

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Senate Journal

Eightieth Session

WEDNESDAY, February 9, 1972.

9:00 o'clock A.M.

The senate met.

The senate was called to order by the president pro tempore of the senate.

Prayer was offered by the Reverend Wilmer Bloy, Pastor of Trinity United Methodist Church, Madison, Wisconsin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By request of Senator Risser, with unanimous consent, Senator Kendziorski was granted a leave of absence for the balance of the week.

The roll was called and the following senators answered to their names:

Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan, Thompson and Whittow—31.

Absent—Senator Knutson—1.

Absent with leave—Senator Kendziorski—1.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

AMENDMENTS OFFERED

Senate amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 791 by Senator Steinhilber.

Senate amendment 2 to Assembly Bill 614 by Senators Devitt, LaFave, Cirilli and McKenna.

Senate amendment 3 to Assembly Bill 614 by Senator Keppler.

Senate amendment 4 to Assembly Bill 614 by Senator Keppler.

Senate amendment 1 to Senate Bill 625 by Senator Cirilli.

Senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 574 by Senators Heinzen and Whittow.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Read first time and referred:

Senate Bill 903

An act to temporarily waive certain requirements for foreign physicians to practice in Wisconsin for Dr. Mehdi A. Benker.

By Senators Frank, Devitt and Lorge, by request of the Oak Creek Chamber of Commerce.

To committee on Health and Social Services.

Senate Bill 904

Relating to posting of waters unsafe for drinking or bathing and granting rule-making authority.

By Senators Busby, Krueger and Dorman.

To committee on Health and Social Services.

Senate Bill 905

Relating to restricting use of salt and chemicals on highways.

By Senators Soik, LaFave, Devitt, Bidwell, Hollander and McKenna; co-sponsored by Representatives Berger, Giese and Helgeson.

To committee on Transportation.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senate Bill 906

Relating to using certain money credited under federal law for employment security building projects, and making appropriations.

By Senator Hollander; co-sponsored by Representatives McEssy and Earl.

To joint committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The committee on Governmental and Veterans' Affairs reports and recommends:

Senate Joint Resolution 114

Relating to terms of office for county officers. (1st consideration)

Adoption; Ayes, 3; Noes, 2.

Senate Bill 871

Relating to registration deadlines for elections.

Passage; Ayes, 5; Noes, 0.

Senate Bill 875

Relating to licensing of funeral directors and embalmers and reciprocal agreements with other states pertaining to funeral directors and embalmers.

Passage; Ayes, 5; Noes, 0.

Senate Bill 878

Relating to appointments to the board of city service commissioners of cities of the 1st class.

Passage; Ayes, 5; Noes, 0.

Senate Bill 885

Relating to the chief of the police department of cities of the 1st class.

Passage; Ayes, 4; Noes, 1.

Senate Bill 891

Relating to designation of the governing body in populous cities.

Passage; Ayes, 4; Noes, 1.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Assembly Bill 1427

Relating to county institutions.

Concurrence; Ayes, 5; Noes, 0.

GORDON W. ROSELEIP,
Chairman.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Senate Petition 249

A petition by 46 senior citizens of Rhinelander in support of Senate Bill 775 and Assembly Bill 1355, creating a state board on aging.

By Senator Krueger.

Read and referred to committee on Health and Social Services.

State of Wisconsin
Claims Board

February 7, 1972.

Mr. William P. Nugent
Senate Chief Clerk
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dear Mr. Nugent:

Enclosed is a copy of the report and recommendation of the State Claims Board covering claims heard on January 17, 1972.

The amounts recommended for payment on claims included in this report have, therefore, under the provisions of s. 16.007, Wisconsin Statutes, been paid directly by the Board.

This report is for the information of the Legislature. The Board would appreciate your acceptance and spreading of it upon the journal to inform the members of the Legislature

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

as to the nature of the claims which come before it for consideration.

Sincerely,

DONALD STERLINSKE,
Secretary.

BEFORE THE CLAIMS BOARD OF WISCONSIN

Hearings were held at Madison, Wisconsin on January 17, 1972, upon the following claims:

<i>Name of Claimant</i>	<i>Amount of Claim</i>
1. Raymond Jackson -----	\$ 20.82
2. William Paige -----	26.00
3. Edwin Boyer -----	63.84
4. Russell Schneider -----	1,360.40
5. Guy D. Crowe -----	35.00
6. Frank Marciniak -----	672.00
7. American National Red Cross -----	229.00
8. Robert Opps -----	88.40
9. Dan Sanford -----	32.34
10. Fred Binkowski -----	178.48
11. Candice and Del Morgano -----	10,395.77
12. Wm. Osborne Hart -----	1,185.00
13. Gordon West -----	45.00
14. Suzette C. Ditsworth -----	23.60
15. Karen Paur -----	487.79
16. John Kegley -----	20.00
17. Eau Claire Co. -----	52.50
18. Elsa Winn Murrie -----	54.84
19. Keikichi Kishimoto -----	64.00
20. Roy Greene -----	71.00
21. Walter Hintz -----	166.92
22. Walter King -----	800.00
23. Richard W. Rashke -----	19,600.00

