. That is for you to decide. But because he is not a Jew, he is not qualified
to offer a Jewish perspective, and he is not regarded as a rabbi.

It would be impossible to overstate to you the views of the Jewish community with
regard to “Jews for Jesus” or “messianic Jews,” who pass themselves off as Jews.
This inherently deceiving approach was illustrated this morning, before the panel,
when both legislators and the media were made to believe that Mr. Rothman was a
Jew and rabbi.

We hope to have clarified any confusion on this matter, and we continue to be
available to you, your colleagues, and the charging and defending legislators.

Thank you for considering our heartfelt views.

Sincerely,

Stephen R. Silberfarb
Executive Director

Steve Hunegs
President

cc: Hon. Matt Entenza, Hon. Arlon Lindner, Hon. Ann Rest, Hon. Wes Skoglund,
Hon. Rob Leighton
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - MARCH 20, 2000

CONTACT: SHEP HARRIS,
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
(612) 338-7816

JCRC COMMENTS ON LINDNER ETHICS HEARING

The following statement was issued by Stephen R. Silberfarb, Executive Director of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Minnesota and the Dakotas (JCRC), in regards to the Minnesota House of Representatives Ethics Committee hearing on the ethics complaint filed against State Representative Arlon Lindner:

"Our understanding of the ethics complaint is that Rep. Lindner is not charged with making comments that are anti-Semitic. He is charged with making comments that violate House rules. The House is a self-governing body and this matter is an internal one under the proper jurisdiction of the Ethics Committee, and we respect the committee process.

"On March 13, 2000, the JCRC met with Rep. Lindner regarding comments he made during the recent House floor debate on a change to the House rules. While we understand that some may interpret Rep. Lindner's comments to Rep. Paymar regarding his 'irreligious left' views as anti-Semitic, Rep. Lindner's explanation that it was a response to the label 'religious right' is reasonable and sincere.

"By no means are we stating that the "irreligious left" comment was acceptable. It was, we believe, a poorly worded play on words that was offensive and for which Rep. Lindner should apologize.

"As we related to Rep. Lindner and the Ethics Committee, JCRC was offended by the following comments made by Rep. Lindner during the debate on February 23:

'You know, we're told there's one God and one mediator between God and man. The man Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn't be left not able to pray in the name of our God.... And if you don't like it, you may have to like it. Or just don't come. I don't come sometimes for some prayers here.... We have that privilege, and you need to exercise it.'

"Such views reflect a lack of inclusion, respect, and tolerance of the many religious traditions of legislators of the House and of the citizens of Minnesota. We have asked Rep. Lindner to apologize for these comments.

-- ### --

The JCRC is the official voice of the Jewish community on matters of public affairs, and is the primary agency tasked with fighting anti-Semitism and prejudice in Minnesota and the Dakotas. For more information about Jewish practices and beliefs, or ways to stop prejudice from spreading, please contact the JCRC at 612-338-7816.
DFLers file complaint over colleague's anti-Semitic remark

By MORDECAI SPECKTOR
Assistant Editor

A Minnesota legislator has been formally charged with an ethics violation for making a remark taken to be an anti-Semitic slur during the floor session of the House of Representatives.

During a debate on Feb. 23 over the rule governing the kind of prayer used to open House sessions, Rep. Arlon Lindner, R-Corcoran, turned to Rep. Michael Paymar, DFL-St. Paul, who is Jewish, and said, "...don't impose your irreligious left views on me."

Lindner's remark was met by gasps and hissing. A number of legislators then rose on the House floor and condemned his statement.

The representatives were voting on a proposed change to the bipartisan House Ethics Committee's rules regarding the chaplains' opening prayer — for the fourth time in two years. The proposal sought to delete phrases requiring a prayer that is "non denominational" and "recognizes the religious diversity of the House."

Those phrases were inserted in the rules last year following complaints about a youth choir singing a Christian hymn to open the legislative session. The changes to the rules were approved on a largely partisan vote in the Republican-controlled House.

"It certainly shocked me that he would say that...especially, on the floor of the House," Paymar told the AJW last week. "I took it very personally. I didn't say anything...but several of my colleagues blazed Rep. Lindner for making such an inappropriate and offensive statement."

The complaint was filed by the Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC), condemned the change in the House rules to allow sectarian prayers, and Lindner's "disparaging comments" to Paymar.

"Simple decency also compels an apology in this matter," said Hunega. "At the same time, the JCRC hopes to transform these ugly comments into a learning opportunity. State Rep. Lindner and the JCRC will be meeting in the near future to discuss the situation."

During the Feb. 23 House debate, both Lindner and House Majority Leader Tim Pawlenty suggested that those who object to such prayers could leave the House floor.

"The statements that Jewish members and other members are expected to leave [the House floor during the prayer] shows the tremendous insensitivity to the rights of anyone who isn't of the dominant religion," remarked Rep. Matt Entenza, DFL-St. Paul, who initiated the protest petition and is one of the legislators filing the ethics complaint against Lindner.

"I think it's important to call this remark what it was, which was clearly anti-Semitic, and inflammatory, and derogatory to all Jewish people...and it requires a very strong reaction," Entenza told the AJW.

He pointed out that Lindner's conservative positions are well known to his House colleagues, but that he "crossed the line this time...instead of attacking people on a political basis, he labeled Jewish people 'irreligious.'"

For his part, Lindner allowed that his remark to Paymar "probably wasn't the best choice of words," but said that Paymar, during his remarks on the House floor, "looked right at me, and started using my name..."

Lindner said that he should not be expected to "just stand still and take the kind of crap, basically, that Rep. Paymar was dishing out and then not respond to it."

As to the allegation that his remark was anti-Semitic, Lindner jokingly remarked that Paymar has accused him of "being part of the Christian right, and the religious right...and I kind of got back by saying, if I'm on the religious right, he's on the irreligious left."

Lindner said that he approached Rep. Jim Rhodes, a Republican legislator from suburban Minneapolis, who is Jewish, following the Feb. 23 incident and explained that his remarks were not "directed at Jews in general, because I love Jewish people, I love Israel. And I have studied Israel's history and the Old Testament, and, you know, the law and the prophets mean a lot to me. And I wouldn't want to do anything that even appeared like I was anti-Jew or something, because I'm not."

In a press statement last week, Steven Hunege, president of the Jewish Community Relations Council (JCRC), condemned the change in the House rules to allow sectarian prayers and Lindner's "disparaging comments" to Paymar.

"Simple decency also compels an apology in this matter," said Hunege. "At the same time, the JCRC hopes to transform these ugly comments into a learning opportunity. State Rep. Lindner and the JCRC will be meeting in the near future to discuss the situation."
Elaine Harder
State Representative District 22B
Assistant Majority Leader
Brown, Cottonwood, Jackson, Martin, Redwood and Watonwan Counties

DATE: April 4, 2000

TO: Rep. Milbert
    Rep. Davids
    Rep. Murphy
    Rep. Wagenius
    Rep. Rhodes
    Brenda Elmer
    Sarah Berkowitz
    Deb McKnight

FROM: Rep. Harder

RE: Authorization from Speaker

Authorization has been received from the Speaker to proceed as per our committee’s recommendation to work on rules.

I hope we can get started in May. Let me know if you have any blocks of time in May that you know you will not be available to begin this work.

Phone: 651-296-5373
E-mail: rep.elaine.harder@house.leg.state.mn.us
March 31, 2000

TO: Rep. Elaine Harder, Chair
    House Ethics Committee

FROM: Speaker Steve Sviggum

RE: Request to Recommend Revisions to House Rules

Thank you for your memo citing contradictory provisions in House Rules relating to speech in debate which you feel require revision. You request my authority to review these rules and suggest clarifying changes to the Rules and Legislative Administration Committee.

By this memo I am granting the Ethics Committee specific jurisdiction to study the issue of inconsistencies in House Rules and to make recommendations for clarification to the Rules and Legislative Administration Committee.

Your identification of inconsistencies and offer to recommend corrective language is greatly appreciated.
STATEMENT BY KEITH REITMAN

My name is Keith Reitman, a Jewish person and friend of Arlon Lindner generally connected with Jewish thought and Jewish community. Each month I read the Jewish World, the Jewish Forward, the Jerusalem Report and recently the publication Moment Biblical Archaeology Review.

After reading a report in the Jewish World on Arlon Lindner’s comments on the House floor titled “DFL’ers File Complaint over Colleague’s Anti-Semitic Remark,” I inquired into this matter.

My inquiry led me to speak with Mordecai, Spector Reporter, and an editor of Jewish World. I then had opportunities to speak with my friend Arlon Lindner, Steve Hunegs, and Stephen Silberfarb from the Jewish Community Relations Council, and Rep. Michael Paymar, St. Paul. These conversations were a great opportunity for me because I learned more about the sincere religious views of Arlon Lindner. I learned about the calm, thoughtful, friendly, knowledgeable problem analyzing and problem solving skills of the JCRC, and the responsible, amiable, and reasonable outlook of Rep. Paymar.

I felt a lot in common with Rep. Paymar and I told him so. The whole debate about prayer in the House reminded me of my childhood on the south side of Chicago where I attended elementary school at a huge brick Victorian Gothic building named Edger Allen Poe School. I was almost the only Jew there and Christmas time there was difficult for me. But even as a 10 year old, I resisted singing Christmas carols around the Christmas tree. At Christmas assembly, my teacher said “you don’t have to sing, just mouth the words.” Times sure have changed since then.

In regard to the comment, “don’t impose your irreligious left views on me” made by Arlon Lindner as reported in the Jewish World, I ask all assembled to yield to the JCRC opinion written in a letter to Arlon dated March 14, 2000 that his explanation was “reasonable and sincere.” Hence, I believe, not bigoted at all.

I wish to review the longer statement made by Arlon by breaking his quote down, line by line and mixing it together in a fictional but plausible dialogue with me. I shall be a freshman legislator who has turned to Arlon for advise and information in private conversation. I shall use his words verbatim from the record and add some words he might say to clarify his verbatim quotes.

Me: Arlon, with the reinstatement of Sectarian, uncensored prayer, I’m hearing some religious leaders invoking Jesus Christ in prayer. Why is that?

Arlon: You know, we’re told there’s one God and one mediator between God and man. The man, Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians, and we shouldn’t be left not able to pray in the name of our God.
Me: I'm from a very diverse district, I've got Asian and African constituents who kill an animal as prayer and sometimes it's messy.

Arlon: "If you don't like it, you may have to like it," because we are very diverse community here in Minnesota, and I bet almost all prayer is a sincere reaching out to a higher power.

Me: You mentioned to me how you avoided a religious ceremony over in the House chamber, that you thought might upset you or make you feel uncomfortable. Should I plug my ears and cover my eyes if Buddha, Rama, the Great Spirit or the Holy Ghost is invoked in a prayer at the House chamber.

Arlon: "Or just don't come." "I don't come sometimes for some prayers here." "I enter the chamber to represent my constituents after the prayer has ended." "We have that privilege, and you need to exercise it." So you can avoid being uncomfortable without interfering in diversity.
Dear Editor,

I returned from a very nice 10 days in Florida to find your front page article about my friend, Representative Arlon Lindner. The article was headlined: “DFLers file complaint over colleague’s anti-Semitic remark.” Arlon making anti-Semitic remarks? I was floored. I have often been together with Arlon. I have never sensed even a hint of anti-Semitism. Indeed, he was among the first 2 or 3 State Legislators to endorse my run for the U.S. Senate in 1996.

Nor do I find his remark made to a Jewish legislator – “don’t impose your irreligious left views on me” – as being anti-Semitic. I would regard the remark as directed at the other legislator’s political not religious views. Is it a good choice of words? Certainly not, but it’s a stretch to regard them as anti-Semitic. Those of us who know Arlon, his sincerity, and depth of personal faith can understand his pique about the debate that took place about the nature of the prayer which opens the legislative day at the Minnesota House of Representatives.

There is always an opening prayer at the U.S. Senate. It was either the Senate Chaplain or a visiting minister or Rabbi. I often invited Minnesota Rabbis and Ministers to give the opening prayer. It was quite an honor for them and for us, and then they would have the “privileges of the floor” for the whole day. It was always our habit to meet and greet the visiting chaplain. It is a very nice tradition. I believe they were asked to submit their prayer to the Senate Chaplain in advance and in the vast majority of cases the prayers were universal. Perhaps the Chaplain counseled them. I really don’t know. But universality was certainly not always the case.

One Jewish Senator frequently objected when the prayer was not universal or mentioned Jesus. I did not. I felt people could pray in their own way and so would I. Frankly, some opening prayers were lengthy lectures to the Senate, sometimes almost in filibuster duration! I found those harder to bear than a minister praying in the name of his or her God.
There is open season for criticizing the thoughts and motivations of religious conservatives like Arlon. No complaints are ever filed. Nobody seems to object to that. But if a conservative makes the slightest misstep, watch out - the fur sure flies!

There really is a double standard. When Al Gore and Bill Bradley met privately in Harlem with the Rev. Al Sharpton, the blatantly anti-Semitic New York Minister who was also the chief sponsor of a recent Gore-Bradley debate, little was said. Gore justified his meeting by saying: "He (Sharpton) received something like I think 131,000 votes in the last New York City election." I was particularly disappointed in Bill Bradley who I know so well as having higher standards.

What would have happened if a Republican presidential candidate met privately with David Duke and then justified the meeting by saying Duke received 671,000 votes in a gubernatorial election, as he did. I would certainly lead the hue and cry. We threw Duke out of our Party long ago and the Democrats should do the same to Sharpton who is no less reprehensible.

But let George W. go to Bob Jones University and all hell breaks loose. It is proof of his anti-Catholicism, even though his brother is a Catholic and a parade of other candidates of both parties have preceded him at Bob Jones.

I understand Arlon regrets his remark, not so much because of its supposed anti-Semitic tone which he tells me (and I fully believe) was not intended, but because it offended one of his colleagues. I trust the House Ethics panel will come to a similar conclusion and see this complaint as a simple political act as your headline implied.

Arlon is a good guy who I am proud to have as a friend.
How do you define ‘religious tolerance’ when it comes to the prayers said at the opening of Minnesota House floor sessions?

Liberals are trying to intimidate Christians

Much has been written concerning my remarks during the Minnesota House debate on Feb. 23 regarding the prayer before each House session.

A little background might be helpful to set the record straight. For 142 years, a wide variety of Minnesotans from diverse religious traditions provided prayer to open the House session: Lutherans, Muslims, Catholics, Jews, Baptists and those of Native American faiths, just to name a few.

In January 1999, a choir from Totino-Grace High School in Fridley was invited to sing for the opening prayer ceremony. Keeping with the school’s religious tradition, the choir sang a beautiful song based on the Apostles’ Creed. Afterward, Rep. Michael Paymar, DFL-St. Paul, and a few other legislators expressed their discomfort because the name Jesus Christ was used in the words of the song.

Rather than simply accepting the differences in faith, Reps. Betty McCollum, DFL-North St. Paul, and Peggy Leppik, R-Golden Valley, after shaming some legislators, managed to place new restrictions and qualifications for prayer into the House rules.

Rep. Leppik admitted on the House floor that this was done mainly to stop Christians from praying in Jesus’s name, which those who prayed seldom did anyway.

This session, I joined several of my House colleagues to undo this intolerant change, to restore the rules to what they had been for 142 years — to allow individuals to pray according to their beliefs, whatever their religious tradition may be. Most members, including myself, appreciated the natural diversity that came from this freedom of expression. I am pleased that a bipartisan majority of the House agreed and voted to remove the restrictive language.

During the Feb. 23 debate, I told Rep. Paymar, who opposed this restoration of the House rules, not to impose his “irreligious left” views on me. I meant my remarks on the “irreligious left” to contrast the overweening and often intolerant “religious right.” But because I was speaking to Rep. Paymar, a legislator of Jewish faith, he and other legislators tried to capitalize politically by arguing that my statement was intolerant, or even anti-Semitic.

This is absurd and absolutely untrue. In my speech on the House floor, I did not make any reference whatsoever to Rep. Paymar being Jewish. I love the Jewish people and the nation of Israel. My Christian faith, after all, has deep and precious roots in Judaism.

This strategy by those on the political left to stop debate through intimidation and victimization must stop. It is destructive to the free and open political process our founders worked so hard to create and our soldiers have fought so hard to protect.

While preaching tolerance and acceptance, the political irreligious left has singled out Christians for discrimination. It has an agenda, and Christians are increasingly the target. During the debate on the House prayer last January, Rep. Phyllis Kahn, DFL-Minneapolis, compared using the name Jesus in the choir’s song to intimidating Jewish people in the way Adolf Hitler had done during the Holocaust.

These sorts of inflammatory statements have led some of the more deranged members of society to commit violence towards Christians. Think of Larry Ashbrook shouting, “It’s all bulls—what you believe!” as he shot up a Parchment church last year. Or the high school student in Kentucky who opened fire on a prayer group in 1997. Or Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris targeting Christians, along with African-American students and athletes, at Columbine High School. Where is this extreme hatred these people evidently have of Christian coming from?

The charges that I defamed people of Jewish faith by calling them “irreligious” are bogus and nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to discredit me in an election year. My conservative reputation, my deeply held beliefs and convictions, combined with the fact that I have led a Wednesday morning fellowship group for four years, has apparently made me a political target.

I earnestly hope that the liberal members of the House will stop being thought and speech police so we can get on with the business of governing the state of Minnesota.

Lindner, of Coon Rapids, represents District 33A in the Minnesota House. Contact him by telephone at (651) 298-7806 or by e-mail at rep.arlon.lindner@house.leg.state.mn.us.
D.J. TICE
EDITORIAL WRITER


Two years ago, a group of Jewish legislators, all DFLers, publicly chastised St. Paul Mayor Norm Coleman for belittling their religion.

Coleman, a Jewish Republican, had employed an Old Testament phrase — "Let my people go!" — while urging state funding for St. Paul's hockey arena. The lawmakers termed this whimsical flourish "highly offensive and insulting."

The problem with exaggerated, politicized complaints about religious or ethnic insensitivity is that they tend to trivialize all such complaints. Here, perhaps, is an illustration.

There appear to be genuine hurt feelings over ill-considered remarks uttered last week in the Minnesota House of Representatives. But the history of liberal lawmakers using religious indignation to battle political opponents makes it hard to be sure.

Last week's war of words concerned the prayers that open sessions of the House. A year ago, the House voted to require an opening prayer that is "nondenominational" and "reflects the religious diversity of the House." Last week, the body reversed that decision.

The House has long invited clergy of many faiths to deliver opening prayers from their various traditions on different days. The trouble started last year, when a choir sang explicitly Christian lyrics that struck some members as excessively sectarian and inconsiderate of non-Christian members.

But other members thought the new requirements would make any authentic prayer difficult.

Unfortunately, last week's debate boiled over. All the attention has been focused on a statement by Rep. Arlon Lindner. Rep. Corcoran. He was responding to Rep. Michael Paymar, DFL-St. Paul, one of the Jewish lawmakers who protested Coleman's biblical reference.

Paymar faulted "Rep. Lindner and others" for "imposing your own religious beliefs on the rest of this body."

Lindner, a fervent Christian conservative, turned to Paymar, "Don't impose your irreligious left views on me."

The response to Lindner has been fierce, beginning with 64 House members, including a dozen Republicans, formally protesting that Lindner had "defamed people of the Jewish faith," though he made no reference to Jewish people in general. Four DFLers have filed an ethics complaint. Included in heavy press coverage was an editorial in a rival newspaper insisting that Lindner had brought "anti-Semitism . . . a shameful part of Minnesota's past" to "the floor of the Minnesota House."

Now, Lindner's remarks will win no prize for courteous debate. But the punitive response betrays, at least in part, intolerance toward uppity conservatives.

Just how polite is public debate nowadays? Obviously, as Lindner says, the term "irreligious left" is a play on "religious right," a put-down label routinely applied to conservative Christians.

The rival editorial page that condemned Lindner had, only two days earlier, excoriated "the religious right," "the religious fringe" and "evangelist Pat Robertson" for employing what the editorial judged "un-Christian" tactics against Republican presidential candidate John McCain. The editorial also accused "the right-to-life establishment" of opposing McCain solely because he would "shut off the slush funding . . . ."

Last fall, the same champions of religious tolerance had laughed off as "a jolly good read" Gov. Jesse Ventura's Playboy interview, in which he called organized religion "a sham and a crutch for weak-minded people."

A computer search shows the term "religious right" has appeared in this newspaper more than 700 times since 1988. The term "irreligious left" had appeared twice before last week.

Last year, liberals widely criticized New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani for undermining free speech by suggesting taxpayer money ought not fund an art exhibit featuring an image of the Virgin Mary adorned with elephant dung. Some years back, a publicly supported photography show including a crucifix submerged in urine received similar support.

In America today, if you say a Christian prayer in public you're showing disrespect to non-Christians. If you display a sacred Christian symbol covered with excrement, you're in line for a public arts grant.

Given the modern casualness about Christians' feelings, maybe it's understandable that Lindner could underestimate the sensitivity of other religious groups. Lindner says he was bothered by Paymar's suggesting the prayer debate was wasting lawmakers' time.

Still, his response, given the context of the debate, was clumsy and harsh. Lindner says he wants to make it clear that he was addressing "one guy," and meant no disparagement of the Jewish faith.

One would like to believe that the House — and, indeed, the whole of American society — can find better ways to honor religious belief in all its forms in a spirit of mutual courtesy and forbearance.

But it's not only Christian conservatives who have work to do to get us there.
Lindner's free speech

I am not a Christian, but neither do I have a chip on my shoulder about people who are. If Rep. Arlon Lindner, R-Corcoran, wants to express his personal religious views on the floor of the Minnesota House, he is constitutionally entitled to do so. To drag him before the House Ethics Committee is improper and a violation of the First Amendment.