THE BOARD FINDS:

1. *Raymond Jackson*

Raymond Jackson claims \$20.82 for reimbursement of a loss because of a check dated December 31, 1964, drawn upon the State's general fund which was lost and became

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

outdated when found, and consequently could not be cashed by claimant. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

2. *William Paige*

William Paige claims \$26.00 for reimbursement for medical expenses incurred as the result of an accident occurring on July 16, 1971 at the Work Incentive Training Center, 536 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Claimant accidentally cut his hand on a piece of tin hanging outside a vise. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

3. *Edwin A. Boyer*

Edwin A. Boyer claims \$63.84 for reimbursement for automobile damages resulting from an accident occurring on June 23, 1970 at the National Guard Armory in Madison, Wisconsin when a loose trash box rolled into the front end of his car. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

4. *Russell L. Schneider*

Russell L. Schneider claims \$1360.40 for reimbursement for automobile and trailer damages resulting from an accident occurring on August 7, 1971 on Interstate 94 in Jefferson County, Wisconsin, when a vehicle driven by a member of the national guard on Federal drill status pulled into the left lane and hit claimant's camping trailer and car. The Board concludes the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, and not one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

5. *Guy D. Crowe*

Guy D. Crowe claims \$35.00 for reimbursement of a loss resulting from the improper sale of a rifle he owned. On July 13, 1970, criminal complaints were filed against claimant in Shawano County which were eventually dismissed on February 5, 1971. In the meantime, a rifle he owned was taken and sold under the purported authority of s. 29.06 (1), Wis. Stats., with 18% of the proceeds going to the conservation fund and the remaining 82% going to the

common school fund. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

6. Frank Marciniak

Frank Marciniak claims \$672.00 for reimbursement of a loss caused by deer who ate 240 bushels of beans during the winter of 1970-71 on his farm in Lincoln Township, Polk County, Wisconsin. The Department of Natural Resources concluded the claim was not covered by s. 29.595 since the bean crop was no longer growing. The Board finds the proper measure of damages is \$2.00 per bushel instead of \$2.80 per bushel as claimed. The Board concludes the reduced claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay, and finds damages of \$480.00.

7. American National Red Cross, Disaster Services

The American National Red Cross claims \$229.00 for reimbursement of a loss on August 27, 1971 at St. Raphael's Church, 222 W. Main Street, Madison, Wisconsin, when 13 cots and 41 wool blankets were not returned to them. The cots and blankets were on loan at the request of the Administrator, Division of Emergency Government. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

8. Robert Opps

Robert Opps claims \$88.40 for reimbursement of a loss on February 17, 1971 at Wisconsin State University—Oshkosh, resulting from the disappearance of his sport coat taken from the general locker room where, as a member of the WSU—Whitewater basketball team, he was instructed to leave his personal belongings. The Board finds the proper measure of damages is \$75.00. The Board concludes the reduced claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay, and finds damages of \$75.00.

9. Dan Sanford

Dan Sanford claims \$32.34 for reimbursement of a loss on September 22, 1971 at the Murray Street parking lot operated by the University of Wisconsin in Madison when his

car was damaged by a parking lot attendant. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

10. *Fred Binkowski*

Fred Binkowski claims \$178.48 for reimbursement of a loss on July 11, 1971 at Chicago, Illinois when his tools were stolen from a UWM vehicle. There was no insurance coverage on these contents in the State owned vehicle. The board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

11. *Candice and Del Morgano*

Candice Marie Morgano and her father Del Morgano claim \$10,395.77 for special and medical damages of \$395.77 and personal injuries to Candice of \$10,000 resulting from an incident occurring on February 12, 1969, at Hyer Hall Women's Dormitory, Wisconsin State University—Stevens Point. Candice was a student at the university living at this dormitory. Between 11:30 and 11:50 P.M., a man entered the dorm lobby. Miss Gay, a university employee, was on duty at the lobby desk and asked the man if he was looking for someone. He replied he was the night watchman (although he was not) and went to the doors leading to the dormitory floors. Miss Gay saw him again later when he left the building. Miss Gay gave an accurate description of the man to the police later on.