— William McGaughey, Minneapolis.
Perhaps it's time to end prayer at Legislature

Steven Hunegs and Stephen Silberfarb recently (Monday) stated their opposition to sectarian prayer in the state House of Representatives. They cite a prayer by Imam Matthew Ramadan, invoking the names of David, Solomon, Jesus and Mohammed, as an "inspirational" example of nonsectarian prayer.

Hunegs and Silberfarb fail to recognize Ramadan's prayer is every bit as sectarian as a Christian prayer which would mention only Jesus Christ.

The Muslim faith asserts there is no god but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet. Muslims also recognize other prophets, including David, Solomon and Jesus. It would appear Ramadan's prayer was no more broad than his faith allows. Muslims take exception to any prayer which elevates anyone other than Allah to the position of godhood.

Some Jews (Hunegs and Silberfarb apparently excluded) will take exception to invoking blessing from anyone except Yahweh. Christians will take exception to invoking blessings from anyone outside of the the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Atheists will take exception to any prayer. The list goes on.

Hunegs and Silberfarb must take their argument to its logical end: truly nonsectarian prayer can only be achieved by addressing some nameless deity in so broad a fashion that no faith is excluded and no truth-claim is denied. Such a prayer must be so demanding of meaning it will satisfy no one except those who find comic relief in its very utterance.

Perhaps it is time to eliminate formal prayer from our legislative sessions.

Mike Knox
Spooner, Wis.
irrigation

irrigation (n. 1. the act of supplying with water. 2. the state of being irrigated. 3. irrigable. adj.)
Main Entry: irreligious
Pronunciation: "ir-rel-ij-o-ous
Function: adjective
Date: 15th century
1: neglectful of religion: lacking religious emotions, doctrines, or practices irreligious that they exploit popular religion for professional purposes -- G. B. Shaw
2: indicating lack of religion
- ir-reli'gious-ly adverb
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Main Entry: ir-religion
Pronunciation: "ir-re-li-jan
Function: noun
Etymology: Middle French or Late Latin; Middle French, from Late Latin *irreligion-*, *irreligio*, from Latin in- + religion-, religio religion
Date: 1598
-the quality or state of being irreligious
- ir-religion-ist/-'li-j-nist, -'li-j-ist noun
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The word you were looking for is **irreligious**.

**Part of speech:** adjective

**Syllables:** ir-re-li-gious

**Pronunciation:** 

**Definition:**
1. not practicing or believing in any religion; not motivated by religious considerations or precepts.
2. marked by an absence of, or indifference or hostility toward, religion or religious considerations.

**Synonyms:**
- skeptical (1; 3), cynical (1), freethinking (freethinker), godless, faithless (3), infidel, agnostic (adj)

**Similar Words:**
- doubtful, unbelieving, incredulous, disbelief (disbelieve (vi)), atheistic (atheist), irreverent

**Derived Words:** 
- **irreligiously**, adv.
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Manufactured in the United States of America.
irrigate

irrigation of a barley field in Wyoming

Irving

Washington Irving (1832 engraving by Hatch (1805-1867)

and Simile (1807-1865)

Isabella I

Isaac II

Isabella II

Irving, John, Born 1942. American writer. His highly

novels include The World According to Garp (1978).

Irving, Washington. 1783-1859, an American writer celebrated

for the stories "Rip Van Winkle" and "The Legend of Sleepy

Hollow," contained in The Sketch Book (1819-1820).

Irvling-ton (i-r Vogue, a town of northeast New

J ersey, residential and industrial suburb of New York

situated on Long Island Sound, which was made a city


is (is) or is admirer of an unusual or unexpected occurrence.

is (is) or is a literary or cultural phenomenon present.

is the law, English. See see in Appendix.

is, or is. Island.

is. abbr. Bible. Isaiah.

is - pref. Variant of id-

is. abbr. Bible. Isaiah.

is. or. Bible. Isaiah.

I-saac (i-Sask). In the Old Testament, the son of Abraham

was offered as a sacrifice to God. The sacrifice was

presented the last moment by divine intervention.

Isabella of Castile. Queen of Castile (1451-1504). Her marriage

to Ferdinand V of Castile and Leon (father Ferdinand II of Aragon)

marked the beginning of a united Spanish state. Isabelas

widowed the voyages of Christopher Columbus.

Isaiah (i-Sa-ta, i-Sa'ya). Bible. A Hebrew prophet of the

ninth century B.C. 2. Abbrev. Isa. See Table at Bible.
Irrejectable, a. Obs. rare. [In-2] (See note)

That cannot be rejected.

1813 How. Jurispr. vol. viii. 157 Not the former Calderone, giving rise to irrepressible injustice (Aristotelian), or the irrepressible injustice of the present day.

Irrepressible, a. Obs. rare. [In-4-N]

Not liable to relapse.

1792 Blackstone, vol. ii. 437

More recent cases have been decided.

Irrelevant (or), a. [In-4-REL.-VANT.-VANT.] et. of. Irrelevant legis late imadmissible, not to the purpose.

Not relevant or necessary to the purpose; that does not apply; said orig. of evidence or arguments.

Irrelevant (or) Irrelevant legislation (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Irrelevant legislative enactment (or) Is
IRRELIGiously.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

Irreligion or irreligious: a. "irreligious" in a sense of being non-religious.

2. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRRELENTLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISABLE.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.

IRREMISIBLY.

1. Not religious: hostile to or without regard for religion: irreligious.
1. **Believing:** assured, confident, convinced, sure, certain, positive, opinionated, dogmatic. faithful, conformist, orthodox, converted, born-again. trusting, trustful, unquestioning, undoubting, unsuspecting, credible, gullible, innocent, naive, green, wet behind the ears.


5. **Disbelieve:** refuse to believe, dissent, disbelieve, scorn, ridicule, mock, scoff at, deny, negate, challenge, dispute, discredit, question, doubt, have doubts about, hesitate, waver, half-believe, have reservations, distrust, mistrust, suspect, smell a rat, take with a pinch or grain of salt, apostatize, lapse. Exposed, Unbelieving, Discredited, Exploded, Unbelievable, Incredible, Beyond Belief, Impossible, Implausible, Unbelievable, False, Unfaithful, Pagan, Heathen, Misbelieving. Freedom, Liberty, Independence, Sovereignty, Autonomy, Freedom, Democracy, Human Rights, Equality, Justice, Transparency, Accountability. Defamation, Slander, Libel, Blackmail, INTENTION, DUCTION, AFFIRMATION, OPPOSITION, THEORY, HYPOTHESIS, SUPPOSITION, BELIEF, CLIMATE OF OPINION.
448 Wickedness

Nouns
1. Wickedness, badness, unrighteousness, sin, sinfulness, evil, evillness, wrong, wicked or bad behavior, evil-doing, wrongdoing; wicked or bad ways, bad character, sinful or immoral or evil ways; rankness, lowness, nefariousness, shametfulness, flagitiousness, infamous, villaiuness, fiendishness, delinquency, criminality, villainy, knavery, roguery, malevolence, enormity, atrociousness, heinousness, viciousness, crueltv, inhumanity; notoriety, notoriousness, scandalousness, infamy, flagrancy

2. Malevolence 306; Wrong 430; Evil 446

3. Depravity, unvirtuousness, impurity, corruption, violation, loss of innocence; vice, obscenity, indecency; lust, vulgaritiy, carnality, debauchery, vileness, baseness; degradation, perversion, degeneration, degeneny, disrepute, fallen nature, rendivism, backsliding, deterioration, profanity, turpitude, moral turpitude, shamelessness; immorality, amorality, amoralism, no morals, loose morals, moral weakness, weakness of the flesh; weak point, laxity, lack of principle

Dispute 171; Immorality 432; Deterioration 808

4. Iniquity, wicked deed, pecadli, transgression, trespass, improbity, dishonesty; flaw, fatal flaw, failing, frailty, infirmity, fault, defect, demerit; sin, venial sin, original sin, capital sin, carnal sin, mortal sin, deadly sin; seven deadly sins: pride, covetousness or avarice, lust, anger, gluttony, envy, sloth

Religion 81; Desire 288; Pride 297; Envy 314; Immorality 432; Weakness 517

5. Impiety, ungodliness, godlessness, blasphemy, sacrilege, desecration, profaneness, profanity, idolatry, idolatriy, devil worship, Satanism, diabolism, witchcraft, sorcery

Occultism 86: Evil 446

6. Villain, blackguard, criminal, lawbreaker, crook, malefactor, outlaw, desperado, culprit, offender, roughneck, hooligan, hoodlum; felon, cheat, thief, rogue, thug, mugger; rapist, child abuser, pedophile; drug peddler or dealer, racketeer, gangster, mobster, malialis; killer, murderer, hired killer, assassin, hatchet man, terrorist, bomber, suicide bomber; wrongdoer, evildoer, transgressor, sinner, black sheep; traitor, betrayer, quisling, Judas, snake, snake in the grass, swine, swindler; pimp, nasty type, thug, bully, brute, savage, sadist, ogre; scum, scum of the earth, dregs of society; criminal world, underworld, gangland, organized crime, syndicate, Mafia, the Mob, Cosa Nostra, Black Hand; [In]: the rackets, hood, con man, hit man

Malevolence 306; Immorality 432; Evil 446

7. Wicked act, criminal act, criminal offense, punish-able offense, hanging offense, guilty act, foul play, unlawful act, lawbreaking, misdemeanor, shoplifting, seque-rence, juvenile delinquency, crime, white-collar crime, felony, drug peddling or dealing, racketeering, robbery, rape, assault, battery; assault with a deadly weapon; murder, assassination, terrorism, bombing, capital crime, deadly crime, career of crime

Killing 30; Substance Abuse 121; Guilt 450

8. Wicked place, sewer, gutter, pit, sink; sink of corrup-tion, sinkhole, hole; den, den of iniquity or vice, fleshpot, brothel, brothel, house of prostitution, cathouse; [Inf]: drug house, opium den, gambling den, road to hell, hell, hellhole

Substance Abuse 121; Immorality 432

Adjectives
9. Wicked, bad, unrighteous, sinful, sinning, evil; be having badly, evildoing, wrong, wrongdoing; rank, foul, arrant, nefarious, disreputable, disgraceful, shameful, flagitious, infamous; fiendish, delinquent, criminal, villainous, knavish, rogueish; malevolent, atrocious, heinous, vicious, cruel, inhuman; noxious, scandalous, flagrant

10. Depraved, unvirtuous, virtueless, scarlet, impure, corrupt, debased: rotten, rotten to the core, steeped in vice, obscene, indecent, lustful, vulgar, carnal, debauched, vile, base; degrading, degraded, pervert-ing, perverted, perverse, degenerate, degener-ative, degenerating, degenerate, profane, profligate; disreputed, fallen, recidivistic, recidivist, slipping, sliding, backsliding, deteriorating, deteriorated; shameless; without morals; immoral, amoral, morally weak, lax, unprincipled

Immorality 432

11. Impious, irreligious, ungodly, godless, godforsaken, blasphemous, sacrilegious, desecrating, profane, devilish, Satanic, diabolic; flawed, failing, frail, infirm, faulted, defeated; proud, covetous, avancious, lustful, angry, glutinous, envious, shiftless, lazy

Evil 446

12. Villainous, illegal, unlawful, lawbreaking, outlaw, desperate, offensive, culpable,picable, blameworthy, guilty; felonious, cheating, theiving, abusive; murderous, terrorist; traitorous, Judas-like, snake-like, recalcitrant; troublesome, scampish, rascally, lowdown, baddie, crooked, stinking, rotten

448 Wickedness
1114
Inhumanely; notoriously. scandalously. (illegally. vulgar. unsophisticated. with clean hands. with ingenuous. guileless. innaUon. pervert; become corrupt. to the fall into evil ways. shame oneself. dis- grace oneself. ruin one's name: lapse. relapse. background. slide. deviate from the path of virtue. stray from the straight and narrow. go to the dogs [Inf]
5 to deprave. make wicked. corrupt. distort. vitiate: lust after. seduce. debauch. degrade. pervert. degenerate; set a bad example. mislead. lead astray. teach wickedness. tempt. diabolize; demoralize; shame. dehumanize.

ADVERBS
6 wickedly. badly. unrighteously. sinfully. evilly. with evil intentions. wrongly. foully. arrantly. nefariously. disgracefully. shamefully. flagrantly. infamously; violently. fiendishly. delinquently. criminally. knavishly; malevolently. atrociously. heniously. viciously. cruelly. inhumanely: notoriously. scandalously. flagrantly.
7 unvirtuously. impurely. corruptly. obscenely. in an obscene manner. indecently. lustfully. vulgarly. carnally. vilely. base: degradingly. to one's discredit. pervertly. degenerately: disreputably. recidivatingly; shamelessly. immorally. amorally. without morals: iniquitously. dishonestly. unscrupulously.
8 impiously. ungodly. irreligiously. blasphemously. sacrilegiously. profanely. devilishly. diabolically. satanically.
9 villainously. criminally. illegally. unlawfully. culpably. offensively; with offense. feloniously. guiltily. murderously.

449 Innocence
No. it is not only our fate but our business to lose innocence. and once we have lost that. it is futile to attempt a return. and once we have lost that. it is futile to attempt a

piacone in Eden. — ELIZABETH BOWEN

NOUNS
1 Innocence. virtue. goodness: morality. uprightness. probity. purity. virginity. chastity. purity of heart. saintliness. state of grace. perfection: immaculacy. cleanliness. cleanliness. spotlessness. stainlessness. whiteness. playfulness. harmlessness. inoffensiveness
2 Cleanliness 111: Modesty 403; Virtue 447
3 Incorruption, incorruptibility, incorruptness, sinlessness: freedom from sin. guiltlessness. inculpability. clear conscience. clean hands. faultlessness. impeccability; blamelessness. freedom from blame. irreproachability. nothing to confess. nothing to declare: innocent intentions. pure motives
4 Cleanliness 111: Morality 431
5 Legal innocence, verdict of innocence. finding of innocent: acquittal. exoneration. exculpation. absolution
6 Law 53; Litigation 54
7 NaiVete. ingenuousness. guilelessness. artlessness. unsophistication. inexperience. immaturity. callowness. greenness. worldliness. naturalness. simplicity. credulousness: childhood. days of innocence. golden age. salad days
8 Youth 26; Ignorance 349; Naivete 821
9 Innocent person. innocent party. innocent: beginner. ingenuous. virgin. newcomer. greenhorn. tenderfoot; infant. child. babe. newborn babe. babe in the woods or wood. good person. saint. lamb. dove. angel: goody two shoes. goody-goody

ADJECTIVES
6 Innocent. virtuous. good. upright: pure. virginal. chaste: pure of heart. saintly. perfect. angelic; immaculate. unblemished. untainted: stainless. spotless. unsullied. unconfused. clear. pristine. white; prelapsarian. untouched by evil. unerring. innocent as a lamb. lambs. innocent as a dove. dove-like. gentle. inoffensive. harmless. innocent. safe; playful. hoUer than thou; goody-goody
7 Incorrupt. incorruptible. sinless. free from sin: guiltless. inculpable. faultless. immaculate; blameless. unblemished. unblameworthy: irreprensible. reproachable. unrepentable. above suspicion: not guilty. cleared. in the clear; with clear hands. clean-handed: uncorrupt. incorruptible. uncorrupted
8 Declared innocent. found innocent. found not guilty; cleared. acquitted. exonerated. exculpated. absolved
9 Naive. ingenuous. guileless. artless. unsophisticated. credulous; inexperienced. immature. callow. green. unworldly. natural. simple; knowing no wrong. knowing no better; prelapsarian. childlike: innocent as a child. innocent as a newborn babe

VERBS
10 Be innocent. have no guilt. stand above suspicion; wrong no one; have clean hands. have a clear conscience. have nothing to be ashamed of. have nothing to hide. have nothing to declare. have nothing to confess: live in a state of grace; not fall from grace: mean no harm. have the best intentions. salve one's conscience
11 Declare innocent. find innocent. find not guilty: clear. acquit. exonerate. exculpate. absolve
12 Be naive. have no guile. lack sophistication. lack experience. lack maturity: know no wrong. know no better; have the innocence of a child. be childlike

ADVERBS
13 Innocently. in all innocence. with clean hands. with a clear conscience. with an easy conscience: virtuously. uprightly. purely. with pure intentions; virginal. chastely. perfectly. to perfection. in a perfect way. angelically. immaculately. spotlessly. unerringly;
Speaker Sviggum: Report from the Committee on Rules and Legislative Administration.

Clerk Burdick: Report from the Committee on Rules and Legislative Administration. Pawlenty for the Committee on Rules and Legislative Administration, offers the following report and moves its adoption. “Resolve that Rule 1.01 of the Permanent Rules of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-First Session shall read as follows.”

Speaker Sviggum: There is a copy of this on each Member’s desk. I call on the Chairman of the Rules Committee, Majority Leader, Representative Pawlenty.

Majority Leader Pawlenty: Mr. Speaker. Just for clarification purposes, there are two reports, separate reports from the Rules Committee. I presume we are on the report coded S-15-CR. Is that correct?

Speaker Sviggum: That is correct. S-15-CR.

Majority Leader Pawlenty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, today we will be considering two separate reports from the Rules Committee. The first is coded S-15-CR. The second will come up after this discussion.

This report, Members, deals with the provision in House Rules relating to the prayer that we present to Members prior to the start of session. By way of background, Members, the language that is at issue here, was changed last year during the 1999 session. I think you are familiar with that. We have had some debates through some motions by Representative Reuter earlier this session and last year about these issues.

But from 1919 to 1999, there was essentially no change in the House Rules regarding prayer. Again, from 1919 to 1999, no change, except in 1973, there was a brief addition of the phrase, “or meditation,” was added to the House Rules.

Last year, as you know, we had a situation where a choir came to the House floor and presented a song that was of concern to many Members, several Members, as perhaps going too far, or maybe using language that was offensive or inappropriate.

In response to that, shortly after that, we had an initiative on the House floor that started with Representative McCollum’s amendment, I think was attempted to be enhanced by an amendment by Representative Leppik. It was all done on the House floor, somewhat, I don’t want to say “on the fly,” but on somewhat short notice.

And that has resulted in some prayer language that was intended, I think, to celebrate and be respectful and tolerant of diversity, but I believe may have had the opposite effect, or at least on paper, may have had the opposite effect.

As it has been interpreted, the new rule that was adopted in 1999 would require a non-denominational prayer, as well as a prayer that would respect the religious diversity of the House. And, taken literally, that language would require a generic or homogenous prayer that was not particular to one faith. In fact, the letter that goes out from the Chaplain speaks of directions to the Visiting Chaplains to make the prayer inter-faith, ecumenical, not to be exclusionary of any faith, and not to be focused on a denomination’s distinctiveness.

Members, I think that if we want to be respectful of diversity, and celebrate diversity, we should allow different perspectives and then tolerate that. And I have spoken to the Speaker about this, Members, about how, if we adopt this Rules Committee Report, this would be implemented.

And the goal here would be to, rather than have any one particular prayer try to reflect the entire religious diversity of the House, that we would strive over the course of the Session to invite Chaplains and Visiting Chaplains in that would reflect religious diversity in the House. And, I think, as we established last year through some procedural debates, when the prayer takes place, we are not formally yet in session, and Members can choose to attend or not attend as they see fit, as an additional consideration.

But our goal here, Members, is to not have prayer that is so watered down or so generic that it becomes pointless and a counter to diversity and celebrating diversity, but in fact allow diversity to take place, recognizing that all of us need to be tolerant of it, but do so within the context of an entire session, and allow each individual prayer to perhaps speak to a particular faith or religious perspective.

So with that background, Members, we offer this Report from the Rules Committee. And we hope that you will support it.

Representative Leighton: Mr. Speaker, I request a roll call vote.

Speaker Sviggum: Roll call being requested. Are there fifteen hands? Seeing fifteen hands, there will be a roll call. Representative Leighton.

Representative Leighton: Mr. Speaker, I also request a Call of the House.

Speaker Sviggum: Call of the House. Are there ten hands requesting a Call of the House? Seeing the ten hands, there will be a Call of the House. The clerk will take the roll. Representative Pawlenty?

Majority Leader Pawlenty: Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the Call be suspended, and that the Sergeant-At-Arms be instructed to bring in the absent Members.

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Pawlenty moves that further proceedings under the Roll Call be dispensed with and that the Sergeant-At-Arms be instructed to bring in the absent members. Those in favor, say “Aye.” Opposed, “Nay.” The motion prevails. The Clerk will close the Roll, and the Sergeant-At-Arms will bring in the absent members. To the Report of the Rules Committee that is before us. Is there any discussion? S-15-CR. The member from Ramsey, Representative Paymar.

Representative Paymar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I am a little surprised at the Majority Leader bringing this change of rules to this body today. This is a short legislative session. We have pressing items that we should be debating. And now this is the second time that Members of your Caucus have brought this to the body, to consume more time, more energy, talking about whether, what kind of prayer we should have to start each session.

Representative Leppik, I thought, gave a, really, a beautiful speech last, last time this was brought up, explaining the reason and the purpose for the language that we currently have in Rules.

That allows for a non-denominational prayer that respects the religious diversity of the House. And how anyone could support the notion of deleting, striking the language out of the Rules that respects the religious diversity of the House is beyond me. So not only am I concerned about the time that this is going to take away from the busy work that we should have, doing Minnesota’s work, but I am concerned about the intent behind it. Because it was only last year - - - Mr. Speaker?

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Paymar?

Representative Paymar: I can’t hear.

Speaker Sviggum: Okay. Members, please give the proper respect to the speaker, Representative Paymar. Representative Paymar?

Representative Paymar: It was only last year, Mr. Speaker and Members, that I remember Representative Lindner getting up before the House, and saying to this body that the Christian religion is the majority in this House, that the Christian religion is the majority of this House, so why can’t we have the kind of prayers that we want in this body. Now, is that your intent? I know that that’s not in your heart, and those others who are going to support this rule change. But it is disrespectful. It is highly disrespectful.

You are imposing your own religious beliefs on the rest of this body, which is, and the minority Members here, minority religious Members here, in my view. I know that is not in your heart, and I know what your intent is. But I have expressed to you before how this makes certain Members feel, who are not Christians.

Now, I know that some of you have Christian prayers throughout the week. I get them on my e-mail. You invite people to your Fellowships. Fine. Do it. Do it whenever you want. Do it before session starts, if you feel like you want to have prayer before the House starts its deliberations. But I would like to be part of that, of that moment, where a religious leader gets up before us and has a prayer. But I would like that to be non-denominational, and I would like it to be respectful of who I am. And I think this is disrespectful. I would hope the body would reject the Majority Leader’s position, we vote down this rule change.
Speaker Sviggum: Is there any further discussion? The Member from Hennepin, Representative Lindner.

Chairman Lindner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Paymar, I don’t know for sure what you are talking about. If you are talking about wasting time, did you just sit there and listen to Representative Kahn waste all that time just a few minutes ago?

I think prayer is very important. You know, we are told there is one God, and one mediator between God and man. The man, Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn’t be left not able to pray in the name of our God, when we have an opportunity to pray. That’s disrespectful of the majority’s rights.

Now, if you don’t want to be here for prayer, as the Speaker has said before, this is not mandatory. The prayer happens before session begins. And I don’t know why you are looking at me all this time, you know, while you are talking.

I am very happy this is coming back up, and I think all we are doing is putting the order of the day, the order for prayer, and the way we do prayer, back like it was for hundreds of years before this session. And if you don’t like it, you may have to like it. Or just don’t come. I don’t come sometimes for some prayers here. There are some groups that pray in here that I stay out of the room. We have that privilege, and you need to exercise it. But don’t impose your irreligious left views on me.

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Ramsey, Representative Haake.

Representative Haake: Thank you. Members, I don’t know about the rest of you, but I really don’t care what God everybody prays to. They are all praying to one God. And as far as I am concerned, I need all the help I can get. And I really appreciate the prayers from everybody’s God. Thank you.

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Ramsey, Representative McCollum.

Representative McCollum: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I am going to vote against this amendment and I am going to vote against it for a couple of reasons. The paramount one is, the two times this has been discussed on the floor was within the way that the Rules of the House are adopted. And that is more than a simple majority. And I voted against it in the Rules Committee.

What we have done here is we’ve said, okay, there is a majority who would like the prayer to be conducted in a certain way. And we can’t win when it is a simple majority, so we’ll amend the rules going through the Rules Committee, where a simple majority can win. The reason why, that we have a higher standard for adopting the rules as we do in the first weeks of session, is so that the minority is heard. And we lost that, with the way that the rules were adopted. And that is why I voted against it in the Rules Committee.

I am very concerned about the tenor of discussion. I am a Christian. I am a Catholic. And I am not here trying to out-Christian anybody else. And when I want to pray a Catholic creed, I do it at church. And I enjoy the fellowship of the many denominations in this hall. And I enjoy the fellowship of praying together, when everybody feels included.

And the comment is, “just don’t come.” Well, you know, if you just don’t come from [sic] the prayer, you just don’t get to say the Pledge of Allegiance either. Because the doors are closed for that. So, Members, I would encourage you not to vote for this amendment. And, Representative Paymar? One of my favorite religious songs is, “They Will Know We Are Christians By Our Love.”

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Ramsey, Representative Entenza.

Representative Entenza: Mr. Speaker, I think the issue today is whether or not we are going to show the respect that the present rule has. And Representative Lindner, I hope that perhaps you want to re-think the last remark that you made? We have Members in this body who come from different religious traditions. And to suggest that someone who comes from the Jewish tradition, a tradition which we should all certainly honor, that somehow that is an irreligious one, suggests to me that it is very important to vote against this motion from the Rules Committee.

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Hennepin, Representative Skoglund.

Representative Skoglund: Mr. Speaker, will Representative Lindner yield to a question?

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Lindner does yield. Representative Skoglund.
Representative Skoglund: Mr. Speaker. Did I hear you say, “Don't impose your irreligious views on me?” Was that your quote to Representative Paymar? Mr. Speaker, apparently I am not speaking loudly enough. Representative Lindner, did you say, “Don't impose your irreligious views on me,” to Representative Paymar?

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Lindner.

Chairman Lindner: It was something like that.

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Skoglund.

Representative Skoglund: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed quite frankly for what Representative Lindner said. And as a Christian, as a Christian who does Bible devotion almost every night with his family, I apologize to you, because most of us don't feel that way, Representative Paymar. I apologize. I am embarrassed, on behalf of we Christians.

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Olmsted, Representative Bishop.

Chairman Bishop: Mr. Speaker and Members. It has been accurately said that this issue is not new. That we have voted on it a number of times. And I believe, if my recollection is correct, that I voted on it both ways, or three or four ways, if there have been three or four votes. And I think that I voted each time, in line with my best judgment of what things meant. But Mr. Speaker and Members, I have this feeling about the order of things in the House that I have observed over, now 18 years. And I don't see anyone objecting to the word “prayer.” Nor have I heard anyone in the past object to the word “prayer,” or by the Chaplain, or by someone standing in for the Chaplain, on a daily, temporary basis as a Chaplain pro tem, or for the words “time for a brief meditation.” Mr. Speaker and Members, I have a problem with “non-denominational.” It is a negative word. I don't know how to make, and I don't see a good reason, for asking a Catholic priest to be our Chaplain. And Monsignor [Haberger?] for years, was the House Chaplain. While I am not of the Catholic faith and persuasion, members of my family are. I have a deep respect for that segment of the Christian religion. Monsignor [Haberger?] was an outstanding Chaplain. I can't remember a single invocation or prayer that he gave that I didn't find helpful. In fact, a number of them, I asked him for copies so that I could read them over. But I wouldn't expect me to ask Monsignor [Haberger?] to give a prayer that was a non-Catholic prayer, because of a “non-denominational” word in front of it. I wouldn't expect a rabbi to give a Catholic prayer. Nor a minister from a Baptist church to give a prayer that was “non-denominational” or from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. We honor ourselves by honoring all of our Chaplains who offer us the prayer or meditations. So I support the action of the Rules Committee, on the word “non-denominational.” I think it conveys a confusing message, and “prayer by the Chaplain” is sufficient. I think, “respects the religious diversity of the House,” has not been an issue. But putting it in the wording, I think, makes it an issue. And I think that we should get back to the words that have worked over the years, and expect the Speaker and the Chaplain to line up persons to give us invocations that are uplifting at the beginning, without giving us invocations that are contrary to anyone's faith. I don't think we have to get into the question of religions. I hope we don't. I know that Representative Lindner knows that we wouldn't have the Christian faith if it hadn't been for Judaism before it. That the standards of Judaism were well known to the founder of the Christian, founders of the Christian church and faith. And we get strength from both. I think we shouldn't be struggling with one over the other. And I think we should expect this particular change in the rules to be a strengthening, rather than a weakening, of our practice. Thank you.

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Crow Wing, Representative Hasskamp.

Representative Hasskamp: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I was not going to speak on this, but after Representative Lindner’s comments, I have to. Because when he said what he did, my heart stopped. And I want the Members, because this is the most personal vote we are going to cast, this is the vote on what we want in this body before the session begins. It is not a political issue. It is a personal issue. And I want my colleagues, Representative Paymar and others of other faiths, to know why I am voting for this rule. And I am voting for the rule because I want to be exposed to other religious beliefs and prayers. Because in my 12 years, we have had other types of religious prayers here. And all my life, I have been exposed to other religions, and it has been good for me, and healthy for me. And Representative Paymar, that is why I don't want it to be sort of watered down to be, you know, non- whatever. I want to be able to be exposed to everything. So I want you to know why I believe we need to go back to giving this rule because I am not afraid of other religious beliefs or prayers. And by the way, Representative Lindner, every single morning, when I do my Liturgy of the Hours, the whole prayer is the Psalms. And the Old Testament is so precious to our faith. So I am really kind of, very kind of, offended myself to have those comments made about our, about the Jewish faith. Members, I wanted you to know why I am voting for this motion, this rule, because I like diversity of this prayer.
Speaker Sviggum: Any further discussion? The Member from Hennepin, Representative Van Dellen.

Representative Van Dellen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too am pleased that this rule change is going to come up today. I have not spoken on this issue in the past, either last session when we changed the rule, or last time I believe when Rep. Reuter brought the issue up early in this session. But I do want to talk about it today, because I believe the outcome might be different.

First of all, a bit of a history lesson is in order for anyone who might be watching on television at home, or who might read about this in the newspaper tomorrow. Last year, when we changed this, at least it was my perception, that when we made the change that has been controversial and is being reversed today, it was my perception that the change, which was a change to a rule which, as Representative Lindner observed, is very old, over a hundred years old, regarding the order of the day and the prayer, and it was my perception the day we changed the rule early in the 1999 regular session, that the amendment came with little warning for at least many Members of the body, and that there was a considerable amount of confusion over what the new words meant, “non-denominational” and the other clause that was inserted into the rule, and that the voting occurred perhaps without full consideration or reflection of what those words necessarily meant. Of course, that reflection occurred after the change was made. And I think the majority decided, upon further reflection, and by that I mean the majority of the Members, not the majority Caucus, but the majority of the Members of the House, both Republican and Democrat, that the wording change was not what they wished, not what they desired, not that it did not have, necessarily, the intent that they desired, and - but by that point it became too late for the majority to act to amend the rule back, and so today, because of the procedural posture in which this comes to us, we have that opportunity to let the majority decide, and I think it is important for the public of Minnesota to know that the majority will will prevail here today, the majority of the House both Republican and Democrat, it is not a partisan issue, but that it is important that the majority will prevail on this issue as others in this representative democracy. That is the first point.

Secondly, I think it is also important, and it was perhaps only knowable upon reflection and experience following the change made in the session last year how the public would perceive the message sent by the body in making the change to the rule. And I can tell you that, as a church-going Christian member of this body, I went, when I went to church in the Sundays following the rule change last session, the clear perception among members not only of my church but my friends and neighbors and associates and acquaintances was that the purpose of the rule was to strike the name of Jesus Christ from any prayers that were conducted in the House. Now, I am not saying that is what the rule says, and I am not saying that that is what you all meant by changing the rule, or that any of you meant that, but that is what the public heard and read when they heard about this change. And it is important to consider what the public perceives to be our direction as their elected representatives. And we have to always keep in mind that, they are not here every day, they are home taking care of their children and working their jobs and raising their families, and we have to consider how they hear it, and how they read it, and they read it as being an offense to the name of Jesus Christ, and we have to do something to correct that, and I think that the rule that the Majority Leader has proposed, the change, will correct that misapprehension by the public.

Thirdly, and finally, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have again in the context of debating this rule become a bit ego-centric here in the House, thinking that the important issue is the diversity of this House, and that’s not it. We’re Representatives. We’re agents for the people of the state, and the important issue is to respect the diversity of the citizens of the state of Minnesota. And I think, in my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we do that not by homogenizing prayer, that we do that by celebrating that diversity by having a wide diversity of prayers at the podium to open our sessions every day, and I can tell you personally that it has helped me grow as a, not only as a person, not only spiritually, but also as a state, as opposed to a district or a parochial representative, as a State Representative, to hear a wide diversity of prayers that might not celebrate the same religion that I am from, but that provoke my thought and make me grow as a Representative, and I am glad that the Majority Leader has offered this rule change so that we can celebrate that diversity again. Thank you.

Speaker Sviggum: The Member from Hennepin, Representative Leppik.

Chair Leppik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to divide the proposed rule change between lines 13 and 14, and take the second part first.

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Leppik, I believe that that is divisible. Members of the body, Representative Leppik moves to divide the rule before us, the proposed rule, between lines 13 and 14 and asks that the second half, lines 14 and 15, be voted on first. There is stricken language in lines 14 and 15. Is that correct, Representative Leppik?

Chair Leppik: That is correct.

Speaker Sviggum: Okay, I believe that is divisible. We will do that. Representative Leppik, there will be a roll call vote on each half of the divided amendment. Is there any discussion to the second part of the amendment, lines 14 and 15, of the Rules Committee report? Representative Leppik?
Chair Leppik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, when I was first elected 10 years ago, I had no intention of coming here to engage in a battle over religion. It was the last thing that I would want or expect to do. But I find myself very uncomfortably in the middle of this, because I simply cannot remain silent.

I am uncomfortable with it because this is the wrong place for such an argument to take place. This Capitol is the center of our Government, where we make laws that affect all the people of this state. We do pray here, before we take attendance for session, to ask for guidance, to reflect, to celebrate, to comfort.

We invite religious leaders and lay people to lead us in prayer. And we expect them to understand that we are a religiously-mixed group. Some are Christian. Most are Christian here. Some are Jewish. And some have other religious beliefs. We all bring our beliefs and our values here. They are part of who we are. But we don’t have to impose our beliefs and particular sectarian expressions as a matter of course on others who do not share them.

We are each free to add whatever we would like, quietly, at the end of a prayer to adapt it to our own religious traditions, and to make it more personal. Some people say that respect and diversity come in the totality of the prayers that are heard over a period of time. And perhaps that is true. It would be true if we did regularly have other religions represented. But, in fact, we don’t. Over ten years, I think I can count on one hand the number of times I have heard a rabbi lead us in prayer. I recall once hearing a Native American religious leader. Better that we show religious tolerance and respect on a daily basis, so that all who wish to participate can do so fully and in good conscience. I have heard people say, “if the prayer does not suit you, just don’t come.” Well, doesn’t that defeat the purpose of bringing us all together, even if just for a moment, in prayer? Besides which, we all know we take pot-luck when we walk in the Chamber. We don’t know what is going to be said in that prayer. It is a sad day when we, as the leaders of the people of this state, say we cannot tolerate a rule that asks that prayers respect the religious diversity of the House.

Speaker Sviggum: Is there any further discussion on the second part of the Rules Committee report before us? There is a roll call that has been requested. The Member from Dakota, Representative Wilkin.

Representative Wilkin: Point of parliamentary inquiry?

Speaker Sviggum: State your point of parliamentary inquiry.

Representative Wilkin: Could you tell Members what a “green” vote means on this?

Speaker Sviggum: Representative Wilkin, we are on the second part of the Rules Committee report, lines 14 and 15. A “green” vote would support lines 14 and 15, meaning those lines, the words “that respects the religious diversity of the House,” would be stricken from the current rule.

Representative Wilkin: So if Members would like to adopt the Rules Committee report, they need to vote “green” on each of the next two votes?

Speaker Sviggum: That is correct, Representative Wilkin. The Member from Mower, Representative Leighton.

Representative Leighton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly encourage a “no” vote on this portion of the amendment. And, you know, would the Republican majority please let us know how many times we are going to need to debate our pre-session prayers? I mean, apparently this has become a top priority of the majority Caucus. This is the second time that we have dealt with this issue in this short session already. Last year, we spent hours debating pre-session prayers.

Chairman Bishop: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Sviggum: For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Chairman Bishop: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the gentleman to address the issue, not pull out politics? I am offended by his remarks that I have been in some way coopted by some Caucus or majority. I have spoken my position on it, Mr. Leighton, and I do not appreciate being considered. I am very much in favor of considering it, and if we have to do it for 10 hours, let us do it, or 10 days. But please do not coopt me, and call this a majority Republican issue. It is not.

Representative Leighton: Mr. Speaker, did Representative Bishop cite a rule?

Speaker Sviggum: No, Representative Leighton, he did not. Let us stick to the issue before us. The issue before us is, lines 14 and 15 of the Rules Committee report. Representative Leighton.
Representative Leighton: Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to focus my comments on this. This is an important issue. I agree with what Representative Leppik has said. I think she has shown some sensitivity on this issue. I can’t say that about the majority of people on that side of the aisle. We have been through this exercise numerous times. The public expects some partisanship in this Chamber. We certainly should aggressively debate issues like education, issues like transportation, issues like taxes. We are now spending the second debate on pre-session prayers, and I think the public would be outraged. We need to focus on the important issues of this day. The point of the current language is to show some sensitivity to all Members in this body.

Representative Lindner, who is the Chairman of a Committee, and who is a leader in the Republican Caucus, said a few moments ago to Members of this body who are non-Christians that they should simply not be present on the Floor of the House of Representatives before the session starts if that is too much of a problem. You know, I think that that comment reflects the lack of sensitivity that the current language is meant to address. I believe that we should keep the current language. I think we need to show some respect for the diversity within the membership of this body. And I would hope that everyone would vote “no” on this portion of the amendment.

Speaker Sviggum: Is there any more discussion to the second part of the Rules Committee report? The Member from Dakota, Representative Pawlenty.

Majority Leader Pawlenty: Mr. Speaker and Members. Questions of politics and questions of religion generate strong feelings, and that is evident here today. Especially if the two get linked together, Representative Leighton, and I don’t think this is about politics. And if you want a cite for Representative Bishop’s point of order, it is Mason’s Section 124 regarding motives of members. But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation here, where our country obviously was founded on principles where individuals, in part, were fleeing religious tyranny. We have got Constitutional provisions that prohibit an establishment of religion. They allow, of course, the freedom of association of groups, including religious groups, and other provisions that are founded on the founding principles of this country, avoiding religious tyranny, avoiding the establishment of government-sanctioned, government-mandated religion.

Representative Paymar, you used the reference “impose religious views on you” in your remarks. And has been pointed out several times, the prayer that is offered here is when we are not in session. You can choose to not come, and come after the prayer, or wait out wherever you like, if you want. If you want to come, we can also make accommodations for the pastor to make a posting of what type of pastor is going to be here on a given day, so you know ahead of time what the nature of the prayer is.

But the larger point is this. I believe most members in this body want to embrace and respect diversity. They want to tolerate differences, whether they be religious differences or others. You want that, Representative Paymar. You want to tolerate religious differences. The frustration arises out of, I think, some confusing language from this prayer. Representative Bishop and others have said we have struggled to define what “non-denominational” is, and “respecting religious diversity,” in the context of prayer. Let me give you an example. In the Christian faith, you can only pray to one God. You can only pray one way. And so it is not a prayer for the Christian Members of the Legislature to have a prayer from, say, a Member who worships Buddha. So that would, by definition, not respect our religious viewpoints. Similarly, if we have a Christian prayer that is in Jesus’ name, that would be offensive to Members of the body who are Jewish, or of concern to you. And so we have a prayer rule that allows prayer, but it has to be a generic prayer which by definition by many faiths cannot be prayer. I mean you cannot have a, technically, Christian prayer, for example - - not to focus on that - - that is generalized. You cannot have a prayer by a Buddhist leader that respects the religious diversity of certain Members of the House. So we have a difficult situation. What we are suggesting as an alternative is to allow people of different faiths to come before the body, as we have traditionally. In the last session, for example, we had Lutheran and Catholic, and non-denominational, Alliance, with community churches, Jewish rabbis, Baptists and others come before the body. I have, again, spoken to the Speaker about this, to make a conscious effort to have pastors come that reflects religious diversity of the House. But it is difficult, if not impossible, to construct a prayer, an individual prayer, that respects the religious diversity of the whole House. That is all we are talking about. We are not talking about “imposing a religion,” or being intolerant. So, again, each individual prayer, it is difficult to respect the diversity of the whole House, but over the course of the session, cumulatively, the prayers should. We agree with that, Representative Paymar, we agree with that. And we certainly are not here to be religiously intolerant or to have any form of religious tyranny. We don’t want that. And I don’t think this leads to that. It worked reasonably well for all the years that we’ve had it. There has not been a substantial change of practice. But the rule change did require a letter to go out to the pastors, again, that mandates that your prayer be inter-faith, ecumenical, not exclusionary of any faith, not focused on a denomination’s distinctives, and it really makes it difficult to design a prayer that meets those definitions. And so, we are just trying to solve that problem. And I don’t think we need to get into hysteria or finger-pointing. It is just allowing diversity in the context of the session.

If you are going to have diversity, Representative Paymar and others, you have got to allow it. You have got to allow it. You have to tolerate it. And if we are just going to have a generic, homogenous prayer, there is no diversity. And I believe you have enough room in your heart and in your perspective to allow diverse religious thought and other forms of diversity. So I hope this is put in proper context and that Members support the amendment as it originally came out of the Rules Committee.
Chairman Abrams (on the dais): The Member from Hennepin, Representative Kelliher.

Representative Kelliher: Members and Mr. Speaker. I do not rise often to speak, but I want to say that, if that is your intent, Mr. Majority Leader, then you will support what Representative Leppik is trying to do. Because I believe what she is trying to do gets at maybe where we should be. And when Representative Van Dellen raised that it should respect the diversity of Minnesota, I remember distinctly having that debate last year. We don’t want to get into that debate. What we want to deal with here is the diversity of this body. And the respect of this body. I believe that when we, if we made the change, and we defeated this part of the change, and maybe made a reconsideration, some of us, on the other part of the change, that could accomplish much of the goal that many of you have spoken to. So I implore you to think about this, to give it your deepest thought, and to support Representative Leppik on this move, and to take away some of the fire and contention that has been around this debate, and to respect the diversity of the body. I ask for your “no” vote.

Chairman Abrams (on the dais): The Member from Ramsey, Representative Entenza.