Candice Morgano was viewing television that evening in the basement lounge in the dorm. She encountered the man in the hall on her way to getting a coke. He directed her attention to an overhead pipe, and while she was looking up he approached her and put one of his hands around her waist and the other over her eyes. He dragged her into a dark restroom and pushed her down onto the floor. She struck her head. He put his hand over her mouth. She fainted. She regained consciousness and saw her attacker leaving. She immediately told other girls in the lounge what happened to her.

The attacker was subsequently arrested and convicted for aggravated battery. Candice Morgano suffered bruises, two

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

black eyes and extensive swelling on the left side of her face, and was emotionally upset.

She gave a detailed account of the incident to a security guard twenty minutes after the incident, and appeared quite calm under the circumstances. She was hospitalized from February 13 to 17, 1969, and medical and special expenses of \$395.77 were incurred. She was out of school for one and one-half weeks.

The Board concludes there is no substantial evidence of negligence on the part of officers, agents or employees of the State and the Board concludes the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, but further concludes on equitable principles that the State should assume and pay the special and medical damages of \$395.77.

12. *William Osborne Hart*

William Osborne Hart claims \$1185.00 reimbursement for attorney fees incurred in October 1970 to compel the correction of erroneously prepared ballots in Adams, Columbia, Juneau, Marquette and Sauk Counties where he was running as an independent candidate for state senator in the November 3, 1970 election. The basis of the claim for relief from the State arises from the Secretary of State's office failure to conform to s. 5.64 (1) (e), Stats., in distributing a sample ballot which did not have the names of all the candidates for the same office appearing on or between the same horizontal lines. Section 7.10 (1) (a), Stats., provides that each county clerk shall provide printed ballots for each election in substantially the same form as those annexed to Chapter 5 of the Statutes. Accordingly, the statutes place the responsibility for preparation of proper official ballots upon the county clerk, and the role of the Secretary of State's office is advisory in nature except for the furnishing of the certified list of candidates's names. The Board concludes there is insufficient evidence of negligence on the part of officers, agents or employees of the State and that the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, and not one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

13. *Gordon West*

Gordon West claims \$45.00 for reimbursement of med-

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

ical expenses resulting from slipping on a paper cup and falling at State Fair Park on July 18, 1971, hurting his right arm. The Board concludes there is insufficient evidence of negligence on the part of officers, agents or employees of the State and that the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, nor one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

14. *Suzette C. Ditsworth*

Suzette C. Ditsworth claims \$23.60 for reimbursement of medical expenses resulting from a fall at State Fair Park on August 21, 1971. The claimant was taken by an ambulance to Milwaukee County General Hospital upon the insistence of an officer who was motivated by a desire to ride along for personal reasons. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles of the State should assume and pay.

15. *Karen Paur*

Karen Paur claims \$487.79 for reimbursement of medical expenses not compensated for by insurance resulting from an accident occurring on October 25, 1968 at the Olympic Skating Rink at State Fair Park. While skating on the outer edge of the rink pursuant to the instructions of the rink management, she fell and sustained a fractured jaw, chipped teeth and a laceration to her chin. Claimant alleges the fall was due to the rink not having ice on the outer edge, and her skate striking concrete. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay, conditioned upon the State, its employees, agents, and officers being released from any further possible liability related to this incident.

16. *John Kegley*

John Kegley claims \$20.00 for reimbursement of a loss incurred on October 11, 1971 at the Oregon State Farm when his watch was destroyed while fighting a fire in the garage and maintenance building. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

17. *Eau Claire County*

Eau Claire County claims \$52.50 for reimbursement of legal expenses incurred on August 4, September 1 and 3, 1971 in Eau Claire County relating to the placement of Ruth Fosmark. Under s. 319.11, Wis. Stats., the court may appoint a guardian ad litem for the ward and compensation may be made as provided under s. 256.48, Wis. Stats. The attorney was appointed by the court as her guardian ad litem, and pursuant to s. 48.02 (8), Wis. Stats., he is allowed reasonable compensation to be paid by the county in which the proceeding is held. The Board concludes the claim is one for which the State is not legally liable, and not one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

18. *Elsa Winn Murrie*

Elsa Winn Murrie claims \$54.84 for reimbursement of a loss allegedly caused by damages to the windshield wipers, arms and blades of her car on September 22, 1971 at Southern Wisconsin Colony, Union Grove, Wisconsin, while parked at the institution in an authorized area. There were no witnesses as to how the damage was caused. The Board concludes there is insufficient evidence that the damage was due to the negligence of officers, agents or employees of the State, and that the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, nor one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

19. *Keikichi Kishimoto*

Keikichi Kishimoto claims \$64.00 reimbursement for medical expenses incurred on July 13, 1971 at Southern Wisconsin Colony, Union Grove, Wisconsin, resulting from a back injury while working with wheel chair patients as a volunteer. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