Representative Entenza: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, uh, Representative Pawlenty, I know you are on the phone, but I, I’ll, I just want to address a couple of remarks, because actually, I agreed with most of your speech. I, I was glad to see the, uh, uh, the, a kinder and gentler tone coming out, um, and talking about respecting, uh, diversity. Uh, but then I’m confused by, your, uh, then calling for the passage of the second part of this amendment, because this says very clearly that we will be respecting religious diversity, but if we vote “green” on this, we are talking about removing that. And your arguments, I think, are about a different issue, a different part of the resolution coming out of the Rules Committee. When you look at this resolution, it comes from Section 1.01 of the Permanent Rules: the Convening of the House. In other words, when we are convening our body. And I am concerned, Representative Pawlenty, that your call for respecting diversity does not recognize the fact that we’re, we’ve already had speeches here talking about the fact that people just shouldn’t show up on the House floor. They should just stay away. They shouldn’t be here for our convening. And I think if we want to respect our religious diversity, we need to make sure that we follow Representative Leppik’s lead, and that we support this particular language.

Because we have already heard speeches on this House floor that make it clear that diversity apparently is not particularly well respected. And I think we need to make sure that we have very clear language that does respect it and I would urge a “red” vote on the second portion of this resolution.

Chairman Abrams (on the dais): The Member from Otter Tail, Representative Nornes.

Representative Nornes: Members, I just want to make a real short comment. I do consider this to be a serious issue, contrary to some others. I also consider it to be very serious to be in this body, to be a part of this Legislature. I feel it is a very, very high privilege. Since being elected to the House of Representatives, I have also thought it was a privilege to invite pastors from my district to come here, to be our guests, to lead us in prayer. And I have done that, every year. And I have talked to the Chaplain, and I have given him names of people that are in my district who would consider it a deep honor to come here. Until last year, when I received word from one of my friends who was a pastor of a church in my community, and he said he would not come here. And the reason for him not coming here is exactly the rule that we are voting on today. And I find right now very difficult, it is very difficult to invite others under this rule.

Chairman Abrams (on the dais): The Member from Sherburne, Representative Olson.

Representative Olson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate Members taking the time to discuss this again. Representative Pawlenty referenced the Constitution and our rights. The Preamble of the Minnesota Constitution recognizes that “we, the people of the state of Minnesota, grateful to God for our civil and religious liberty.” And of course, that is established in the federal Constitution. Under Article I, Section 2, Rights and Privileges, “No member of this state shall be disenfranchised or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof.”

My question to you, Members, is why, how is it right to take away my right to have someone say a prayer that is meaningful to me? How is that respectful, and not respectful to take away? Excuse me, why is it right to take away my right to have someone say a prayer that is meaningful to me? Why is that right?

I don’t need to ask the other side of the coin. I don’t need to reflect on what the other side of it is. You are talking about respect. You are talking about respecting the religious diversity of the House. What this is a good example of, is that you cannot put language in law that establishes diversity. You cannot simply write something that says “respect diversity,” and it happens.

Because what we have experienced in this body since we have had this, is that some of us can no longer have someone come and pray a prayer that is meaningful to us. And you are saying that is “respectful of diversity.” Instead, what it means is that certain religions cannot say a prayer, or have a prayer said that reflects their beliefs. But all other religions can.
And I do not understand how you are, I cannot see how you are saying that this language, if we left it as it is, would be respectful, because it literally means that some prayers cannot be said, but all others can. And it doesn't matter if it is the majority of the body's prayer, or if the minority's. Because what we had for over 140 years is the religious diversity of this House being respected.

I have heard prayers from the podium, from the Clerk's position, that did not respect my religious views. But I found it insightful. I found it beneficial. I found it insightful to experience, but it did not respect my religious views. And that is fine. It does not have to respect my religious views every day.

What was said earlier, that there should not be a matter of course. The language we have had established a matter of course. It established a House prayer. What we had for 140 years did not establish a House prayer. We had diversity. Everyone has had the right to ask for a clergy to come in, or a rabbi, or whatever, to come in and say a prayer for the body. And we have always respected the religious diversity of the House. And I hope that we will go back to that position. Thank you.

Chairman Abrams (on the dais): Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, a roll call has been requested. A “green” vote is to accept the second portion of the Rules Committee report. A “red” vote is to reject the second portion of the Rules Committee report. The Clerk will take the roll. The House is under Call. Members will please vote. The Clerk will call the absent Members. All Members having voted, the Clerk will close the roll. There being 71 “ayes” and 60 “nays,” the second portion of the report of the Rules Committee is adopted.

We are now on the first half of the report of the Rules Committee. Is there any discussion? If not, a roll call has been requested. A “green” vote is in favor of the first portion of the report of the Rules Committee. A “red” vote is a vote against the first portion of the report of the Rules Committee. The Clerk will take the roll. Members will please vote. The House is under Call. Members will vote. All Members having voted, the Clerk will close the roll. There being 79 “ayes” and 52 “nays,” the first portion of the report of the Rules Committee is adopted.
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REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS
IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT
AGAINST REPRESENTATIVE ARLON LINDNER

On February 28, 2000, the Speaker referred to the Ethics Committee a complaint filed against Representative Arlon Lindner pursuant to the Permanent Rules of the House of Representatives, Rule 6.10. The complaint and an amendment filed March 15, 2000, are attached.

Pursuant to the Rules of Procedure of the House Committee on Ethics, the Committee notified Representative Lindner and the complainants in the matter that the Committee would meet on March 20, 2000, to consider the complaint and requested them to be present.

Pursuant to the Committee's rules of procedure, within 21 days after receipt of the complaint, on March 20, 2000, the Committee met in public session to hear witnesses and take evidence from the complainants and Representative Lindner and his counsel on whether there was probable cause to support the complaint. A second public hearing was held on March 21, 2000. At the conclusion of that hearing, a majority of the members of the committee voted to meet in executive session to consider and determine the question of probable cause.

Findings and Conclusions

(1) The facts in the matter are not in dispute.

(2) The Committee finds that Representative Arlon Lindner's comments on the House Floor on February 23, 2000, were very regrettable.

(3) The Committee further finds that discipline is inappropriate and no further action will be taken.

(4) The Committee will send the Speaker of the House a recommendation that the House Rules relating to speech in debate are contradictory and need to be revised.

[Signatures]
February 28, 2000

Rep. Elaine Harder
487 State Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Representative Elaine Harder:

Pursuant to Permanent Rules of the House, 6.10, I am forwarding to you, an ethics complaint regarding Representative Arlon Lindner, and accompanying materials which I received today. As you know, House Rules require that I forward any complaints to the Committee within seven days for your consideration. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Representative Steve Sviggum
Speaker of the House

cc: Members of the Ethics Committee (w/out enclosures)
   Representative Bob Milbert, Vice-chair
   Representative Greg Davids
   Representative Mary Murphy
   Representative Jim Rhodes, alternate
   Representative Jean Wagenius, alternate
February 28, 2000

The Honorable Steve Sviggum  
Speaker of the House  
463 State Office Building  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Speaker Sviggum:

Pursuant to House Rule 6.10 we request that the House Committee on Ethics convene for the purpose of investigating the conduct of Representative Arlon Lindner. The subject of this ethics filing is contained in the enclosed complaint.

It is our request that a preliminary hearing be held on this complaint immediately, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on Ethics.

Ann H. Rest  
Representative Ann H. Rest

Matt Entenza  
Representative Matt Entenza

Wes Skoglund  
Representative Wes Skoglund

Robert Leighton  
Representative Robert Leighton

Enclosure

cc: Representative Arlon Lindner
FORMAL NOTICE OF COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTATIVE ARLON LINDNER FOR VIOLATION OF THE RULES OF THE MINNESOTA HOUSE

NOTICE OF COMPLAINT

The undersigned, members of the Minnesota House of Representatives, in furtherance of their responsibilities to uphold the Constitution and Rules of the House, hereby notify the Speaker of the House of their filing of a complaint against Representative Arlon Lindner.

Representative Lindner's violation of Rule 6.10 of the House, promulgated pursuant to the Minnesota State Constitution, Article IV, Section 7, and the formal Rules of the House, adopted on January 11, 1999, requires the immediate convening of the House Ethics Committee for a preliminary hearing as provided by House Rule 6.10.

The complaint is hereby enclosed and contains, with specificity, the allegations sworn by the undersigned Representatives.

We swear the statements in the complaint are true, so help us God.

Dated this 28th Day of February, 2000.

Representative Ann H. Rest

Representative Matt Entenza

Representative Wes Skoglund

Representative Robert Leighton
ETHICS COMPLAINT
AGAINST REPRESENTATIVE ARLON LINDNER
FOR VIOLATION OF MINNESOTA HOUSE RULE 6.10

COMPLAINT

The Minnesota State Constitution, Article IV, Section 7, provides that each house may determine the rules of its proceeding and for the punishment of members. The House adopted on January 11, 1999, rule 6.10 which provides in relevant part:

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that violates a rule or administrative policy of the House, that violates accepted norms of House behavior, that betrays the public trust, or that tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute.

During the debate on proposed changes to House Rule 1.01 on February 23, 2000, Representative Arlon Lindner violated Rule 6.10.

Representative Lindner speaking to Representative Michael Paymar, a Jewish member of this House, said, "don't impose your *irreligious* left views on me."

This statement violates accepted norms of House behavior and tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute. We are compelled to bring the following two counts to the attention of the House Committee on Ethics:

**Count 1**

Pursuant to House Rule 9.01 the Rules Committee has established a code of conduct for members, officers and employees of the House. The statement by Representative Lindner violates Rule 6.10. The rule states in part:

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that . . . violates accepted norms of House behavior.

Representative Lindner's derogatory remarks about the Jewish faith clearly violates accepted norms of conduct. This is further verified by the provisions of the House Code of Conduct.
(Attachment 1) that require a State Representative to treat everyone with respect, fairness and courtesy, and be respectful of the House of Representatives as a fundamental institution of civil government.

**Count 2**

Pursuant to House Rule 9.01 the Rules Committee has established a code of conduct for members, officers and employees of the House. The statement by Representative Lindner violates Rule 6.10. The rule states in part:

A complaint may be brought about conduct by a member that ... tends to bring the House into dishonor or disrepute.

The statement by Representative Lindner defamed people of the Jewish faith by calling them irreligious and impugning the sincerity of their religious beliefs. As evidence of this, members filed a formal protest and dissent as a result of the remarks of Representative Lindner.

(Attachment 2)

**Conclusion and Request for Relief**

We, the undersigned, believe that the following two counts require immediate consideration by the House Committee on Ethics. We respectfully request that the Committee find that probable cause exists for the violation of these rules and that the Committee, in open hearing, recommend an appropriate sanction for the violation of our rules.

Submitted with this complaint (as required by Rule 6.10) is a copy of the Transcript from the House Floor Session from February 23, 2000, and a copy of the recording log from that day's session.

We swear that the statements in this complaint subscribed to us are true, so help us God.

Dated this 28th Day of February, 2000.

[Signatures]

Representative Ann H. Rest

Representative Matt Entenza

Representative Wes Skaglund

Representative Robert Leighton
Representative Michael Paymar:

I'm a little surprised at the Majority Leader for bringing this change of rules to this body today. This is a short legislative session. We have pressing items that we should be debating. And now this is the second time that members of your caucus have brought this to the body to consume more time, more energy, talking about what kind of prayer we should have to start each session. Rep. Leppik, I thought gave a really a beautiful speech last time this was brought up, explaining the reason and the purpose for the language that we currently have in rules, that allows for non-denominational prayer that respects the religious diversity of the House. And how anyone could support the notion of deleting, striking that language out of the rules that respects the religious diversity of the House is beyond me. So not only am I concerned about the time that this is going to take away from the busy work when we should have been doing Minnesota's work, but I'm concerned about the intent behind it. Because it was only last year... Mr. Speaker, I can't hear... It was only last year, Mr. Speaker and Members that I remember Rep. Lindner getting up before the House and saying to this body that the Christian religion is the majority in this House, that the Christian religion is the majority of this House so why can't we have the kind of prayers we want in this body? Now is that your intent? I know that that is not in your heart to be disrespectful of those members who aren't Christians, Rep. Lindner and others who are going to support this rule change, but it is disrespectful. It is highly disrespectful. You are imposing your own religious beliefs on the rest of this body and the minority members here. Minority religious members here, in my view. I know that's not in your hearts and I know what your intent is, but I have expressed to you before how this makes certain members feel who are not Christians. Now I know that some of you have Christian prayers throughout the week. I get them on my e-mail. You invite people to your fellowships. Fine, do it. Do it whenever you want. Do it before Session starts if you feel like you want to have prayer before the House starts its deliberations. But I would like to be part of that moment where a religious leader gets up before us and has a prayer. But I would like that to be non-denominational and I would like it to be respectful of who I am. And I think this is disrespectful. I would hope the body would reject the Majority Leader's position, we vote down this rule change.

Representative Arlon Lindner:

Rep. Paymar, I don't know for sure what you're talking about. If you're talking about wasting time, did you sit there and listen to Rep. Kahn waste all that time just a few minutes ago? I think prayer is very important. You know we're told there's one God and one mediator between God and man. The man Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn't be left, not able to pray in the name of our God when we have an opportunity to pray. That's disrespectful of the Majority's rights. Now if you don't want to be here for prayer, as the Speaker has said before, this isn't mandatory, the prayer happens before session begins. And I don't know why you're looking at me all this time, you know while you're talking. I'm very happy this is coming back up and I think all we're doing is putting the order of the day, the order
for prayer and the way we do prayer back like it was for hundreds of years before this session. And if you don’t like it, you may have to like it. Or just don’t come. I don’t come sometimes for some prayers here. There’s some groups that pray in here that I stay out of the room. We have that privilege. And you need to exercise it. But don’t impose your irreligious left views on me.

Tape Counter 3454
Representative Barb Haake:

Members, I don’t know about the rest of you, but I really don’t care what God everybody prays to. They’re all praying to one God. And as far as I’m concerned, I need all the help I can get. I really appreciate the prayers from everybody’s God. Thank you.

Tape Counter 3473
Representative Betty McCollum:

Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members. I’m going to vote against it for a couple of reasons. The paramount one is that the two times this has been discussed on the floor, it was within the way the Rules of the House are adopted. And its more than a simple majority. And I voted against this amendment in the Rule Committee. What we’ve done here is we’ve said, ‘OK, there’s a majority who would like the prayer to be conducted in a certain way. And we can’t win when it’s a simple majority. So we’ll amend the rules going through the rules committee, where simple majority can win.’ And the reason why we have a higher standard for adopting the rules as we do in the first weeks of session, is so that the minority is heard. And we lost that in the way that the rules are adopted. And that’s why I voted against it in the rules committee. I’m very concerned about the tenor of discussion. I’m a Christian, I’m a Catholic. And I’m not here trying to out-Christian anybody else. And when I want to pray a Catholic Creed, I do it at church. And I enjoy the fellowship of the many denominations in this hall. And I enjoy the fellowship of praying together when everybody feels included. And the comments just don’t come. Well, you know, if you just don’t come for the prayer, you just don’t get to say the Pledge of Allegiance either. Because the doors are closed for that. So Members, I would encourage you not to vote for this amendment. And Rep. Paymar, one of my favorite religious songs is, “They know we are Christians by our Love”.

Tape Counter 3570
Representative Matt Entenza:

Mr. Speaker I think the issue today is whether or not we’re going to show the respect that the present rule has. And Rep. Lindner, I hope that perhaps you want to rethink the last remark that you made. We have members in this body who come from different religious traditions. And to suggest that someone who comes from the Jewish tradition, a tradition that we should all certainly honor, that somehow is an irreligious one, suggests to me that it is very important to vote against this motion from the rules committee.

Tape Counter 3580
Representative Wes Skoglund:

Mr. Speaker will Rep. Lindner yield to a question? Did I hear you say, ‘Don’t impose your irreligious views on me?’ Is that your quote to Rep. Paymar? Mr. Speaker, apparently I’m not speaking loudly enough. Rep. Lindner, did you say ‘Don’t impose your irreligious views on me?’ to Rep. Paymar?
Representative Arlon Lindner:
   It was something like that.

Representative Wes Skoglund:
   Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm embarrassed, quite frankly for what Rep. Lindner said. And as a Christian, who does Bible devotions almost every night with his family, I apologize to you, because most of us don't feel that way, Rep. Paymar. I apologize, I'm embarrassed on behalf of we Christians.
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The bill was passed and its title agreed to.

The Speaker resumed the Chair.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Paymar moved that the name of Rhodes be added as an author on H. F. No. 205. The motion prevailed.

Paymar moved that the name of Rhodes be added as an author on H. F. No. 206. The motion prevailed.

Sviggum moved that the name of Kalis be added as an author on H. F. No. 211. The motion prevailed.

Dawkins moved that the name of Peterson be added as an author on H. F. No. 245. The motion prevailed.

Opatz moved that the name of Folliard be added as an author on H. F. No. 304. The motion prevailed.

Molnau moved that the name of McElroy be added as an author on H. F. No. 421. The motion prevailed.

Orfield moved that the name of Pawlenty be added as an author on H. F. No. 423. The motion prevailed.

Goodno moved that the name of Mulder be added as an author on H. F. No. 608. The motion prevailed.

Rukavina moved that the name of Wagenius be added as chief author on H. F. No. 707. The motion prevailed.

Rifenberg moved that the name of Nornes be added as an author on H. F. No. 732. The motion prevailed.

Greenfield moved that the name of Luther be added as an author on H. F. No. 1057. The motion prevailed.

Abrams moved that the name of Mulder be added as an author on H. F. No. 1095. The motion prevailed.

Milbert moved that his name be stricken as an author on H. F. No. 1201. The motion prevailed.

Boudreau moved that the following statement be printed in the Journal of the House: “It was my intention to vote in the negative on Wednesday, March 5, 1997, when the vote was taken on the final passage of H. F. No. 266.” The motion prevailed.

Sviggum raised a point of order pursuant to section 124, paragraph 3, of “Mason’s Manual of Legislative Procedure” relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.

Rifenberg moved that the following statement be printed in the Journal of the House: “It was my intention to vote in the affirmative on Wednesday, March 5, 1997, when the vote was taken on the final passage of H. F. No. 266.” The motion prevailed.
The motion prevailed and the amendment was adopted.

Molnau moved to amend S. F. No. 2857, the unofficial engrossment, as amended, as follows:

Page 2, delete lines 38 to 44
Correct the section totals and the summaries by fund accordingly

A roll call was requested and properly seconded.

The question was taken on the Molnau amendment and the roll was called. There were 57 yeas and 76 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Those who voted in the negative were:

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted.

Girard moved to amend S. F. No. 2857, the unofficial engrossment, as amended, as follows:

Pages 23 to 26, delete section 38
Renumber the sections in sequence and correct internal references
Amend the title accordingly

A roll call was requested and properly seconded.

POINT OF ORDER

Sviggum raised a point of order pursuant to section 124, paragraph 3, of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.
I hereby announce the passage by the Senate of the following House File, herewith returned, as amended by the Senate, in which amendment the concurrence of the House is respectfully requested:

H. F. No. 219. A bill for an act relating to insurance; health plans; requiring coverage for treatment of Lyme disease; requiring a study; amending Minnesota Statutes 1994, section 62A.136; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapter 62A.

Murphy moved that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H. F. No. 219 and that the bill be repassed as amended by the Senate.

Sviggum moved that the House refuse to concur in the Senate amendments to H. F. No. 219, that the Speaker appoint a Conference Committee of 5 members of the House, and that the House requests that a like committee be appointed by the Senate to confer on the disagreeing votes of the two houses.

A roll call was requested and properly seconded.

POINT OF ORDER

Carruthers raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order well taken.

The question recurred on the Sviggum motion and the roll was called. There were 81 yeas and 53 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abrams</th>
<th>Dawkins</th>
<th>Hackbart</th>
<th>Krinkie</th>
<th>Ness</th>
<th>Rostberg</th>
<th>Van Dellen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, B.</td>
<td>Dehle</td>
<td>Harder</td>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td>Olsen, M.</td>
<td>Rukavina</td>
<td>Van Engen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettsenmann</td>
<td>Dempsey</td>
<td>Hausman</td>
<td>Leppik</td>
<td>Onnen</td>
<td>Seagren</td>
<td>Vickersman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Entenza</td>
<td>Holsten</td>
<td>Lindner</td>
<td>Orfield</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Warkentin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boudeau</td>
<td>Erhardt</td>
<td>Jans</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Oskopp</td>
<td>Stanek</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Finseth</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Macklin</td>
<td>Osthoff</td>
<td>Swiggum</td>
<td>Weisman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocker</td>
<td>Freichs</td>
<td>Johnson, V.</td>
<td>Mares</td>
<td>Oszment</td>
<td>Swenson, D.</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, S.</td>
<td>Girard</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td>Mariani</td>
<td>Paulsen</td>
<td>Swenson, H.</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Goodno</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>McCollum</td>
<td>Pawlenty</td>
<td>Sykora</td>
<td>Workman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooners</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Knoblauch</td>
<td>McElroy</td>
<td>Pellow</td>
<td>Tomason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doggett</td>
<td>Gunther</td>
<td>Koppendrayer</td>
<td>Molnau</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilts</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>Kraus</td>
<td>Mulder</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Tuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who voted in the negative were:

| Anderson, B. | Delmont | Johnson, A. | Long | Murphy | Peterson | Tunheim |
| Bakke | Dorn | Johnson, R. | Lourey | Olson, E. | Fugh | Wagenius |
| Bentzam | Farrell | Kals | Luther | Opatz | Rest | Wenzel |
| Brown | Garcia | Kelley | Mahon | Orenstein | Sama | Winter |
| Carlson, L. | Greiling | Kelso | Marko | Ostrom | Schumacher | Spk. Anderson, L. |
| Carruthers | Hasskamp | Kinkel | McGuire | Otemba | Skoglund | |
| Cooper | Huntley | Leighton | Milbert | Pelowski | Solberg | |
| Duerr | Jennings | Lieder | Munger | Perl | Trimble | |

The motion prevailed.
Pellow moved to amend H. F. No. 1056, the first engrossment, as amended, as follows:

Page 3, line 14, after the period insert "However, the council may not cancel any route or transit service where there are on the average, 20 or more riders per vehicle, in each direction of the route."

POINT OF ORDER

Goodno raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.

The question recurred on the Pellow amendment to H. F. No. 1056, the first engrossment, as amended. The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted.

Garcia moved that H. F. No. 1056, as amended, be continued on Special Orders. The motion prevailed.

H. F. No. 628, A bill for an act relating to the family; creating a presumption of refusal or neglect of parental duties in certain termination of parental rights cases; amending Minnesota Statutes 1994, section 260.221, subdivision 1.

The bill was read for the third time and placed upon its final passage.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill and the roll was called. There were 132 yeas and 0 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abrams
Anderson, B.
Bakk
Bertram
Bettmann
Bishop
Boudreau
Bradley
Broecker
Brown
Carlson
Carruthers
Clark
Commers
Cooper
Daggett
dauner
Davids
Dawkins

The bill was passed and its title agreed to.

S. F. No. 893, A bill for an act relating to insurance; the comprehensive health association; changing benefits; changing the association's enrollment freeze date; amending Minnesota Statutes 1994, sections 62E.12; and 62Q.18, subdivision 8.

The bill was read for the third time and placed upon its final passage.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill and the roll was called. There were 132 yeas and 0 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:
Carruthers raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order well taken.

POINT OF ORDER

Sviggum raised a point of order pursuant to Article III of the Minnesota Constitution relating to the distribution of the powers of government. The Speaker ruled the point of order not in order.

H. F. No. 2278, A bill for an act relating to state government; requiring the governor to develop a plan to create a secretarial system of executive branch organization.

The bill was read for the third time, as amended, and placed upon its final passage.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill and the roll was called. There were 82 yeas and 50 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

- Anderson, R.
- Asch
- Battaglia
- Bauerly
- Beard
- Bergson
- Bertram
- Bishop
- Brown, C.
- Brown, K.
- Carlson
- Carruthers
- Clark
- Cooper
- Daunur
- Dawkins
- Delmont
- Dorn
- Evans
- Garcia
- Goodno
- Gutknecht
- Hasskamp
- Huntley
- Jacobs
- Jaros
- Jefferson
- Jennings
- Johnson, A.
- Johnson, R.
- Kais
- Kelley
- Kinkel
- Klinzing
- Lasley
- Lieder
- Long
- Lourey
- Luther
- Mahon
- Mariani
- McCollum
- McGuire
- Milbert
- Mosel
- Munger
- Murphy
- Neary
- Nelson
- Olson, E.
- Olson, K.
- Opatz
- Orenstein
- Orfield
- Osthoff
- Ostrom
- Ostrom
- Ostrom
- Pelowski
- Perlt
- Peterson
- Pugh
- Reding
- Rest
- Rice
- Rodosovitch
- Vellenga
- Wejcman
- Wenzel
- Winter
- Steensma
- Sviggum
- Tomassoni
- Trimble
- Tunheim
- Washburn
- Wittenberg
- Winkler
- Yelinek
- Spk. Anderson, I.

Those who voted in the negative were:

- Abrams
- Bettermann
- Commers
- Davids
- Dehler
- Dempsey
- Erdahl
- Finseth
- Fristad
- Frechtl
- Girard
- Greenfield
- Grunes
- Haukoos
- Holsten
- Hugson
- Johnson, V.
- Kelso
- Knickerbocker
- Knight
- Koppendrayer
- Krinke
- Krueger
- Lepnik
- Limmer
- Lindner
- Lynch
- Macklin
- Molnaa
- Morrison
- Ness
- Olson, M.
- Onnen
- Orten
- Ozment
- Pauly
- Pawlenty
- Rhodes
- Seagren
- Skoglund
- Stanis
- Swenson
- Tompkins
- Van Dellen
- Van Engen
- Vickerman
- Wagenius
- Wahtman
- Weaver
- Wozniak
- Wolf

The bill was passed, as amended, and its title agreed to.

Carruthers moved that the remaining bills on Special Orders for today be continued. The motion prevailed.

GENERAL ORDERS

Carruthers moved that the bills on General Orders for today be continued. The motion prevailed.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Greiling moved that the name of Asch be added as an author on H. F. No. 664. The motion prevailed.

Dawkins moved that the name of Wejcman be added as an author on H. F. No. 2644. The motion prevailed.
The question recurred on the Welle amendment, as amended, to the proposed rules, as amended, and the roll was called. There were 131 yeas and 0 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

- Dauner
- Haukoos
- Krinkie
- Munger
- Peterson
- Tompkins
- Davids
- Hausman
- Krueger
- Murphy
- Pugh
- Trimble
- Aas
- Davids
- Hausman
- Leppik
- Nelson
- Ness
- Rest
- Van Dellen
- Battle
- Dempsey
- Jacobs
- Linner
- Olson, E.
- Rodosovich
- Vickerman
- Beardsley
- Dorn
- Jefferson
- Lindner
- Olson, K.
- Sarna
- Wagenius
- Bergeson
- Erhardt
- Jorning
- Lourey
- Olson, M.
- Seagren
- Walmann
- Bentz
- Evans
- Johnson, A.
- Luther
- Onnen
- Sekhon
- Weaver
- Bettenhausen
- Farrell
- Johnson, R.
- Lynch
- Opatz
- Simoneau
- Wejman
- Bishop
- Freichs
- Johnson, V.
- Macklin
- Orenstein
- Skoglund
- Welle
- Blake
- Garcia
- Kahn
- Mahon
- Orfield
- Smith
- Wenzel
- Brown, C.
- Girard
- Kalis
- Mariani
- Osthoff
- Solberg
- Winter
- Brown, K.
- Goodno
- Kelley
- McCollum
- Ostrem
- Sparby
- Wolf
- Carlson
- Greenfield
- Kalso
- McGuire
- Ozment
- Stanski
- Worke
- Carstensen
- Greiling
- Kinkel
- Milbert
- Pauly
- Steensma
- Workman
- Clark
- Gruenes
- Klinzing
- Molnau
- Pawlenty
- Sviggum
- Spk. Long
- Clemmons
- Gutknecht
- Knickerbocker
- Morrison
- Pelowski
- Swenson
- Tomassoni
- Cooper
- Hasskamp
- Koppendrayer
- Mosel
- Perl
- Tompkins

The motion prevailed and the amendment, as amended, was adopted.

Bishop moved to amend the proposed Permanent Rules of the House for the 78th Session, as amended, as follows:

Page 9, lines 24 and 25, delete the new language

The motion prevailed and the amendment was adopted.

Lasley was excused for the remainder of today's session.

Sviggum moved to amend the proposed Permanent Rules of the House for the 78th Session, as amended, as follows:

Page 20, lines 17 to 19, delete the new language and restore the stricken language

Page 20, line 20, restore the stricken "sets" and delete "set"

Page 20, after line 31, insert:

"Any amendment raising appropriations or taxes must be balanced with an equal amendment of appropriation or decrease to keep the bill within the budget resolution. Amendments may provide for the appropriation or increase or decrease from other bills that are being considered by the House."

A roll call was requested and properly seconded.

POINT OF ORDER

Sviggum raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.
Trimbile moved that H. F. No. 2586, now on Technical General Orders, be re-referred to the Committee on Governmental Operations. The motion prevailed.

Trimbile moved that H. F. No. 1453, now on Technical General Orders, be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The motion prevailed.

McGuire moved that H. F. No. 2437, now on Technical General Orders, be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The motion prevailed.

Dawkins moved that H. F. No. 2643, now on Technical General Orders, be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The motion prevailed.

Reding moved that H. F. No. 2848 be recalled from the Committee on Labor-Management Relations and be re-referred to the Committee on Governmental Operations. The motion prevailed.

Runbeck moved that H. F. No. 2864 be recalled from the Committee on Local Government and Metropolitan Affairs and be re-referred to the Committee on Taxes. The motion prevailed.

Gutknecht moved that S. F. No. 1716, now on General Orders, be re-referred to the Committee on General Legislation, Veterans Affairs and Gaming.

A roll call was requested and properly seconded.

POINT OF ORDER

Svig gum raised a point of order pursuant to section 125 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personal disputes between members. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.

The question recurred on the Gutknecht motion and the roll was called. There were 76 yeas and 49 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abrams, Anderson, R. H., Begich, Blatz, Boo
Anderson, R., Battaglia, Bettermann, Bodahl, Dauner
The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted.

Clausnitzer offered an amendment to the second portion of House Resolution No. 49.

POINT OF ORDER

Wynia raised a point of order pursuant to rule 3.9 that the Clausnitzer amendment was not in order. The Speaker ruled the point of order well taken and the amendment out of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Rodosovich raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.

POINT OF ORDER

Marsh raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.

Dempsey raised a point of order pursuant to section 124 of "Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure" relating to personalities not permitted in debate. The Speaker ruled the point of order not well taken.

Pauly and Sviggum were excused for the remainder of today's session.

The question recurred on the second portion of House Resolution No. 49 as divided by Poppenhagen.

Pursuant to rule 2.5, Thiede requested that he be excused from
Sec. 120

CHAPTER 13

DECORUM IN DEBATE

Sec. 120. Equality of Members in Debate

See also Sec. 52, Equality of Members.

The rights and duties of members of a legislative body are derived from and founded upon the absolute equality of the members. Every member has the same right as any other member to present questions for the consideration of the house and has the same right to be heard. Members must not be permitted by their conduct to deny to others that which they may claim for themselves. It is the duty of all members to conduct themselves so as not to obstruct the like rights of other members. Freedom of speech involves obedience to all the rules of debate.

Sec. 121. Breaches of the Order of the House

See also Sec. 101, Debate is Limited to the Question Before the House.

1. An ancient rule governing debate is that “no one is to speak impertinently, or beside the question, superfluously, or tediously.”

2. A member who resorts to persistent irrelevance or to persistent repetition after the attention of the house has been called to the matter may be

Sec. 122. Procedure Under Call to Order

1. If repeated calls do not produce order, the presiding officer may call any member by name, who obstinately persists in irregularity.

2. During debate, while the presiding officer is speaking, or the house is engaged in voting, no one is to disturb another in a speech by hissing, coughing, spitting, speaking or whispering to another, nor passing between the presiding officer and the member speaking, nor crossing the floor of the house, nor walking up and down, nor taking books or papers from the desk, nor writing there.

3. If, at any time, the presiding officer rises to state a point of order, or give information, or otherwise speak within the presiding officer’s privilege, the member speaking must sit down until the presiding officer has been heard.

4. The reading in the house of any letter from a person not a member or any other communication calling in question acts of members or officials of the house or being abusive is out of order and should not be permitted.

Sec. 121, Par. 2: Jefferson, Sec. XVII, quoting Scob. 31, 32; 2 Hatsell 166, 168; Sturgis, p. 125; Hughes, Sec. 734.

Sec. 121, Par. 3: 2 Hatsell 171; Jefferson, Sec. XVII; Cushing, Secs. 37, 211; Reed, Sec. 212; U.S. House Rule XIV, Par. 7.

Sec. 121, Par. 4: Cushing, Sec. 207; Hughes, Sec. 724.

Sec. 121, Par. 5: Hughes, Sec. 708.

Sec. 122, Par. 1: Jefferson, Sec. XXIV; Cushing, Secs. 40, 225; Reed, Sec. 221.
Sec. 122 MASON’S LEGISLATIVE MANUAL

2. When called to order by the presiding officer, the member must sit down until the question of order is decided. The member may not proceed without the body’s permission. The presiding officer may state the offense committed, and the member may then be heard in explanation or justification, and may be required to withdraw while the body considers whether it will take any action against the member.

3. Although in control of debate on a question of order, the presiding officer may put to a vote the question of whether a member called to order during a debate should be allowed to proceed. A member who has been called to order in debate and decided out of order loses the floor and another may be recognized. When called to order for irrelevancy, a member may proceed in order unless the question was brought to a vote and the debate found irrelevant.

Sec. 123. Use of Disorderly Words in Debate

1. No person may use indecent language with reference to the body or its members.

2. When disorderly words are used by a member in debate, notice should immediately be taken of them by the member objecting, and if desiring the words to be taken down, the objecting member should repeat them exactly as that member believes them to have been spoken. If of the opinion that the words are disorderly, the presiding officer should direct that the clerk take them down. If of the opinion that the words are not disorderly, the presiding officer may delay the order to the clerk to take down the words unless there is a demand by other members, when the presiding officer should order the clerk to take them down as stated by the objecting member, or a member may insist on the determination of the question by the house by putting the question in the form of a motion.

3. When words are taken down, they are then a part of the minutes, and when read to the offending member, that person may deny those words. When there is a dispute as to the words, before the question of disorderliness is voted upon, the presiding officer should first put the question: “Are the words written down the words spoken by the member?”

4. The question of whether the words are disorderly is then submitted to the body. If the body is satisfied that the words are not disorderly, no further proceeding is necessary. If the words are found disorderly, the member using them should be permitted to explain and apologize to the body, but if the member refuses to apologize, the presiding officer may censure the member or the body may choose to act in the case.

5. If the remarks of the member are decided to be improper, that member may not proceed if any one objects without the permission of the body ex-
Sec. 124. Personalities Not Permitted in Debate

See also Sec. 110, Addressing Members or Presiding Officer.

1. In debate a member must confine remarks to the question before the house, and avoid personalities.

2. A member in referring to another member should avoid using the member's name, rather identifying that member by district, seat, as the member who last spoke or by describing the member in some other manner.

3. It is not the person but the measure that is the subject of debate, and it is not allowable to arraign the motives of a member, but the nature or consequences of a measure may be condemned in strong terms.

Sec. 125. Personal Disputes Between Members

1. Whenever there has been a dispute or an assault between members, the body may require the members to settle their differences and agree not to prosecute the disagreement further. The members may be put under restraint if they refuse to settle their differences or until they do.

2. In a dispute between members, of which the body takes official notice, both parties to the dispute should retire after being heard while the body decides what action, if any, it will take concerning the matter. It is not, however, necessary for a member objecting to disorderly words to retire unless that member is personally involved. Disorderly words to the presiding officer, or in respect to the official acts of an officer, do not involve the officer so as to require that person to retire.

Sec. 124, Par. 2: Jefferson, Sec. XVII; Cushing, Sec. 206.
Sec. 124, Par. 3: Sturgis, p. 125; Hughes, Sec. 705.
Sec. 125, Par. 1: Jefferson, Sec. XVII.
Sec. 125, Par. 2: Jefferson, Sec. XVII.
Sec. 126. Complaints Against the Presiding Officer

1. The presiding officer is subject to the same rules regarding disorderly words as members.

2. Complaint of the conduct of the presiding officer should be presented directly for action by the house, in which case the presiding officer should vacate the chair and call a member to preside until the matter is settled.

3. A question concerning conduct of the presiding officer should not be presented by way of debate on other matters. Allusions to, or critical reference to the presiding officer, are not in order. Such attacks are not conducive to the good order of the house.

Sec. 126, Par. 1: Hughes, Sec. 709.
Sec. 126, Par. 2: Hughes, Sec. 692.
Sec. 126, Par. 3: Hughes, Sec. 692.

Sec. 130. Bringing Question to Vote

See also Sec. 523, Putting the Question to Vote.

1. When the debate appears to be closed, the presiding officer should inquire, "Are you ready for the question?" If, after a reasonable pause, no one rises to claim the floor, the presiding officer may assume that no member wishes to speak, and put the question to vote.

2. Debate is not closed by the presiding officer stating the question, for until both the affirmative and negative are put, a member can rise and claim the floor and reopen the debate or make a motion, provided the member rises with reasonable promptness after the presiding officer asks, "Are you ready for the question?"

3. When the question is debatable, and no one rises to claim the floor after the question is stated by the presiding officer, the presiding officer should inquire, "Are you ready for the question?" After a moment's pause, if no one rises, the presiding officer should put the question to vote. When the question is debated or motions are made, the presiding officer should wait until the debate has apparently ceased, and should again inquire, "Are you ready for the question?" Having given ample time for any one to

Sec. 130, Par. 1: Sturgis, p. 127; Cushing's Legislative Assemblies, Sec. 1610.
Sec. 130, Par. 2: Cushing's Legislative Assemblies, Sec. 1610; Sturgis, p. 127.
Exception... 6. Objection, demur, faultfinding; an instance of this, an objection, adverse criticism, complaint...

--from Oxford English Dictionary, 1961

ex•cep•tion \ik'sepshən... 3 a: something offered or offerable as objection or as a ground of objection or taken as objectionable...

--from the Merriam Webster-Dictionary, 1961

ex•cep•tion (ik sep·shən) n...5. take exception, a. to make an objection; demur: They took exception to several points of the contract. b. to take offense: She took exception to what I said about her brother...

--from the Random House Dictionary, 1987

ex•cep•tion (ik-sep·shən) n...3. an objection or a criticism...4.

--from the American Heritage Dictionary, 1992
Mark your calendar!

Assembly on State Issues Meeting
March 31 - April 2, 2000
Denver, Colorado
Call Vicky Rodriguez at (303) 830-2200 ext. 113.

Assembly on Federal Issues Meeting
May 4-6, 2000
Washington, D.C.
Call Renae Sledge at (202) 624-8685.

Visit our Web site at www.ncsl.org
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From: Brenda Erickson