20. *Roy Greene*

Roy Greene claims \$71.00 reimbursement for damages to his car resulting from a manure spreader driven by a resident backing into his car at parking lot #9 at Northern

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Colony in Chippewa Falls on September 2, 1971. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

21. *Walter Hintz*

Walter Hintz claims \$166.92 for reimbursement of expenses for towing his own car and renting another car after a concrete block was put through the windshield of his own car by a resident of Southern Wisconsin Colony on June 12, 1971. The Board concludes the claim is one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

22. *Walter King*

Walter King claims \$800.00 for reimbursement for the loss of a ring at Green Bay Reformatory on November 9, 1970. The ring was not inventoried by state officials, and there is no evidence as to how the claimant acquired the ring; nor is there evidence of the value of the ring. The Board concludes there is insufficient evidence of negligence on the part of officers, agents or employees of the State, and that the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, nor one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

23. *Richard W. Rashke*

Richard W. Rashke claims \$19,600 for loss of wages and pain and suffering arising from an incident on April 26, 1971 at the Mendota State Hospital, Alcoholic Treatment Center. Claimant was admitted on a voluntary alcoholic commitment. As part of the regular recreational therapy program, the claimant fell while playing volleyball and injured his wrist. None of the patients in the game were issued tennis shoes, although tennis shoes were worn by the instructor. The floor was slippery. The claimant could have returned to work by October 1, 1971, but decided to enroll in Madison Area Technical College instead in September 1971. Claimant's normal occupation involved physical labor which he was prevented from performing due to the injury to his wrist. Claimant had been dismissed from his prior employment four days prior to the incident because of his alcoholism. The Board concludes there is insufficient

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

evidence of negligence on the part of officers, agents or employees of the State, and that the claim is not one for which the State is legally liable, nor one which on equitable principles the State should assume and pay.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES:

The payment of the following claims should be denied:

Russell Schneider
William Osborne Hart
Gordon West
Eau Claire County
Elsa Winn Murrie
Walter King
Richard W. Rashke

The payment of the following amounts to the following claimants, respectively, is justified under the provisions of sec. 16.007 (6), Wis. Stats:

Raymond Jackson -----	\$ 20.82
William Paige -----	26.00
Edwin Boyer -----	63.84
Guy D. Crowe -----	35.00
Frank Marciniak -----	480.00
American National Red Cross, Disaster Services	229.00
Robert Opps -----	75.00
Dan Sanford -----	32.84
Fred Binkowski -----	178.48
Candice and Del Morgano -----	395.77
Suzette C. Ditsworth -----	23.60
Karen Paur -----	487.79
John Kegley -----	20.00
Keikichi Kishimoto -----	64.00
Roy Greene -----	71.00
Walter Hintz -----	166.92

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin this 4th day of February, 1972.

WALTER G. HOLLANDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on
Finance.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

GEORGE MOLINARO,
Chairman, Assembly Committee on
Finance.

DONALD STERLINSKE,
Representative of Secretary of
Administration.

ALLEN WILLIAMS,
Representative of Governor.

ALLAN P. HUBBARD,
Representative of Attorney General.

The State of Wisconsin
Department of Justice
Madison 53702

February 8, 1972.

To The Honorable, The Senate
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dear Senators:

As you are aware, the popular election of judges has long been the favored method in our State for selecting members of the State judiciary. I was, therefore, naturally disturbed to learn of developments which have followed in the aftermath of the recent amendment to Art. VII, sec. 24, of the Wisconsin Constitution, which changed the mandatory retirement date of supreme court justices and circuit court judges from the end of the month in which the justice or judge attains the age of 70 to the July 31st following the date on which he becomes 70.

Prior to the adoption of this constitutional amendment on April 2, 1968, the fact that the mandatory retirement date of the various judges and justices would vary obviously made any orderly transition from a retiring judge to a newly elected judge almost impossible, without some intervening period during which a gubernatorial appointee would act, since the elections for judicial offices are normally held at the spring election. As you will recall, however, upon the required second consideration of the above amendment, the proposal was approved by the legislature for a second

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

time, by 1967 Senate Joint Resolution 96, which also directed that the amendment be submitted to the electorate on the basis of the following ballot question and explanation:

"I. Shall Section 24 of Article VII of the Constitution be amended to provide a uniform annual retirement date for Supreme Court Justices and Circuit Judges of July 31st following attainment of retirement age, instead of the month of attaining retirement age? (Note—Supreme Court Justices and Circuit Judges now must retire at the end of the month of attaining retirement age. *A "yes" vote on this amendment would provide a uniform retirement date of July 31st following attainment of retirement age for all such justices and judges and would allow time for calling an April election to choose a successor thereby effecting the transition to a new judge during the summer.*)"

(Emphasis added.)

I find it difficult to escape the conclusion that the electorate voting on this proposition believed they were being asked, and intended by their vote, either to approve or disapprove a system whereby a successor for a retiring judge or justice would be elected at the spring election preceding the July 31st mandatory retirement date of the incumbent. Our citizens undoubtedly expected, from the wording of the proposition put to them, that a "yes" vote would have the effect indicated. If their votes did not have this effect, then the will of the electorate was effectively frustrated in a most serious matter, the alteration of the fundamental law of our State.

Certainly, the above quote from Senate Joint Resolution 96 makes it evident that the 1967 legislature did not consider the purpose of the amendment simply to extend the tenure of judges and justices from one month to almost a year beyond age 70, depending on whether a birthdate fell before or after July 31st. First of all, in the absence of the legislature's expressed purpose, little justification would have existed for such an unequal treatment of the senior members of our judiciary as is provided by this constitutional amendment. Further, in the absence of the legislative explanation, a "yes" vote becomes a vote not only to extend the tenure of judges beyond the month in which they attain the age of 70, but would also become a vote which would allow a governor to *appoint* judges and justices for *longer*

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

periods of time than would otherwise have been allowed under the constitution before the amendment. It would thus appear that, if the constitutional amendment did not accomplish its announced purpose, the electorate could well have been voting for a constitutional provision which "would allow" just the opposite of that which both the legislature indicated and the electorate intended.

Subsequent to the above amendment to Art. VII, sec. 24, Wis. Const., Secretary of State Robert C. Zimmerman requested an opinion of my predecessor, Attorney General LaFollette, as to whether election notices for the April 1969 Spring election should include offices then presently filled by circuit judges who would reach retirement age before July 31, 1969. In his opinion, reported in 57 OAG 237 (1968), he advised that the constitutional amendment was not self-executing and that further legislation would be required before an April election to choose a successor could take place. At page 238 of that opinion, the following appears:

"At some future time, it is conceivable that legislation could be enacted under which a vacancy in office could be anticipated. In this way, proof that a circuit judge would attain the age of 70 prior to July 31 of any year could be a statutory ground for calling an election during the month of April preceding the judge's retirement date. This result, however, cannot be achieved without further enabling legislation. . . ."

Immediately thereafter, in January 1969, 1969 Assembly Bill 90 was introduced in the legislature. By means of this bill, the legislature attempted to insure the transition referred to in 1967 Senate Joint Resolution 96 and on the 1968 Spring election ballot, by making provision for the election of circuit court judges and supreme court justices at the spring election preceding the mandatory retirement of the incumbent judge or justice. This bill was vetoed by the governor, however, and the assembly was unable to override the veto.

Subsequently, on January 20, 1971, an original proceeding was commenced in the Wisconsin Supreme Court by petition for a writ of mandamus directing the Secretary of State, Robert C. Zimmerman, to notice an election for

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Branch 7 of the Circuit Court for Milwaukee County to be held at the April 1971, Spring election and to insure acceptance of nomination papers and the placing of the name of the petitioner on the ballot at such election. The interpretation of Art. VII, sec. 24, Wis. Const., as well as the fact that the petitioner had waited until close to the deadline for filing nomination papers to institute his action, were both argued to the supreme court. On January 22, 1971, the court denied the petition for a writ of mandamus, without a written opinion indicating the basis for its decision. Therefore, we are without any specific guidance as to the basis upon which the court rendered its decision.

As a result of the foregoing, we are presented with a situation where the electorate has been seriously misled as to the effect of their vote on a constitutional amendment, further efforts of the legislature to implement the constitutional amendment have proved ineffectual and the matter continues unresolved. This should not be, particularly where an amendment has passed by such a decisive vote as 734,000 to 215,000 votes.

For these reasons, I feel it is imperative that the legislature again manifest its intent with respect to the orderly replacement of retiring judges through the electoral process, by the enactment of joint resolutions in this session and the next session of the legislature which propose clear constitutional provisions to that effect. By doing so, the legislature can more accurately and positively record its intent concerning the present long delays which are allowed before an election is held to replace a retiring judge or justice, and the public will be provided an opportunity to respond with reference to the question free from ambiguity.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. WARREN,
Attorney General.

Senator Whittow moved reconsideration of the vote by which Senate Bill 456 was indefinitely postponed.

By request of Senator Whittow, with unanimous consent, the motion for reconsideration was laid over pursuant to Senate Rule 67 (4).

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

By request of Senator Chilsen, with unanimous consent, **Senate Bill 261** was withdrawn from the joint committee on Finance and considered for action at this time.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Senate Bill 261

Relating to State aid for special programs for educationally handicapped students and making appropriations.