Message: Attached are examples of chamber rules re: member conduct during debate. I will forward anything else I find or gather shortly.
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Date: 3/16/00
### Examples of Chamber Rules
**Re: Member Conduct--Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rule Number</th>
<th>Text or Text Excerpt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Senate Rule 40</td>
<td>Senators engaged in debate shall refrain from engaging in abusive and derogatory language in reference to other Senators and shall immediately be called to order by the presiding officer if such practice prevails. When a Senator shall be called to order by the President, he or she shall immediately sit down; however, the Senator will not lose his or her place and may resume the microphone at the direction of the presiding officer. Senators engaged in debate shall address each other by their official title and last name or reference their geographical district of representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rule 71</td>
<td>If a Senator be called to order by a Senator for words spoken, the exceptional words shall be taken down immediately in writing by the Secretary. The presiding officer shall then judge the matter, and rule accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Rule 50</td>
<td>If any member transgresses the rules, in speaking or otherwise, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call him to order, in which case the member called to order shall immediately sit down, unless he is allowed to explain; and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate. If the decision be in favor of the member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed; if otherwise, and the case requires it, he shall be liable to censure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Senate Rule 9</td>
<td>C. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator. D. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall call the Senator to order, and when called to order the Senator shall sit down and not proceed without leave of the Presiding Officer or upon motion adopted by the Senate, that the Senator be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate. E. If a Senator be called to order for words spoken in debate, the exceptional words shall, upon the demand of any Senator, be taken down in writing, and read at the table for the information of the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Rule 18</td>
<td>A. When a member desires to speak in debate or deliver any matter to the House, or make a motion, he shall rise and address himself to the Chair, and on being recognized may address the House. He shall confine himself to the question and avoid personalities. No member shall impeach or impugn motives of any other member's argument or vote...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Rule 19</td>
<td>A. No member shall be permitted to indulge in personalities, use language personally offensive, arraign motives of members, charge deliberate misrepresentation or use language tending to hold a member of the House or Senate up to contempt. B. If any member be called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling him to order shall repeat the words excepted to; and they shall be taken down in writing at the Chief Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House, but he shall not be held to answer or be subject to the censure of the House therefor if further debate or other business has intervened. C. If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the Rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may call him to order, in which case he shall immediately sit down unless permitted to explain; and the House shall, if appealed to, decide the case without debate. If the decision is in favor of the member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise; and, if the case requires it, he shall be liable to censure or such punishment as the House may deem proper...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Senate Rule 36</td>
<td>When a Senator shall be called to order he or she shall sit down until the President shall have determined whether he or she is in order or not. Every question of order shall be decided by the President, subject to an appeal to the Senate by any Senator. If a Senator be called to order for words spoken, the objectionable language shall immediately be taken down in writing by the Secretary of the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Test Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (cont'd)</td>
<td>Assembly Rule 114</td>
<td>If any Member transgresses the Rules of the Assembly, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call the offending Member to order. The Member so called to order immediately shall take his or her seat, until the Speaker, without debate, has determined whether the Member is in order. That decision by the Speaker shall be subject to an appeal to the Assembly. If any Member is called to order for offensive words spoken in debate, the person calling him or her to order shall state to the Assembly the words to which exception is taken. No Member may be held to answer, or be subject to censure by the Assembly, for language used in debate if other business has been transacted by the Assembly prior to exception being taken to the words spoken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Senate Rule 16</td>
<td>...(d) (1) If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the Senate, the President shall, or any member may, call him to order, in which case he shall immediately sit down, and shall not speak, except in explanation, until it shall have been determined whether or not he is in order. (2) If any Senator is called to order for words spoken in debate, the person calling him to order shall repeat the words excepted to, and they shall be reduced to writing by the secretary; but no Senator shall be held to answer or be subject to censure of the Senate therefor if further debate or other business has intervened after the words spoken and before exception to them shall have been made. (e) Any Senator shall have the right to protest or remonstrate against any action of the Senate, and such protest or remonstrance, with the reasons therefor, if reduced to writing, shall without alteration or delay be, with the consent of the Senate, entered in the journal if the protest or remonstrance is not personal in its nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Senate Rule 16</td>
<td>If a member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules and order of the Senate, the president shall, or any member may, call such member to order, and if speaking, such member shall sit down, unless permitted to explain; and if a member is guilty of a breach of any of the rules and orders, such member may be required by the Senate, on motion, to make satisfaction therefor, and not be allowed to vote or speak except by way of excuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Rule 18</td>
<td>The speaker shall, or any member may, call to order any member who in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules and orders of the house. If speaking, the member shall sit down, unless permitted to explain; and if a member is guilty of a breach of any of the rules and orders, the member may be required by the house, on motion, to make satisfaction therefor, and shall not be allowed to vote or speak except by way of excuse until such satisfaction is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>House Rule 15</td>
<td>(a) Each member shall conduct himself or herself in a dignified manner at all times. (b) No member or other person may walk across the House Chamber, or converse privately, in such a manner as to interrupt the House proceedings. (c) A member shall not be interrupted when speaking except for the following reasons: (1) a call to order by the Speaker. (2) a point of order by a member. (3) a motion by a member to move the previous question, to adjourn, or to recess. (d) A member shall not make derogatory personal comments about or to other members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>House Rule 24</td>
<td>Legislative office is a trust to be performed with integrity in the public interest. A Member is respectful of the confidence placed in the Member by the other Members and by the people. By personal example and by admonition to colleagues whose behavior may threaten the honor of the lawmaking body, the Member shall watchfully guard the responsibility of office and the responsibilities and duties placed on the Member by the House. To this end, each Member shall be accountable to the House for violations of this Rule or any provision of the House Code of Conduct contained in Rules 24 through 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>House Rule 27.3</td>
<td>When a Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, the Member shall rise and respectfully address the Speaker as &quot;Mr. (or Madam) Speaker&quot; and shall confine all remarks to the question under debate, avoiding personalities. Once recognized, a Member may speak from the Member's desk or may, with the Speaker’s permission, speak from the well. The Speaker shall order any member who conducts himself or herself in a disorderly manner during any session of the House to stay in his or her seat and be in order. The Speaker shall order the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove any member who persists in disorderly conduct from the House for the remainder of the day's session, unless the member who has been disorderly pledges to the House that he or she will maintain a good behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Senate Rule 7-3</td>
<td>(c) If any Senator in speaking (or otherwise) transgresses these Senate Rules, the Presiding Officer shall, or any Senator may, call him or her to order, in which case the Senator so called to order shall sit down, unless permitted to explain; and the Senate, if appealed to, shall decide on the case without debate. If the decision be in favor of the Senator called to order, he or she shall be at liberty to proceed. If otherwise, and the case requires it, he or she shall be liable to the censure of the Senate. (d) If any Senator be called to order for words spoken in debate, the person calling him or her to order shall repeat the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down by the Secretary. No Senator shall be held to answer or be subject to the censure of the Senate for words spoken in debate if any Senator has spoken in debate or other business has intervened after the words spoken and before exceptions to them shall have been taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>House Rule 23</td>
<td>If any member, in speech or otherwise, transgress the rules of order or decorum, he shall immediately be called to order by the chair and shall take his seat. The Clerk shall reduce the objectionable words to writing and read them to the House. After hearing a short explanation from the member called to order, or upon the withdrawal of the objectionable language, the Speaker may permit the member to proceed, or may compel silence upon him until the matter is disposed of. The ruling of the chair shall be subject to an appeal to the House. A member offending the House shall be liable to censure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Joint Rule 304</td>
<td>At public hearings, the chair may limit testimony as necessary for the orderly conduct of the hearing. Members may question witnesses to clarify testimony and to elicit helpful and pertinent information. While aggressive and probing questions may sometimes be appropriate, members shall exhibit respect for the witnesses and for one another. Members shall refrain from interrogation that is argumentative, oppressive, repetitive or unnecessarily embarrassing to hearing participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>House Rule 2:31</td>
<td>If a member is called to order for offensive words in debate, the member calling for order must report the words to which exception is taken and the Clerk must record them. A member must not be held to answer, or be subject to censure of the House, for language used in debate unless exception is taken before another member speaks or other business takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>House Rule 20</td>
<td>If any member, in speaking, or otherwise, transgresses the Rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may on point of order ask the Speaker to call the transgressor to order; and the member called to order shall immediately sit down, unless permitted on motion of another member to explain, and the House if appealed to, shall decide on the case without debate. If the decision be in favor of the member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed; if against him and the case requires it, he shall be liable to the censure of the House, or such other punishment as the House may deem proper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Rule 21</td>
<td>If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk’s desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate on other business has intervened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Senate Rule 78</td>
<td>If a senator is called to order for words spoken in debate, the senator calling him to order shall repeat the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing on the secretary’s table, and no senator shall be held to answer, or be subject to the censure of the senate for words spoken in debate, if any other senator has spoken or business has intervened after the words spoken and before exception to them has been taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Rule 83</td>
<td>When any member is about to speak in a debate or deliver a matter to the House, he/she shall rise from his/her seat and respectfully address himself/herself to “Mr. Speaker” or “Madam Speaker.” The member shall confine himself/herself to the questions under debate and avoid personality. If any member violates the rules of the House the Speaker, or any member, may call him/her to order. Any member called to order shall immediately sit down, unless permitted to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide the case without debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Senate 2, Sec. 9</td>
<td>If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling him or her to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk’s desk and read aloud to the Legislature, but he or she shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the Legislature therefore, if further debate or other business shall have intervened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>House Rule 46</td>
<td>If any member, in speaking, or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the House, the Speaker shall call the offending member to order. The member so called to order shall take the member's seat immediately, unless permitted by the Speaker to explain. Any member may, by raising the point of order, call the attention of the Speaker to such transgression. Except as provided in Rule 45, the point of order shall be decided by the Speaker without debate. Every such decision of the Speaker shall be subject to appeal to the House by any two members. If a member be called to order by another member for offensive words spoken in debate, the member calling the member to order shall, if the Speaker so requires, reduce the objectionable language to writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Senate Rule 6.10</td>
<td>(1) In speaking, a member must confine remarks to the question under debate and shall avoid personalities. A member may refer to the actions of a committee if such actions are relevant to the debate, but a member shall not impugn the motives of another member's vote or argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rule 6.35</td>
<td>(1) If a member transgresses the rules of the Senate, the President, or any member through the President, may call the member to order. Unless permitted by the President to explain, the member called to order shall be seated immediately. (2) The member who is called to order may appeal the ruling of the President. If the Senate decides the appeal in favor of the member, the member may proceed with the debate. If the Senate decides the appeal against the member, the member may proceed &quot;in order&quot; or be liable to a motion of censure of the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rule 6.40</td>
<td>If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member objecting shall immediately repeat the words to which objection is taken and they shall be recorded by the Journal Editor. However, if any other member has spoken or other business has intervened after the words were spoken and before the objection was made, the member shall not be held answerable or subject to censure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Senate Rule 7.4</td>
<td>No senator shall use profane, insulting, or abusive language in the course of public debate in the senate chamber, or in testimony before any committee of the general assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rule 9.10</td>
<td>No senator shall use profane, insulting or abusive language or act in any manner that interferes with the orderly conduct of the session of the senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island (cont'd.)</td>
<td>House Rule 14</td>
<td>If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses any rule of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call him to order, in which case the member called to order shall immediately sit down, unless permitted by the Speaker to explain and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case but without debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>House Rule 1.3</td>
<td>If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the Rules of the House, the Speaker shall call him to order, or any member may call such transgressions to the attention of the Speaker who shall call the transgressor to order. If repeated cries of order are ineffective, the Speaker may call a member by name, and if the Speaker deems it necessary, he shall state the offense committed. The member may be heard in his exculpation and shall withdraw, and the House shall consider his punishment or any further proceedings to be had.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Rule 3.6</td>
<td>Every member, when about to speak, shall rise from his seat and respectfully address himself to &quot;Mr. Speaker&quot; and shall avoid disrespect to the House or the Senate and all personalities, observe decency of speech, and shall confine himself to the question under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>House Rule 5, Sec. 33</td>
<td>If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the house, the speaker shall, or any member may, call the member to order, in which case the member so called to order shall immediately be seated; however, that member may move for an appeal to the house, and if appeal is duly seconded by 10 members, the matter shall be submitted to the house for decision by majority vote. In such cases, the speaker shall not be required to relinquish the chair, as is required in cases of appeals from the speaker's decisions. The house shall, if appealed to, decide the matter without debate. If the decision is in favor of the member called to order, the member shall be at liberty to proceed; but if the decision is against the member, he or she shall not be allowed to proceed, and, if the case requires it, shall be liable to the censure of the house, or such other punishment as the house may consider proper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Senate Rule 39</td>
<td>No Senator or other person shall give audible expression to his or her approval or disapproval of any proceeding before the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Rule 40</td>
<td>If words are spoken in debate that give offense, exception thereto shall be taken the same day, and be stated in writing; and in such case, if the words are decided by the presiding officer, or by the Senate, upon an appeal, to be offensive, and they are not explained or retracted by the Senator who uttered them, he shall be subject to such action as the Senate may deem necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (cont'd.)</td>
<td>House Rule 58</td>
<td>If any member, in speaking, transgress the Rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call him to order; in which case the member called to order shall immediately take his seat, unless permitted to explain. If there be no appeal, the decision of the Chair shall be final. If the decision be in favor of the member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed; otherwise, he shall not proceed, except by leave of the House. For frequent or repeated violations of order, especially if persisted in after the admonition of the Speaker, a member shall be liable to the censure of the House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>House Rule 32</td>
<td>When a member is about to speak in debate or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise in his place and respectfully address the presiding officer as &quot;Mr. Speaker,&quot; and, upon being recognized, shall proceed, confining himself to the question under debate, avoiding all personalities and indecorous or disrespectful language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Rule 36</td>
<td>If a member be called to order for words spoken in debate, the person calling him to order shall repeat the words excepted to and they shall be taken down at the Clerk's table. And no member shall be held to answer, or be subjected to the censure of the House, for words spoken in debate, if any other member has spoken or other business has intervened after the words were spoken and before the exception to them was taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Senate Rule 58</td>
<td>Any member called to order shall sit down, and shall not speak, except in explanation, until it shall have been determined whether or not the member was in order. When a member is called to order for words spoken, the exceptional words shall be taken down in writing to better enable the president to judge whether they are in violation of the rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Rule 58</td>
<td>(1) During debate, a member may question the orderliness of the remarks made by another member or whether the other member, in the manner of discussion or conduct, has violated the rules of the assembly. (2) When the presiding officer calls a member to order, that member shall not speak, except in explanation, until it is determined whether or not the member is in order. (3) When a member is called to order for the use of improper or disorderly language, the specific words to which exception has been taken shall be put in writing, thus enabling the presiding officer better to be able to judge whether the words spoken were in violation of the rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rule Number</td>
<td>Text or Text Excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>House Rule 16-1</td>
<td>When a member is interrupted and called to order by the presiding officer for digressing from the question, exceeding a time limit, using improper language, speaking without recognition by the chair or wrongfully excluding others who wish to speak, he shall cease speaking and be seated at once until it is determined whether he is in order, except he may be permitted to explain his position when asked to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Debate Decorum

A request for information on debate decorum was posted to the electronic discussion group of the American Society of Legislative Clerks and Secretaries in March 2000. The original questions were:

1. Must a challenge or protest to language used or words spoken by a member during debate on the floor occur within a set time frame?
2. Has your chamber ever disciplined or censured a member for language used or words spoken during debate on the floor?
3. What was the member's "punishment?"

Shown below are the responses.

**Arizona, House.** If any member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling the other member to order shall repeat the words excepted to; and they shall be taken down in writing at the Chief Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but the member shall not be held to answer or be subject to the censure of the House if further debate or other business has intervened. House Rule 19 B. When heated words are exchanged in debate or otherwise, the member speaking apologizes to the other member and to the House. No one has been censured or subjected to any other punishment as the House deems appropriate for at least twenty-five years.

**Arkansas, Senate.** The Senate rules state: 9.06 If any member in speaking or otherwise transgresses the Rules of the Senate, the President shall, or any member may, call him to order, in which case he shall immediately sit down unless permitted on motion of another member to explain, and the Senate shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate. If the decision is in favor of the member called to order he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise, and, if the case requires it, he shall be liable to censure or such punishment as the Senate may deem proper.

9.07 If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Secretary's desk and read aloud to the Senate; but he shall not be held to answer, nor by such other censure of the Senate, therefore, if further debate or other business has intervened.
Colorado. Senate. The Colorado Senate rules read as follows: "(2) If any Senator is called to order for words spoken in debate, the person calling him to order shall repeat the words excepted to, and they shall be reduced to writing by the secretary; but no Senator shall be held to answer or be subject to censure of the Senate therefor if further debate or other business has intervened after the words spoken and before exception to them shall have been made." I don't ever recall this rule being used. In most cases, the presiding office (President, pro tem or Chairman of the Committee of the Whole) will intervene if members start getting personal. This has happened when emotions are running high and, when it does, the presiding officer just asks the members to keep their remarks to the topic at hand. Usually, that ends the problem.

Idaho. Senate. "If a Senator is called to order for words spoken, the exceptional words spoken shall be immediately reduced to writing by the Secretary and if the ruling is final (no appeal or appeal unsuccessful), the Senator called to order shall yield the floor and speak no further if on a matter of privilege nor until all others have had an opportunity to speak if on a question before the Senate." We have never censored anyone that I can remember. If someone gets their feelings hurt, they might object, and the President will remind everyone of the Rule, but it usually doesn't amount to more than an apology given on the floor.

Nevada. Senate. If any Senator is called to order for offensive or indecorous language or conduct, the person calling him/her to order shall report the offensive/indecorous language/conduct to the presiding officer. No member may be held to answer for any language used on the floor of the Senate if business has intervened before exception to the language was taken. In cases of breaches of decorum or propriety, any Senator, officer or other person is liable to such censure or punishment as the Senate may deem proper. In 1997, a Senator made serious allegations that the amendment process of the Senate was being influenced by nonmembers of the body. In essence, he stated that the process was being manipulated by staff and other influences because of who he was and for what he believed. The Majority Leader responded immediately by stating: the nature of the Senator's remarks impugned the integrity of the Senate. The Majority Leader requested the Senator to be either specific about his allegations or apologize. Two days later, the Senator offered a public apology on the floor.

Assembly. Nevada Assembly Standing Rule No. 20 states: "If any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the Assembly, the Speaker shall, or any member may, call to order, in which case the member so called to order shall immediately sit down, unless permitted to explain: and if called to order by a member, such member shall immediately state the point of order." At this time the point of order must sustained/not sustained. Following that we would use Masons. I have not heard of any problem having ever occurred in the Assembly.

Ohio. Senate. In the Ohio Senate, objection to the offending language would have to occur immediately. If the member is ruled out of order by the President, he or she would be required sit down and would not be permitted to continue speaking without leave of the Senate. This has not happened in the last 15 years. The relevant rules follow.

Rule 68. (How Often Senator May Speak.) No senator shall speak more than twice on the same question except by leave of the Senate or responding to the floor; and the senator speaking shall confine the speech to the question under debate and avoid personalities.

Rule 73. (Senator May Be Called to Order.) If any senator, in speaking or otherwise, is transgressing the Rules of the Senate, the President shall, or any member may, call the senator to order; and the senator called to order shall take the senator's seat until the question of order is decided.
Rule 74. (If Called to Order.) If the decision be in favor of a senator called to order, the senator shall be at liberty to proceed; if otherwise, the senator shall not be permitted to proceed without further leave of the Senate.

**Oregon. Senate.** Oregon’s Senate Rules state: "If a member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the member objecting shall immediately repeat the words to which objection is taken and they shall be recorded by the Journal Editor. However, if any other member has spoken or other business has intervened after the words were spoken and before the objection was made, the member shall not be held answerable or subject to censure." Last session one member seemed to "offend" members of his own caucus on a routine basis. Fortunately, our current Senate President is a peace-maker, so he was able to mediate successfully. Although, it took a lot of time away from the business of the Senate.

**Pennsylvania. Senate.** There have only been a couple of times in my tenure when offensive language was used in debate. Exception to the debate must be immediate. We do have the elaborate procedure of taking down the words, etc. and proceeding to discipline as the Senate might order but we have never used this procedure. In the past, when objection was heard, we immediately put the Senate at ease. The Member offering the offensive remarks is called to the front desk along with the floor leaders. After a private tête à tête, the Member is usually convinced to offer an apology to the Senate and any offended Members. We then entertain a motion to expunge the offensive remarks from the Journal and records of the Senate. However, the apology remains in the Journal.

**Texas. Senate.** Senate Rule 4.07 provides: "Whenever a member is called to order by the President of the Senate or by the presiding officer then the chair and such member fails to sit down and be in order but continues disorderly, it shall be the duty of the sergeant-at-arms and/or the sergeant's assistants upon the direction of the presiding officer to require such recalcitrant member to take his or her seat and be in order. Any member who persists in disorderly conduct after being warned by the presiding officer may, by motion duly made and carried by two-thirds vote of the members present, be required to purge himself or herself of such misconduct. Until such member has purged himself or herself of such misconduct, the member shall not be entitled to the privileges of the floor." Our members are such good ladies and gentlemen, there have been no instances of removal in many years.

**Utah. Senate.** In Utah, Senate Rule 22.06 states: "If a senator is called to order for words spoken in debate, the senator making the call shall repeat the words to which exception is taken and the words shall be recorded by the Minute Clerk. If called to order, the senator shall sit down, unless granted permission to explain. A senator may not be called to order or censured for words spoken in debate if there has been intervening business. During my tenure (7 years), no senator has ever been disciplined or censured for words spoken during a floor debate.

**Washington. Senate.** Normally the point of order is raised immediately, and the sanction is a caution to the offending speaker. If it's flagrant enough, the offender would be required to cease speaking. Or, in truly bad cases, the body could impose reprimand, censure, or expulsion. I'm not aware of any of these. As to the timing, it's not entirely clear, but since we follow Reed's Rules, they suggest that the point has to be made "as soon as possible," so I don't think any significant passage of time would be allowed. We did have an incident last year where a senator's remarks were found offensive by certain House members, and the senator made an apology on a point of personal privilege the following day. Our experience has been consistent with this comment from Reed's Rule 226: "It almost always happens, when attention is called to the unsuitable nature of the words used by the member, or the acts performed by him that he makes such an explanation or retraction as enables the assembly to excuse him and go on with its business."
**West Virginia. House.** The West Virginia House has censured for words spoken in debate. The words excepted to must be repeated by the person taking exception to them, and they are to be taken down at the Clerk's desk to be read back to the House by the Clerk. The House may take whatever course of "punishment" it desires, from a slap on the hand to expulsion for the remainder of the day's session.

**Wisconsin. Senate.** The only thing I have is what is stated in Mason's, Section 123, (9). When another member has spoken or any other business has taken place since the member spoke, it is too late to take notice of any disorderly words used for the purpose of censure.
Representative Michael Paymar:

I'm a little surprised at the Majority Leader for bringing this change of rules to this body today. This is a short legislative session. We have pressing items that we should be debating. And now this is the second time that members of your caucus have brought this to the body to consume more time, more energy, talking about what kind of prayer we should have to start each session. Rep. Leppik, I thought gave a really a beautiful speech last time this was brought up, explaining the reason and the purpose for the language that we currently have in rules, that allows for non-denominational prayer that respects the religious diversity of the House. And how anyone could support the notion of deleting, striking that language out of the rules that respects the religious diversity of the House is beyond me. So not only am I concerned about the time that this is going to take away from the busy work when we should have been doing Minnesota's work, but I'm concerned about the intent behind it. Because it was only last year... Mr. Speaker, I can't hear... It was only last year, Mr. Speaker and Members that I remember Rep. Lindner getting up before the House and saying to this body that the Christian religion is the majority in this House, that the Christian religion is the majority of this House so why can't we have the kind of prayers we want in this body? Now is that your intent? I know that that is not in your heart to be disrespectful of those members who aren't Christians, Rep. Lindner and others who are going to support this rule change, but it is disrespectful. It is highly disrespectful. You are imposing your own religious beliefs on the rest of this body and the minority members here. Minority religious members here, in my view. I know that’s not in your hearts and I know what your intent is, but I have expressed to you before how this makes certain members feel who are not Christians. Now I know that some of you have Christian prayers throughout the week. I get them on my e-mail. You invite people to your fellowships. Fine, do it. Do it whenever you want. Do it before Session starts if you feel like you want to have prayer before the House starts its deliberations. But I would like to be part of that moment where a religious leader gets up before us and has a prayer. But I would like that to be non-denominational and I would like it to be respectful of who I am. And I think this is disrespectful. I would hope the body would reject the Majority Leader's position, we vote down this rule change.

Representative Arlon Lindner:

Rep. Paymar, I don't know for sure what you're talking about. If you're talking about wasting time, did you sit there and listen to Rep. Kahn waste all that time just a few minutes ago? I think prayer is very important. You know we're told there's one God and one mediator between God and man. The man Christ Jesus. And most of us here are Christians. And we shouldn't be left, not able to pray in the name of our God when we have an opportunity to pray. That's disrespectful of the Majority's rights. Now if you don't want to be here for prayer, as the Speaker has said before, this isn't mandatory, the prayer happens before session begins. And I don't know why you're looking at me all this time, you know while you're talking. I'm very happy this is coming back up and I think all we're doing is putting the order of the day, the order...
for prayer and the way we do prayer back like it was for hundreds of years before this session. And if you don’t like it, you may have to like it. Or just don’t come. I don’t come sometimes for some prayers here. There’s some groups that pray in here that I stay out of the room. We have that privilege. And you need to exercise it. But don’t impose your irreligious left views on me.

Tape Counter 3454
Representative Barb Haake:

Members, I don’t know about the rest of you, but I really don’t care what God everybody prays to. They’re all praying to one God. And as far as I’m concerned, I need all the help I can get. I really appreciate the prayers from everybody’s God. Thank you.

Tape Counter 3473
Representative Betty McCollum:

Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members. I’m going to vote against it for a couple of reasons. The paramount one is that the two times this has been discussed on the floor, it was within the way the Rules of the House are adopted. And its more than a simple majority. And I voted against this amendment in the Rule Committee. What we’ve done here is we’ve said, ‘OK, there’s a majority who would like the prayer to be conducted in a certain way. And we can’t win when it’s a simple majority. So we’ll amend the rules going through the rules committee, where simple majority can win.’ And the reason why we have a higher standard for adopting the rules as we do in the first weeks of session, is so that the minority is heard. And we lost that in the way that the rules are adopted. And that’s why I voted against it in the rules committee. I’m very concerned about the tenor of discussion. I’m a Christian, I’m a Catholic. And I’m not here trying to out-Christian anybody else. And when I want to pray a Catholic Creed, I do it at church. And I enjoy the fellowship of the many denominations in this hall. And I enjoy the fellowship of praying together when everybody feels included. And the comments just don’t come. Well, you know, if you just don’t come for the prayer, you just don’t get to say the Pledge of Allegiance either. Because the doors are closed for that. So Members, I would encourage you not to vote for this amendment. And Rep. Paymar, one of my favorite religious songs is, "They know we are Christians by our Love".

Tape Counter 3570
Representative Matt Entenza:

Mr. Speaker I think the issue today is whether or not we’re going to show the respect that the present rule has. And Rep. Lindner, I hope that perhaps you want to rethink the last remark that you made. We have members in this body who come from different religious traditions. And to suggest that someone who comes from the Jewish tradition, a tradition that we should all certainly honor, that somehow is an irreligious one, suggests to me that it is very important to vote against this motion from the rules committee.

Tape Counter 3580
Representative Wes Skoglund:

Mr. Speaker will Rep. Lindner yield to a question? Did I hear you say, ‘Don’t impose your irreligious views on me?’ Is that your quote to Rep. Paymar? Mr. Speaker, apparently I’m not speaking loudly enough. Rep. Lindner, did you say ‘Don’t impose your irreligious views on me?’ to Rep. Paymar?
Representative Arlon Lindner:
   It was something like that.

Representative Wes Skoglund:
   Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm embarrassed, quite frankly for what Rep. Lindner said. And as a Christian, who does Bible devotions almost every night with his family, I apologize to you, because most of us don't feel that way, Rep. Paymar. I apologize, I'm embarrassed on behalf of we Christians.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rep Hines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rep Schumacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC takes roll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC closes roll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote yard 3, reject 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment A99-0583 not adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rep Schumacher A99-0583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rep Tuma - not germane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee: 31st HR 31st Leg Session
Division/Subc: 31st day
Chair: Steve Srigley
Date: 4-26-99

Log:
- Rep. Entenza - advice for speaker
- Rep. McDermott - advice for speaker
- Rep. Entenza - advice
- Rep. Shimek - advice
- Rep. Selberg - advice for speaker
- Rep. McDermott - advice for speaker
- Rep. Schumacher - advice for speaker
- Rep. Pugh - advice
- Rep. Knoploch - advice
- Rep. Doty -
- Rep. Pugh
- Rep. Edgett - advice
- Rep. Entenza - advice
- Rep. Chidester - Rule 4.03, HR #1, 099-0583 point of order
- Rep. Schumacher - Appeals ruling of Speaker - requests Call of the House
- Rep. Manzke
- Clerk will take roll
- Clerk closes roll
- Time: 9:31 P.M.
- Clerk will call absent members
- Rep. Trusk - those not taking the floor excused
- Rep. Abrams - motion does not proceed - Clerk continues to call absent members

Committee: Win. 4th Nat. Legislators

Date: April 26, 1949

Log:
- AC: Bizarri amendment
  Amendment - motion
  A 2/3 majority - amendment was not adopted
- AC: Saggers amendment - sub
- Rep. Saggers - legs bill with date - 15 hands
  Amendment 0-5
  yields
- Rep. Saggers
- Rep. Tingler
- Rep. Tingler
  yields
- Rep. Ginter
- Rep. Tingler
- Rep. Tingler
- Rep. Tingler
- Rep. Tingler
- Rep. Tingler
- Rep. Tingler - not against
  Rep. Hutter - Liability
  issue
- Rep. Ginter
- Rep. Ginter
- Rep. Ginter - not against
  Rep. McCollum - vote for
- Rep. Ginter

Side: B
Page: 15
Committee: Higher Education
Division/Subdivision: -
Chair: Steve Sigg donner
Date: April 25, 1999

Log:
- Clerk took roll
- Clerk closed roll
- Vote: Yeas 45, Nays 0; 27/30
- Amendment A-5 is part adopted.
- EC: Rep. Johnson (Amendment)
- Rep. Johnson (A0705582)
- Rep. Seifert - Rule 403, 403(2)
- Rep. Johnson - Advice
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Hillberg - Advice
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert - Advice
- Rep. McNulty - Advice
- Rep. Pena - Advice
- Rep. Pena - Advice
- Rep. Mariani - Advice
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Mariani - Advice
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert - Advice
- Rep. Seifert - Advice
- Rep. Seifert - Advice
- Rep. Seifert - Advice
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifert
- Rep. Seifet
LOG:

Rep. Tregren - Vote against amendment 92-9

- Vote taken roll
- Clerk closes roll
- Vote: Yes 55, No 34
- Rep. Sargent more absent members left, excused
- Motions heard not prevail
- Amendment not adopted

AC: Speak, O'Tromba
- Rep. O'Tromba - No amendment
- Rep. Sargent called - 15 hands
- Rep. Tregren - could add
- Bill - supports
- Rep. Marzani - Yes - led
- Amendment
- Yield
- Rep. O'Tromba -
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba -
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba
  - Rep. O'Tromba

CRTELEF. LOG
TAPE: 4
START TIME: 12:00

COMMITTEE: [Name]
DIVISION/SUBC: [Subcommittee]

SIDE: A
PAGE: 19

DATE: April 21, 1999

REVOLUTIONS:
1955
2000
2050
2130

LOG:
- Rep. Staudard
- Rep. C. Thompson
- Rep. Higgins: need take roll
- Next closing roll
- Vote: Yes 32, No 0, Adopt Amendment AS-1 is adopted.
- Rep. Mason moved these changes in this section are carried as amended.
- Rep. F. Cumes - quorum call
- Rep. Trulson - roll call
- Rep. Trulson
- Rep. O'Brien
- Rep. Bishop
- Rep. Allman
- Rep. F. Cumes
- Rep. Lingle -
- Rep. Knoche: Rto. 1:15 - thence:
- Rep. Trulson - Allen
- Rep. Trulson - Allen
- Rep. O'Brien
- Rep. Trulson - Allen -

The big gum - rules point of order well taken.
REVISION: 225

LOG:

Rep. Funk - Appeal
Calling on Speaker - Definitive call
Rep. Hamen, motion to lay in table appeal - roll call rept
Rep. High - Parliamentary inquiry
Rep. Haggerty - Distortion table not debatable
Chief take roll
Chief clears roll

Date: Chad - May 62
Rep. appeal on table
Amendment to A5-11
Rep. Haggerty - no prob in accepting amendment
Rep. Chat - language
Rep. Burnett -
Rep. Chat - not account
Rep. Burnett -
Rep. Ness
Rep. Burnett -
Rep. Ness
Rep. Ness
DATE: April 26, 1972

COMMITTEE: Joint Legislative

DIVISION/SUBC: 5th Audit


TAPE: 4

START TIME: 12:00 PM

SIDE: 1

PAGE: 22

REvolutions:

2984

LOG:

- Rep. Tenerowski - Motion to 
  withdraw amendment - 
  between lines 3 & 4 - 
  lead legislature - parrot 
  let pt. yes vote 2nd part

- Rep. Higgins

- Rep. Kielericki

- Rep. Landis

- Rep. Higgins - 1st part of take

amendment not adopted

- Rep. Higgins

- Rep. Tenerowski - yes vote

- Adopt roll as is - Click 
  taken roll

- Click/roll roll

Note: Hour 03 May 06

Confirmed at 22: 1st portion

Rep. Landis moved these

not present be in favor

Motion not adopted (point

a. Future amendment

b. Rep. Pajolek - Amend

- Explanation

- Rep. Morse

- Rep. Bakich

- Rep. Murray

- Rep. Bakich

- Rep. Murray

CHRTAPE.LOG
COMMITTEE:  
DIVISION/SUBC:  
CHAIR:  
DATE:  April 21, 1969

Log:
- Rep. Kukukova
- Submit amendment as
  past adopted - without notice
- Rep. Angell amendment
- Rep. Angell - Fell call vote
  - Amendment 49 - explanation
- Rep. Entsminger
- Rep. Lagarell - vote not amendment
- Rep. Angell - give instruction
- Rep. Hodgson - indirect amendment
- Rep. Angell
- Rep. Feld
- Rep. Lagarell
- Rep. Schattman
- Teller: Teller 45 45 00
  amendment (p-9 is) part
- Rep. Moore one week absent
  amongst the pervious period
- Resolution - Red x 533 5
- Rep. Entsminger - 47 53 3
- Rep. Schattman - 56 13 55
- Rep. Entsminger - 56 13 55
- Rep. Lagarell
- Rep. Collins - supports bill
- Rep. Nagy - supports bill
REVOLUTIONS
0115
0326
0367
0430
0540
0638
0646
0654
0756
0848
1010
1138
1351
1507
1656
1844
1612
1890
1920
1986

LOG:

- Rep. Colgan
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Carlson
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Carlson
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Carlson
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Carlson
- Rep. Seagren - Murphy
- Rep. Seagren - yield
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Carlson
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
- Rep. Seagren
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVOLUTIONS:</th>
<th>LOG:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20:18</td>
<td>Rep. Marion - The green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:59</td>
<td>Rep. Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:35</td>
<td>Next to a roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:36</td>
<td>Next to a roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 36</td>
<td>Vote: Yes 90 No 32 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:57</td>
<td>If 253 is passed as amended, 254 will be agreed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>Rep. Omarz - Motion of House to lift-exter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:11</td>
<td>Rep. Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2350</td>
<td>Rep. Holton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:18</td>
<td>Rep. Managers for Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:41</td>
<td>CC: 1st reading of STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:47</td>
<td>Rep. Linke - CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion to adopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:30</td>
<td>Rep. Pate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC: 2nd reading of CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:41</td>
<td>CC: 3rd reading of CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:42</td>
<td>Motion to adopt CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion of resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATE:** April 26, 1998
COMMITTEE: 3rd HP Select Committee

START TIME: 12:00 PM

TAPE: 5

DIVISION/SUBJ.: 3rd HP

SID: A

PAGE: 26

DATE: April 21, 1949

LOG:
- Rep. McElhenny - HR #6
- Vote - Motion prevails - HR #6 passed
- Rep. Haney - Call of House neg - 10 votes
- Roll call
- Rep. Dunlop - Sergeant brings in absent members
- Call of the roll
- Rep. Dunlop
- Rep. Haney - Roll call out - 15 votes
- Rep. Haney - How many
- HR #6 required?
- Rep. Haney - 90 votes
- Rep. Harbert - Motion to table amendment to permit
- Rules - roll call req
- Clerk will take roll
- Clerk will also take vote; Yes: 73, No: 16, G
- Rep. Haney - Mechanics
- Rep. Dunlop - Mechanical
- Rep. Dunlop - Motion
- Members be excused motion prevails - Clerk will close roll.
Committee: Rules & Privileges

Chair: Rep. Briggs

Date: April 26, 1999

Log:

- Rep. Lester - Amendment to Rules
  - Rep. Turner
- Rep. Hilliker - Supports
  - Rector amendment to Rules
  - Rep. McCullom
  - Rep. Keen
  - Rep. Anderson
  - 1st of Order
- Rep. Richardson - Tape 5 - Side B
  - Rep. Legiet
  - Rep. Anderson - Roll Call
  - Rep. Bishop - Rester
  - Amendment - Lines 8 & 7
  - Vote 1st and 2nd
  - Vote: Lines 6 eliminating non-appearances
  - Rep. Cleary
  - Rep. Halberg - Supports
  - Rep. Hilliker
  - Rep. Pugh - Not against
  - Both of amendment
  - Vote 1st - Click to take
  - (Votes Yes) 73, No 25
  - Amendment to Rules 1st portion
Committee:  [Redacted]
Division/Subcommit:  [Redacted]
Chair:  [Redacted]

Date:  April 26, 1949

Log:

Rep Paulsen - moved

2nd st not adopted.

Rep Paulsen - moved

House be adjourned.

Rep Paulsen - moved

House be adjourned.

Motion prevailed - adjourned.
LOG:

House comes to order
Prayer by the Chaplain
Pledge of Allegiance
Red call by Clerk
Reading of Journal by Clerk
Intro of Bills HF 48 - 81

Rep Pawlenty moves to suspend Rules
- Prevails -

Adjoined for 3 days. Reso 3 prevails

TCPA = Rules changed and re-numbered

TUPA finishes

Discussion on Rule adoption

Rep Kahn: Given up on rule changes, more
compromised (shave - must, etc.)

Rep Kahn: inconsistent word usage

Rep Rugh

~ TT 43 ~

Rep Pawlenty: "244 are technical change..."

- Adopted -

Rep Kahn: Repeal all

Rep Pawlenty: tabled Kahn motions

~ TT 10 ~

Rep Erentzen: language change - 215

Rep Hasskamp:

Rep Tuma: change to make user-friendly

- Adopted -

~ TT 33 ~

McCullum: Time for Prayer & Meditation
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG


DIVISION/SUBC:

CHAIR: Rep. John Jones

DATE: 11/11/19

TAPE: START TIME: __:__

SIDE: __

PAGE: __

REVOLUTIONS:

2979
2914
2843
2512
1794
2142
2444
2521
2274
1128
2200
1480
1620
1610
1475
1346
1030
0750
0680
0550
12.00.1
04:42.25
06:10
04:00
06:45
06:83
07:00
16:00

LOG:

Rep. Green - cutting off debate?
Rep. Andrus - the house has unanimous consent to allow adjournment.
Rep. Marcari - don't use the time constraint as an excuse otherwise.

Rep. Thompson - the time restraint is not written up by a member.


Clock taken - all amendment.

Amendment lost May 70, 26: 60.
Rep. Skelton amendment 004 - free debate.
Rep. Bishop - [epic] the bill is structured to extend time at least 20 min.
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE:  [House of Reps: 81st Session]

DIVISION/SUBC: 

CHAIR:  [Name]

DATE:  3/17/71

LOG:

Rep. Skaglund

Clock taken role

Yay: 60; Nay: 71

Motion dies without prevail

Rep. Lemmk - Amend O14

Rep. Del_orders - yea and nay 2 + 3

Rep. McCollum

Rep. Smith

Rep. Lepnik

Rep. Ness

Rep. Abrams

Rep. Kahn - people will be uncomfortable by no open prayer

Rep. Rhoades

Rep. Reuter - Invoking "God" or "Jesus Christ" becomes non-regular

Rep. Ehrryst supports Lepnik

Rep. Oden

Rep. Bemis

Rep. Plucks

Rep. Lonski

Rep. Swenson

Rep. Lingman

Rep. Clark

Rep. Clark, Community

Rep. Clark
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE:  [Redacted]
DIVISION/SUBC:  [Redacted]
CHAIR:  [Redacted]

DATE:  1/11/79

LOG:

Rep. CPU
Rep. Haas
Rep. Clark
Rep. Haas
Rep. Erickson

Clark amendment, against prevail. Division: aye

Leggy amend. Lines: 49.收益率: 52 pages 44
Kahn amendment, amendment 22
Rep. Bevans
Rep. Kahn

Veto kill
Rep. Cisin amendment, 779, request recess
Rep. Hatzen
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Selberg
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Selberg
Rep. Olson

Clock stop talk

Rep. Olson

Toll call late - yes
Rep. Anderson referred to committee of Rules
Rep. Skoyland

Toll call vote - yes
Rep. Enterza
Rep. Pedanzy - Report is a new concept
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: House of Rep. 81st Session

DIVISION/SUBC: 

CHAIR: Speaker: Sam Spong (Chair)

DATE: 1/11/99

LOG:

Rep. Olsen

Rep. WINTER- open using the word "freedom"

ROLL CALL BY CLERK, yeas: 77, nays: 56
- Motion adopted -
- Amendment 007 -

ROLL CALL VOTE: yea

Rep. Entenza

Rep. Opitz

ROLL CALL: yeas 132, nays 112
- Motion adopted -
- Amendment 105 -

Rep. Olsen: "Education bill was 90-0 good"

Rep. Bishop: "If words are changed in Senate, in some conclusions..."

Rep. Fadness: "wants that the words be changed in rules committee"

Rep. Olsen - only one part in before an amendment by Fadness, Fadness, Fadness -

Rep. Winter

Rep. Linder

Rep. Cicotte

Rep. Cicotte: "committee made a committee for measures which on the floor is debated"

Rep. Cicotte

Rep. Opitz

Rep. Linder

Rep. Tomasson:
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: ________________ Rep. ________________

DIVISION/SUBC: ________________

CHAIR: ________________ Rep. ________________

DATE: ________________

TAPE: ________________

START TIME: ________________

SIDE: A 1B

PAGE: ________________

REVOLUTIONS:

2488
2772
2765
2795
2907
2943
2914
3022
3107
3122
3219
3281
3356
3354
3447
3516
3531
3547
3642
3766
3863
3943
4041
4131
4222
4317
4412
4516
4610
4707
4804
4907
5014

LOG:

Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Winter
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Causer
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Pawlenty

vote: motion prevails/amendment accepted

Tiebreaker amendment - 28: roll call requested

Rep. Tuma
Rep. Lehner

roll call yeses 48, nays 31

High speed internet, 7724, giving special powers to commissioners

amendment to the amendment, Rep. Pawlenty also substitutes to

amendment, corrected, high speed internet

Tuma amendment 26

Rep. Causer requests roll call - am proposes roll call suspension

roll call yeses 42, nays 70

Greenfield amendment 7728 withdrawn

Cutting internet, 7728 withdrawn

Machulin amendment 7722

Rep. Causer requests roll call

cutting internet, 7722 withdrawn

Rep. Causer

Rep. Machulin

Cutting internet, 7722 withdrawn

Rep. Causer

Rep. Causer requests roll call succeeds

Rep. Causer
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: MK House Rep. Committee 5th session
DIVISION/SUBC:

DATE: 4/14/99

REVOLUTIONS:
- 2262
- 2261
- 2252
- 3176
- 3085
- 2920
- 2840
- 2800
- 2743
- 2723
- 2602
- 2494
- 2356
- 2302
- 2295
- 2271
- 2230
- 1240
- 1430
- 1345
- 1060

LOG:
- Roll call 85-5, aye, 70
- Kahn amendment IT12
- Rep. Purnell
- Rep. Kahn
- Rep. Powell
- Roll call vote - yes
  - Kahn amendment IT12
  - Yeas: 65, Nays: 65
- Amendment IT13
- Rep. Krinkle - suggest adoption
  - Amendment adopted
- KAHN - IT34
- Rep. Tuma - removed because not used
- Rep. Kahn - now we mean more interaction
- Roll call continued
- Clerk opens roll
- Yeas 54, Nays 77
- Amendment
- Rep. Franks
  - Kahn amendment IT27
  - Yeas: 79, Nays: 52
- Motion parallel
- Motion parallel
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: MN House of Representatives 81st Session

DIVISION/SUBC: ______________________

CHAIR: Speaker: Steve Swigum

DATE: 1/11/99

LOG:

Roll call
Rep. Paulsen - Formic acid is ripe; how quickly until floor
Rep. Finseth - on Wednesday addressed
Rep. Fancil - Table, no motion
Roll call - yes - 70 nays - 60
Motion prevails
Rep. Courter - Deccum
Rep. Kahn - "Gentle Lady"
Announcements
House Adjourned
CALL TO ORDER

Prayer by Chaplain

Pledge of Allegiance

Rep Purdy Speaks

Rep Strepkie Speaks

Quorum Roll Call

Chair closes roll

Quorum is present

Chair reads journal from preceding day

Introduction of bills

Chair gives first reading

24:76 - 75:19

Rep Reuter introduces H.F. 7720

Mistake made by Author

Rep Reuter speaks on bill

Roll call vote is requested

Rep Mazer speaks

Rep Reuter requests roll call

Rep Reuter asks for green vote?