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 261**?

Senate amendment 1 adopted.

By request of Senator Keppler, with unanimous consent, **Senate Bill 261** was laid aside.

Senate Bill 886

Relating to snowmobile operation and equipment, creating a snowmobile recreational council and making an appropriation.

Read a second time.

By request of Senator Hollander, with unanimous consent, **Senate Bill 886** was referred to joint committee on Finance.

By request of Senator Hollander, with unanimous consent, **Senate Bill 886** was withdrawn from the joint committee on Finance and considered for action at this time.

Senate Bill 886

Read.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1 to senate substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 886**?

Senate amendment 1 to senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 886**?

Senator Heinzen moved rejection.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 12; noes, 19; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Frank, Heinzen, Keppler, Knowles, Krueger, Lorge, Lotto, McKenna, Martin, Roseleip and Thompson—12.

Noes—Senators Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Hollander, Johnson, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lourigan, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—19.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski and Knutson—2.

The motion did not prevail.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886 offered by Senator McKenna.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886?

Senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886?

Senate amendment 3 to senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

Senator Hollander in the chair.

9:40 A.M.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 4 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886?

Senate amendment 4 to senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

Senator Lorge moved reconsideration of the vote by which senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886 was adopted.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 30; noes, 2; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan, Thompson and Whittow—30.

Noes—Senators Cirilli and Parys—2.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 2 to senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886 offered by Senator Soik.

Senator Roseleip moved rejection.

The motion prevailed.

President of the senate in the chair.

10:10 A.M.

The senate stood informal for ten minutes.

10:15 A.M.

10:25 A.M.

The senate reconvened.

By request of Senator Soik, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 2 was laid aside and senate amendment 5 was considered for action at this time.

Senate amendment 5 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886 offered by Senator Soik.

Senator Lorge moved rejection.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 9; noes, 23; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Heinzen, Hollander, LaFave, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Roseleip and Thompson—9.

Noes—Senators Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman,

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Frank, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Lipscomb, Lotto, Martin, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—23.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion did not prevail.

Senator Hollander in the chair.

11:05 A.M.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 20; noes, 12; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Frank, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Lipscomb, Lotto, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—20.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Busby, Dorman, Heinzen, Hollander, LaFave, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Roseleip and Thompson—12.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

So the amendment was adopted.

By request of Senator Soik, with unanimous consent, senate amendment 2 to senate substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 886** was withdrawn and returned to the author.

Senate amendment 6 to senate substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 886** offered by Senator Risser.

Senator Krueger raised the point of order that senate amendment 6 was similar to legislation indefinitely postponed by the senate and therefore not germane.

The chair ruled the point of order not well taken.

Senator Lorge moved rejection of senate amendment 6 to senate substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 886**.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 22; noes, 9; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Heinzen, Hollander, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, LaFave, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Parys,

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Peloquin, Roseleip, Schuele and Swan—22.

Noes—Senators Chilsen, Dorman, Frank, Johnson, Lipscomb, Risser, Soik, Thompson and Whittow—9.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski and Steinhilber—2.

The motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 7 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886 offered by Senator Thompson.

Senator Knowles moved rejection.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 26; noes, 5; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Frank, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, LaFave, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Peloquin, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—26.

Noes—Senators Dorman, Lipscomb, Parys, Risser and Thompson—5.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski and Whittow—2.

The motion prevailed.

President of the senate in the chair.

11:35 A.M.

Senate amendment 8 to senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886 offered by Senator Chilsen.

Senator Lorge asked unanimous consent to be made a co-author of senate amendment 8.

Senator Chilsen objected.

Senate amendment 8 to senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate substitute amendment 1 to Senate Bill 886?

Senate substitute amendment 1 adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

By request of Senator Johnson, with unanimous consent, the bill was considered for final action at this time.

Senate Bill 886

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 30; noes, 0; absent or not voting, 3; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, LaFave, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Thompson—30.

Noes—None.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski, Lipscomb and Whittow—3.

So the bill passed.

Ordered immediately messaged.

Upon motion of Senator Keppler, the senate recessed until 2:00 P.M.

12:03 P.M.

RECESS

2:00 P.M.

The senate reconvened.

President pro tempore of the senate in the chair.

Senate Bill 261

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2 to Senate Bill 261?

Senate amendment 2 adopted.

Ordered to a third reading.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

President of the senate in the chair.

2:05 P.M.

Senator Keppler asked unanimous consent that the bill be considered for final action at this time.

Senator Swan objected.

Senator Peloquin moved that the bill be considered for final action at this time.

Senator Swan moved a

CALL OF THE SENATE

Which motion was supported.

The sergeant-at-arms was directed to close the doors and the clerk to call the roll.

The roll was called and the following senators answered to their names:

Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—30.

Absent—Senators Schuele and Thompson—2.

Absent with leave—Senator Kendziorski—1.

By request of Senator McKenna, with unanimous consent, the call was raised.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 23; noes, 8; absent or not voting, 2; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Chilsen, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Keppler, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber and Whittow—23.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Cirilli, Hollander, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Martin and Swan—8.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski and Thompson—2.

More than two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the motion prevailed.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senate Bill 261

Read a third time.

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 24; noes, 6; absent or not voting, 3; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Keppler, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik and Whittow—24.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Hollander, Knowles, Knutson, Martin and Swan—6.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski, Steinhilber and Thompson—3.

So the bill passed.

Ordered immediately messaged.

Assembly Bill 614

Relating to settlement of municipal labor disputes involving certain law enforcement personnel and firefighters.

Read a second time.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 614?

Senator Dorman moved rejection.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 18; noes, 10; absent or not voting, 5; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Johnson, Keppler, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele and Whittow—18.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Heinzen, Hollander, Knowles, Knutson, Lotto, Murphy, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—10.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski, Krueger, Martin, Peloquin and Thompson—5.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Knowles moved nonconcurrency in Assembly Bill 614.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senator Soik raised the point of order that **Assembly Bill 614** required a fiscal note and, not having one, was improperly before the senate.

The chair ruled the point of order not well taken.

Senator Soik appealed the ruling of the chair.

The question was: Shall the ruling of the chair stand as the decision of the senate?

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 9; absent or not voting, 3; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Swan, Thompson and Whittow—21.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Knutson, Krueger, Lotto, Murphy, Soik and Steinhilber—9.

Absent or not voting—Senators Kendziorski, LaFave and Martin—3.

So the ruling of the chair was sustained.

The question was: Nonconcurrency in **Assembly Bill 614**?

Senator Schuele moved a

CALL OF THE SENATE

Which motion was supported.

The sergeant-at-arms was directed to close the doors and the clerk to call the roll.

The roll was called and the following senators answered to their names:

Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Murphy, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan, Thompson and Whittow—31.

Absent—Senator Frank—1.

Absent with leave—Senator Kendziorski—1.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senator Hollander in the chair.

3:00 P.M.

President of the senate in the chair.

3:10 P.M.

All members being present the question was: Noncon-
currence in **Assembly Bill 614?**

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was:
ayes, 12; noes, 20; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Heinzen, Hollander, Knowles,
Knutson, Lotto, Martin, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhil-
ber and Swan—12.

Noes—Senators Busby, Chilsen, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman,
Frank, Johnson, Keppler, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb,
Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele,
Thompson and Whittow—20.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion did not prevail.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 2 to
Assembly Bill 614?

Senate amendment 2 adopted.

By request of Senator Keppler, with unanimous consent,
senate amendment 3 was laid aside and placed immediately
following senate amendment 5.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 4 to **Assembly
Bill 614** offered by Senator Keppler.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 4 adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 4 to
Assembly Bill 614?

Senate amendment 4 adopted.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 5 to **Assembly
Bill 614** offered by Senator Keppler.

Senate amendment 1 to senate amendment 5 adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 5?

Senator Devitt moved rejection.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 15; noes, 17; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, LaFave, Lipscomb, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele, Thompson and Whittow—15.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Busby, Chilsen, Hollander, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, Martin, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—17.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion did not prevail.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 13; noes, 19; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Lourigan, Martin, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—13.

Noes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele, Thompson and Whittow—19.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

So amendment 5 was not adopted.

The question was: Adoption of senate amendment 3 to Assembly Bill 614?

Senator McKenna moved rejection.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 21; noes, 11; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Thompson and Whittow—21.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Martin, Murphy, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—11.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion prevailed.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senate amendment 6 to Assembly Bill 614 offered by Senator Knutson.

Senator Devitt moved rejection.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 20; noes, 12; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele, Thompson and Whittow—20.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Lotto, Martin, Murphy, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—12.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 7 to Assembly Bill 614 offered by Senator Knutson.

Senator Dorman in the chair.

4:15 P.M.

Senator Devitt moved rejection.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 19; noes, 13; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, Keppler, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele and Thompson—19.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Knowles, Knutson, Lotto, Martin, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—13.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion prevailed.

Senate amendment 8 to Assembly Bill 614 offered by Senator Martin.

President of the senate in the chair.

4:20 P.M.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senator Devitt moved rejection.

Senator McKenna moved that senate amendment 8 to **Assembly Bill 614** be laid on the table.