Roll call is taken - lay on table

Chair shall close roll

So it's 72 nays

Rep Reuter speaks on vote

Motion of suspension of rules

Rep Hirs addresses rep Mraz

Rep Mraz speaks

Rep Hirs
COMMITTEE:  91st Session and House of Rep
CHAIR: Speaker Swiggum
DATE:  2-1-2009

TAPE:  1
START TIME:  12:00
SIDE:  A
PAGE:  2

REVOLUTIONS:
17 35
17 50
17 84
18 20
19 10
19 37
19 74
20 25
20 63
2111
2209
2247
2285
2320
2370
2406
2477
2506
2530
2580
2609
2627
2643
2748
2830
2854
2915

LOG:
Rep Moers
Rep Fulliard
Rep Junker
Rep Fulliard speaks against vote
Rep Haskamp
Addresses Rep Haskamp (Rep Renner)
Rep Haskamp
Rep Seeman
Rep Renner
Rep Caudina
Rep Aamodt
Rep Renner
Rep McCullen
Rep Renner
Rep McCullen
Rep Seeker
Rep Shimskis
Rep Enhardt
Rep Renner
Rep Enhardt
Rep Krillwski
Motion for vote on Speaker
Rep Olson
Clerk takes roll
Clerk closes roll
LS I's to neg's Bill referred to ED Policy
Motions and resolutions
Resolution #12
LOG:

H.F. 2986 (motions & resolutions)
Copies of HCR 110 are placed on desks
Rep. Reuter requests call house
Roll call
Rep. Abrams moves roll call suspended
Rep. Reuter requests roll call
Rep. Reuter wants to change rules

Short Prayers
Rep. McCullum asks for quiet
Rep. Reuter resumes
Speaker calls for 2/3 vote
Rep. Copple

TAPE SIDE B
Rep. Haslamp requests roll call (on lines)

Speaker calls for roll call

Rep. Turner
Rep. Bergener
Roll call 20 Y - 110 N Amend to
Rep. Kowalczyk

Rep. Olsen
Roll Call amendment to clause 69 Y - 63 N
Rep. Moss - unexpected service call
Rep. D'Agostino
Rep. Cruz - personal privilege
Rep. Bishop - personal privilege
Rep. Helf
Rep. Abrams
COMMITTEE: 81st Session MN House of Reps

CHAIR: Speaker Swiggum

DATE: 2-1-2000

LOG:

Rep Pugh
Rep Molnar
Rep Rhodes
Rep Ozment
Rep Linder
Rep Molnar: Remove call of House. House adjourn
FLOOR
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: House Floor
DIVISION/SUBC: 76th Day
CHAIR: Speaker Swanson

DATE: 2/23/2000

REVOLUTIONS:

0001
0217
0532
0585
0607
0625
0724
0805
0823
0893
0948
0945
1665
1988
1950
1960
1927
1870
1151
1334
1327
1234
1413
1455
1445
1499
1549
1599
1641
1716

LOG:

House called to order

Clerk takes roll

Clerk closes roll 118 hrs 7 min
Rep Pelowski

Motion as approved
Rep Mahoney
Rep Buesgens

Reports of standing committees received

2nd reading of H.E.'s

2nd reading of SF's

Introduction of bills + 1st reading
Consent Calendar for day

HF 2940 1st item for day
Rep Kost ef. speedy bill

3rd reading of H.E. 2940

Clerk takes roll

Clerk closes roll 132 hrs 2 min

3rd bill on consent calendar HF 3144
Rep Swenson or..whatever
Rep Kahl
Rep Swanson

Rep Kahl
Rep Swanson
Rep Kahl
Rep Swanson
Rep Swanson
Rep Kahl
Rep Kahl
Rep Kahl
Rep Kahl
Rep Kahl
House Committee Tape Log

Tape: 1
Start Time: 3:00
Side: 1A
Page: 2 of 7

Committee: House Floor
Division/Subc:
Chair: Speaker Sviggram
Date: 2/23/2000

Log:
Rep McNamara
Rep Clark
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep McNamara
Rep Kahn
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Pt of Order: Rep Kahn
Rep Swenson
Rep Wineman
Rep Kahn mentions point of order. Split reading on HF 3142
Chair takes roll
Chair closes roll at 3:05 p.m.
HF 3156 4th item on Consent Calendar
Rep Workman explains the bill
Rep Eberhart
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Workman
Rep Paulsen
Rep Leichtnam
Rep Paulsen
Rep Paulsen
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

TAPE: 1
START TIME: 3:05

COMMITTEE: House Floor
DIVISION/SUBC: 
CHAIR: Speaker Swaggum

SIDE: 14 + 18
PAGE: 3 of 7
DATE: 2/23/00

REVOLUTIONS:
2099
3144
3167
3182
31872
3454
3473
3570
3605
3612
3677
3580
3560
3332
3239
2982
2921
2117
2707
2068
2082
2070
2021
2037
2100
2065
1945
1760
1609
1518
1550

LOG:
Clerk takes the roll
Rep Paulsen moves motion pending
Clerk closes the roll 114 ayes 00 noes
Rep Paymar
Rep Lindner
Rep Hoake
Rep McColloch
Rep Entz
SIDE B
Rep Skoglund
Rep Lindner
Rep Skoglund
Rep Bishop
Rep Hlas Kamps
Rep Van Deelen
Rep Leppik moves to divide rule 515 CR second portion
Rep Leppik
Parliamentary inquiry 23 cts
Rep Leighton
Rep Bishop
Rep Leighton
Rep Paulsen
Rep Holsolly
Rep Entz
Rep Maves
Rep Cian
Clerk takes the roll
Clerk closes roll 71 ayes 00 noes
1st Person 515 CR1 / clerk takes roll
Clerk closes roll 79 ayes 52 noes

1st Print adopted
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

TAPE: 2 of 2
START TIME: 3:45
SIDE: 18
PAGE: 4 of 7

COMMITTEE: House Floor
DIVISION/SUBC:
CHAIR: Speaker, Swensen
DATE: 2/23/00

REVOLUTIONS:

125
1467
1439
1249
1216
1143
1016
874
586
538
416
283
469
124
1194
1006
1194
1134
1151
1197
1348
1393

LOG:

Report from Rules 11/C
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen

Clerk reports amendment 29
Rep. Olson
Rep. Storr
Rep. Solberg
Rep. Olson
Rep. Olson
Rep. Olson

Amendment moved with Rules Committee by Rep. Olson

Time 2

Amendment 11/C R 30
Roll call requested by Minority Leader, Rep.
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Solberg
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Olson
Rep. Olson
Rep. Olson
Rep. Olson

Clerk takes roll

Clerk closes roll by 6:50 p.m. 6:53:55 by Speaker
Amendment 30 R 9 or 10 or 11
Rep. Leighten
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Leighten
Rep. Dorhout
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

TAPE: 2 of 2
START TIME: 3:05
SIDE: 2A
PAGE: 5 of 7
DATE: 2/23/00

COMMITTEE: House Flex
DIVISION/SUBC: 
CHAIR: Senator Swigun

REVOLUTIONS:
1422
1445
1459
1498
1610
1648
1675
1735
1765
1793
1845
1859
1898
1950
2075
2147
2213
2246
2271
2346
2350
2322
2516
2641
2824
3224
3355
3330
3344
3357
3421

LOG:
Amendment does not prevail for voice
Amendment 11 CR 16
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. McCollum
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. McCollum
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. McCollum
Rep. Paulsen
Rep. McCollum
House Committee Tape Log

Tape: 2 of 2
Start Time: 3:05
Side: 2A
Page: 6 of 7
Date: 2/23/00

Committee: House Floor
Division/Subc:
Chair: Speaker Swenson

Revolutions:
3431
3441
3565
5152
3565
3477
2411
2411
2777
3340
335
3273
3279
2622
3245
3217
3193
3100
3133
3403
3403
394
2765
2542
3314
2423
2302
2324
24
20

Log:
Rep McCallum
Rep Selberg
Rep Paulsen

Rep Larson
Clerk takes roll on the Pearl Amendment, 11CR 27
Motion prevails by Rep Nelson
Clerk closes roll 62 Ayres 68 Myers/Adopted
Roll 11CR Rules
Clerk closes roll 62 Ayres 68 Myers/Rules adopted as amended
Calendar by Rep SF 34
Rep Fossum moves 5.14
Motion prevails
Calendar by Rep continued by unanimous
Motion + resolutions
Rep Lias
Rep Lepak
Rep Redt
Rep Smith
Rep Opatz
Rep Drugg

Rep Swenson

Rep Kurov
Rep Eide
Rep Winnel
Rep Eilertson
Rep Gruenefeld
Rep 
Rep Knutson
Rep Rhodes
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

TAPE: 2 of 2  
COMMITTEE: House  
DIVISION/SUBC:  
CHAIR: Speaker Sussen  
DATE: 2/23/00  

SIDE: B  
PAGE: 7 of 7  

REVOLUTIONS:  
2890  
2873  
2864  
2854  
2829  

LOG:

Rep. Smith  
Rep. Holstein  
Rep. Finseth  
Motion prevails to adjourn  
House adjourned
81st. Sess.

COMMITTEE: MN House of Rep. Open Session
DIVISION/SUBC: Day #3
CHAIR: Speaker: Steve Sviggum

DATE: 11 Jan. 1999

LOG:

House comes to order
Prayer by the Chaplain
Pledge of Allegiance
Roll call by Clerk
Reading of Journal by Clerk
Introduction of Bills HF 48 - 81
Rep Pawlenty moves to suspend Rules
- Prevails -

Adjourn for 3 days. Reso 3 prevails
PLUMA = Rules changed and re-numbered
TUMA finishes
Discussion on Rule adoption

Rep Kahn: Given up on rule changes, were

incomprehensible (shell, muss, etc)

Rep Kahn: inconsistent word usage

Rep Pugh -
- TT 43 -

Rep Pawlenty: "849 = technical change..."
- Adopted -

Rep Kahn: Refuse to move to plain English

Rep Pawlenty: tabled Kahn motion
- TT 10 -

Rep Entenza: language change - P 15

Rep Hasskamp:...

Rep Tuma & change to make user-friendly
- Adopted -
- TT 33 -

McCullum: Time for Prayer + Meditation
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: MN House of Reps 81st Session

DIVISION/SUBC:

CHAIR: Speaker: Steve Sviggum

DATE: 1-11-99

REVOLUTIONS:

33 2,956
  2,962
  3,017
  3,047
  3,063
  3,123
  3,114
  3,204
  3,260
  3,298
  3,316
  3,348
  3,429
  3,458
  3,473
  3,506
  3,522
  3,540
  3,558
  3,592
  3,600

18 3,614
  3,555
  3,513
  3,478
  3,416
  3,196
  3,086

LOG:

Mianau: what's a non-genom prayer?
McCullum
Mianau
McCullum
Rep. Kubly: "interdenominational"
Rep. Derrier
Enoksen
Rep. Olson
Rhodes

Rep. Pawlenty: "Gaa" ok?
Rep. Leppik: "founspects her diversity of this house."
Rep. McCullum: ok
Rep. Leppik
Rep. McCullum
Rep. Swiggum
Rep. McCullum: tables amendment
Opatz
Amendment No. 2
Rep. Opatz: Honor of chairs
Pawlenty supports it
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Rutkavina: objects
Rep. Opatz
Rep. Rutkavina
motions prevail; division called 62, 91 ayes, motion prevails
Entenda amendment T718 requests roll call "gag rule"
Rep. Kielkiewicz: were trying to increase arm of time guaranteed
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: House of Reps 31st Session
DIVISION/SUBC:  
CHAIR: Spkr. Prof. Suggum

DATE: 11/11/99

LOG:

Rep. Cuthbert - this is a poison pill proposal
Rep. Latvinsky - Democrats did have input
Rep. Olsen
Rep. Greenfield - cutting off debate?
Rep. Latvinsky - prevent chaos, chemophobia
Rep. Greenfield
Rep. Bishop - it's worth a try
Rep. Tomassoni - we currently have the ability to cut off debate
Rep. Jutrides
Rep. Peterson
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Skegland
Rep. Ozment
Rep. Anderson - the house does an admirable record for allowing
Rep. Ozment
Rep. Tomassoni - keep bickering culture
Rep. Mariani - don't use the time constraint as an excuse
Rep. Tomassoni
Rep. Bunkavina - the bill is wrong
Rep. Skegland
Rep. Paldevin - the time sheriff is not arbitrary, only for
Rep. Winter

Clerk takes Roll on Feinig Amendment
Amendment Lost  May  70 Yea: 61
Rep. Skegland Amendment 004 - free Debate
Rep. Bishop - [p. 12] the bill is structured to extend time to at least 20
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE:  MN House of Reps: 31st Session

DIVISION/SUBC:  

CHAIR:  Speaker Steve Sviggum

DATE:  1/11/99

TAPe:  2
START TIME:  2:20

SIDE:  A/B

PAGE:  4

REVOLUTIONS:
1403
1710
1762
1843
1900
2018
2133
2270
2380
2458
2640
2685
2773
2810
2955
2984
3033
3056
3143
3207
3249
3345
3375

LOG:

Rep. Skoglund

Clock took role

Yay: 60  Nay: 71

Motion loses  punt prevails

Rep. Lemanick - Amend 014 -- 2/3

Rep. DeLille - amended parts 2/3

Rep. McCallum

Rep. Smith

Rep. Leppik

Rep. Ness

Rep. Abrams

Rep. Kahn - people will be uncomfortable by open prayer

Rep. Roberts

Rep. Reuter - Invoking "God" or "Jesus Christ" becomes amendable

Rep. Erickson - supports Leppik

Rep. Olson

Rep. Behr

Rep. McCallum

Rep. Lindner

Rep. Layman

Rep. Pawlenty

Rep. Leppik

Rep. Leighton - req. roll call vote v/s 72 days 2/3

2nd part

Rep. Clark amendment 14

Rep. Oskee

Rep. Clark
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: UN House of Rep 81st Session
DIVISION/SUBC: 
CHAIR: Spkr. Steve Swiggum

DATE: 1/11/99

LOG:
Rep. Leppik
Rep. Haas
Rep. Clark
Rep. Haas
Rep. Bruson
Clark amendment: do not prevail; division: down
Leppik amend. lines 4-5; roll call: yes aq 89 nays 42
Kahn amendment; amendment 22
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Kahn
vote no
Rep. Olson amend. 77 a yes 69 nays 42
Rep. Entenza
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Seiberg
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Selberg
Rep. Olson
Clerk takes roll
Amendment TT9: Calyx as 71 nays
Amendment A2
Rep. Olson
Roll Call Vote - yes
Rep. Olson referred to committee of Rules
Rep. Keegland
Roll Call Vote - yes
Rep. Entenza
Rep. Paulsen - proposal is a new concept
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: House of Rep. 81st Session

DIVISION/SUBC: ________________

CHAIR: Speaker Steve Suggum (Abrams)

DATE: 1/11/99

LOG:

Rep Olson

Rep Winter - poor usage of the word "financial"

Roll Call by Clerk: yea: 77 nays: 56

Motion adopted

Amendment 007

Roll Call Vote: yea

Rep Entenza

Rep Opitz

Roll Call: yea: 121 nay: 112

Not adopted

Amendment 005

Rep Olson: "Education bill will not be good"

Rep Bishop: "If words are changed in..." come to some conclusions.

Rep Pawlenty: moves that the record be removed to floor committee

Rep Olson: only one part is before us

Motion by Pawlenty prevails

Amended on 07/16

Rep Winter

Rep Pawlenty

Rep Greenfield

Rep Pawlenty: germane, move in committee and no motion in floor is desired

Rep Greenfield

Rep Opitz

Rep Pawlenty

Rep Tomassoni
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: 51st session MN House of Reps

DIVISION/SUBC: 

CHAIR: Spkr. Steve Swaggum

DATE: 1/11/99

LOG:

Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Winter
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Casper
Rep. Pawlenty

Vote: motion prevails; amendment adopted

Telegram amend - 28, roll call requested

Rep. Tuma

Rep. Behler

Roll call: yeas 95, nays 37

High amendment. 7744. Giving up special powers as minority amendment to the amendment. Rep. Pawlenty also subscribes to this.

Amend, carries. High am carries

Casper amendment 26

Rep. Casper requests roll call - am proposes 2/3 vote to suspend

Roll call: yeas 62, nays 70

Greenough amend. 7728 withdrawn

Fjelding amend. 012 withdrawn

McCullough amend. 7722

Rep. Selfert proposes n-referral

McCullough roll call req.

Rep. Pawlenty

Rep. McCullough

Roll call on motion to re-refer - motion prevails. Yeas 127, nays 7

Rep. Leighton amendment 7724

Rep. Selfert

Rep. Leighton requests roll call; succeeds

Rep. Goodin
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: MN House of Representatives, 81st session

DIVISION/SUBC: ________________

CHAIR: Sen. Steve Swiggum

DATE: 3/11/99

LOG:

CALL OF THE HOUSE AT 2:30

ROLL CALL VOTE - YES

~ Kahn amendment TT12 ~

YEARS: 65, NAYS: 65

Amendment TT13

Rep. Krenik - suggest adoption

~ Amendement adopted ~

KAHN ~ TT34 ~

Rep. Tuma - removed because not used

Rep. Kahn - New one means more interaction

Roll call requested

Clerk takes roll

YEARS 54, NAYS 77

Amendment

Rep. Erhardt - procedure for amendment adoption

Rep. Pugh - signa signed open to the public

Rep. Pawlenty

Rep. Solberg

Clerk reads roll to adopt house rules

YEARS: 79, NAYS: 52

Motion prevails

Motion prevails

Motion prevails
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: MN House of Representatives 81st Session

DIVISION/SUBC:

CHAIR: Spkr: Steve Sviggum

DATE: 11/11/99

LOG:

Roll call

Rep. Rawley - from crisis it went how quickly until their
Rep. Finseth - on Wednesday addressed

Rep. Rawley - Table of motion
Roll call - yes - 70 nays - 60
Motion Preceded

Rep. Crothers - Deorum
Rep. Kalen - "Gentle lady"

Announcements
House Adjourned
House Committee Tape Log

Committee: House Floor
Division/Subc:
Chair: Speaker Swiggum
Date: 2/23/2000

Page: 12 of 7

Revolutions:
0217
0535
0585
0607
0625
0724
0805
0823
0853
0908
0945
0965
0988
1050
1060
1127
1170
1199
1334
1377
1394
1411
1450
1464
1494
1519
1550
1599
1641
1710

Log:
House called to order
Clerk takes roll
Clerk closes roll 118 Yes 7 No
Rep Dewski
Motion is approved
Rep Mahoney
Rep Buesgens
Reports of standing committees offered
2nd reading of HF's
2nd reading of SF's
Introduction of bills + 1st reading
Consent Calendar Friday
HF 2140 1st Item for Day
Rep Kast explains bill
3rd reading HF 2140
Clerk takes roll
Clerk closes roll 132 Yes 0 Nays
3rd bill on consent calendar HF 3142
Rep Swenson explains bill
Rep Kahn
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep Kast
Rep Swenson
Rep Kast
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep Kast
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep Kast
Rep Kahn
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: House Floor
DIVISION/SUBC: 
CHAIR: Speaker Swiggum

DATE: 2/23/2000

TAPE: 1
START TIME: 3:00
SIDE: 1A
PAGE: 2 of 7

REVOLUTIONS:

1746
1810
2001
2078
2103
2131
2171
2206
2241
2275
2305
2373
2388
2400
2460
2491
2507
2611
2636
2651
2662
2678
2702
2709
2724
2733
2770
2810
2853
2870
3084

LOG:

Rep McNamara
Rep Clark
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep McNamara
Rep Kahn
Rep Swenson
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Kahn
Rep Khan...
Tape: 1
Start Time: 3:05
Side: 1A + 1B
Page: 3 + 7
Committee: House Floor
Division/Subc: ___________________________
Chair: Speaker Sviggum
Date: 2/23/00

Revolutions:
2099
3144
3167
3186
3372
3454
3473
3570
3605
3602
3587
3550
3560
3338
3239
2982
2921
2917
2707
2666
2625
2668
2521
2399
2108
2065
1995
1760
1669
1618
1550

Log:
1. Clerk takes the roll.
3. Clerk closes the roll. 114 ayes 11 nays.
9. Side B.
28. Clerk closes the roll. 71 ayes. 60 nays.
29. 1st Passage 515 CR 1. Clerk takes roll.
30. Clerk closes roll 79 ayes 52 nays.
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

Tape: 2-1
Start time: 3:05
Division/Subc: 
Chair: Speaker, Sergeant
Date: 2/23/86

Revolution:
1565
1467
1439
1249
1216
1113
1976
1274
0810
0675
0566
0264
0175
2003
1925
1067
0122
0454
0505
0586
0915
0875
0919
1089
1094
134
1151
1197
1348
1313

Log:
Report from Rules 110 CR Rep Paulsen
Rep Bishop
Rep Paulsen

 Clerk reports amendment 27
Rep Olson

Jim Styn
Rep Solberg
Rep Olson
Rep Solberg

Rep Olson

Amendment moved into Rules Committee by Rep Olson

Amendment 110 CR 30

Roll call requested by Rep Paulsen

Rep Bishop

Rep Pugh

Rep Bishop

Rep Paulsen

Rep Paulsen moved to Rules Committee

Rep Pugh

Clerk takes call

Clerk closes roll: 69 ayes 62 nays

Amendment read by clerk: CR 31

Rep Leighton

Rep Tuma

Rep Leighton

Rep Paulsen
REVOLUTIONS:
1422
1445
1459
1489
1610
1648
1675
1735
1745
1743
1849
1859
1898
1916
2075
2147
2213
2246
2271
2345
2362
2422
2596
2691
2824
2924
183
3330
3344
3354
3464

LOG:
Amendment does not move by voice
Amendment 11 CR 16
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Knoblach
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Tuma
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Bishop
Rep. Pawlenty

Speaker Suiggan calls the roll
Rep. Ahnow m.m. passes
Speaker closes roll 59 Ave Nov 41
Chair reads amendment 11 CR 27 Rep 26
Rep Bishop
Rep. McCollum
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. Solberg
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. McCollum
Rep. Pawlenty
Rep. McCollum
Rep. Pawlenty
HOUSE COMMITTEE TAPE LOG

COMMITTEE: House
DIVISION/SUBC:
CHAIR: Speaker Swiggin

DATE: 2/27/xx

REVOLUTIONS:
- 2890
- 2873
- 2867
- 2854
- 2829

LOG:
- Ken Smith
- Rep. Holsten
- Rep. Frassetto
- Motion prevails to adjourn
- House adjourned