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 14; noes, 18; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, LaFave, Lipscomb, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele and Thompson—14.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Lorge, Lotto, Lourigan, Martin, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—18.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion did not prevail.

The question was: Rejection of senate amendment 8 to **Assembly Bill 614**?

The ayes and noes were demanded and the vote was: ayes, 18; noes, 14; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Cirilli, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, Heinzen, Johnson, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Roseleip, Schuele and Thompson—18.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Hollander, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Lotto, Martin, Murphy, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—14.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

The motion prevailed.

Senate substitute amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 614** offered by Senator Steinhilber.

Senator Devitt asked unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be considered for action at this time.

Senator Steinhilber objected.

Senator Devitt moved that the rules be suspended and the substitute amendment be considered for action at this time.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 18; noes, 14; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Devitt, Dorman, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Krueger, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Parys, Peloquin, Risser, Schuele and Thompson—18.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Cirilli, Frank, Knowles, Knutson, Lotto, Martin, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber, Swan and Whittow—14.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

Less than two-thirds having voted in the affirmative the motion did not prevail.

Senator Lorge raised the point of order that senate substitute amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 614 was not in proper form.

The chair ruled the point of order not well taken.

Senator Lorge raised the point of order that senate substitute amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 614 was not germane.

Senator Keppler raised the point of order that Senate Bill 551 being the next special order it was presently before the senate.

Senator Bidwell raised the point of order that Senator Lorge's point of order was untimely.

The chair ruled that senate substitute amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 614 was not germane.

Senator Steinhilber appealed the ruling of the chair.

By request of Senator Risser, with unanimous consent, the senate stood informal.

5:05 P.M.

5:40 P.M.

The senate reconvened.

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

Senator Knowles raised the point of order a substitute amendment must be before the senate body in order to consider its germaneness pursuant to Senate Rule 50 (3).

The chair ruled the point of order not well taken.

Senator Knowles appealed the ruling of the chair.

Senator Risser asked unanimous consent that the record be expunged as it relates to suspension of the rules on senate substitute amendment 1 to Assembly Bill 614.

Senator Steinhilber objected.

The question was: Shall the ruling of the chair stand as the decision of the senate?

The ayes and noes were required and the vote was: ayes, 16; noes, 16; absent or not voting, 1; as follows:

Ayes—Senators Busby, Devitt, Dorman, Frank, LaFave, Lipscomb, Lorge, Lourigan, McKenna, Martin, Parys, Pelouquin, Risser, Schuele, Thompson and Whittow—16.

Noes—Senators Bidwell, Chilsen, Cirilli, Heinzen, Hollander, Johnson, Keppler, Knowles, Knutson, Krueger, Lotto, Murphy, Roseleip, Soik, Steinhilber and Swan—16.

Absent or not voting—Senator Kendziorski—1.

By request of Senator Devitt, with unanimous consent, Assembly Bill 614 was made a special order of business at 2:00 P.M., Thursday, February 10.

By request of Senator Knutson, with unanimous consent, the journal showed that had he been in attendance he would have voted as follows on the bills listed below:

Senate Bill 241—"Aye";

Senate Bill 202—"No";

Senate Bill 255—"Aye";

Senate Bill 1—"No".

JOURNAL OF THE SENATE [February 9, 1972]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By request of Senator Devitt, with unanimous consent, he was granted a leave of absence for Thursday, February 10 until 2:00 P.M.

Senator Keppler moved that the senate adjourn until 9:00 A.M., Thursday, February 10.

6:00 P.M.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Senator Johnson introduced Earnest Harper and David Tobish, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

Senator Thompson introduced 60 students of the 5th and 6th grades of Cottage Grove Elementary School with teachers, Mrs. Bakken and Mrs. Lampman and mothers, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Hallmark, Mrs. Bulman, and Mrs. Gjermo, Cottage Grove, Wisconsin.

Senator Keppler introduced Mayor Roger Schneider and Alderman Archie Kuntze, Chili, Wisconsin.

Senator Heinzen introduced Arthur Ceplina and Robert T. Wallczak, Stevens Point, Wisconsin.

Senator Heinzen introduced Charles Louis, Donald Zager, and Jack Ruder, Marshfield, Wisconsin.

Senator Hollander introduced 14 students of Waupun Senior High School, Waupun, Wisconsin.

Senator Murphy introduced Mayor Paul Vrakas of Waukesha and firefighters from Waukesha Charles Griffith, Ronald Wiesner, and Thomas A. Golson and firefighters from Brookfield, Ronald Rathowski, and Robert Hawkins.

Senator Devitt introduced Dennis Bayer and Stanley LaBelle, Oshkosh, Wisconsin.