

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Assembly Journal
Ninetieth Regular Session

3:39 P.M.

TUESDAY, May 5, 1992

The assembly met.
Representative Schneider in the chair.
The assembly dispensed with the call of the roll.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

State of Wisconsin
Office of the Governor
Madison

To the Honorable, the Assembly:

The following bills, originating in the assembly, have been approved, signed and deposited in the office of the Secretary of State:

Assembly Bill	Act No.	Date Signed
647 -----	284 -----	April 29, 1992
372 -----	288 -----	April 30, 1992
377 -----	289 -----	April 30, 1992
414 (partial veto) -----	290 -----	April 30, 1992
507 -----	291 -----	April 30, 1992
572 -----	292 -----	April 30, 1992
629 -----	293 -----	April 30, 1992
672 -----	294 -----	April 30, 1992
684 -----	295 -----	April 30, 1992
748 -----	296 -----	April 30, 1992
717 -----	299 -----	April 30, 1992
976 -----	300 -----	April 30, 1992
983 -----	301 -----	April 30, 1992
1055 -----	302 -----	April 30, 1992
919 -----	307 -----	May 1, 1992
388 -----	308 -----	May 1, 1992

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 30, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am approving **Assembly Bill 414** but exercising my partial veto in two sections. The bill establishes a grant program for between two and five hospitals or nursing homes with large numbers of HIV-infected patients to purchase health care safety devices which will help staff avoid puncture wounds and potential exposure to the HIV virus. The bill appropriates and directs the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) to allocate up to \$50,000 GPR in fiscal year 1991-92 and up

to \$100,000 GPR in fiscal year 1992-93 for grants. The bill also requires DHSS to evaluate the effectiveness of the devices used and to report its findings to the Legislature by January 1, 1993.

In general, I believe that testing of safety devices for use in health care provider settings is a responsibility of the pharmaceutical equipment industry and of health care providers. It should not be primarily a state responsibility. However, I recognize that, due to the existence of the HIV virus and concerns among health care providers about accidental infection by the virus, it is not unreasonable for the state to provide some help and encouragement to the state's health care providers in attempting to minimize the dangers posed by accidental punctures. I am therefore approving some funds for a one-time only grant program to hospitals to assist in reducing dangers due to accidental punctures in health care settings.

Section 1

I am vetoing the appropriation of \$100,000 GPR in fiscal year 1992-93 because I believe that this grant program should be a one-time only program and that the \$50,000 GPR provided in 1991-92 should be sufficient for the purposes of the testing program.

Section 3

Allocation: I am exercising my partial veto upon the directive to DHSS to allocate up to \$100,000 GPR in fiscal year 1992-93 for the same reasons that I have vetoed the appropriation of the same amount in Section 1. I am also vetoing the specification of the number of grants to be provided under this program because DHSS should have flexibility to determine the optimal number of settings in which to conduct tests with the funds provided.

HIV Infection: Although I recognize that the concerns about accidental infection arise primarily because of the HIV virus, the testing sites for these grants should not be limited to facilities with significant numbers of patients with HIV infection because this has potential for distorting test results, as the study sites may not be representative. Results of tests conducted in any health care setting should be transferable to settings in which there are significant numbers of HIV patients. For this reason, I am vetoing the restriction that grants be provided only to facilities with significant numbers of HIV patients. Because I am vetoing this restriction, I am also vetoing the definitions of "HIV" and "HIV infection," as they are not needed.

Nursing Homes: I am also vetoing the provision that permits nursing homes to apply for and receive grants because the health care workers most at risk are in hospital settings. Again, I am vetoing the definition of "nursing home," as it is not needed due to this partial veto.

Use of funds: I am vetoing the provision that appears to limit the use of grant funds to the purchase of health care safety devices because I believe that the funds may be better used for the incidental costs associated with the carrying out of the evaluation of the relative effectiveness of various devices. My veto will permit DHSS, through the Request-for-Proposals process, to determine how grant funds should best be used.

Report date: I am vetoing the required date of January 1, 1993, for DHSS' report on the findings and recommendations of the study because it is unrealistic, as it is likely to require more time to produce a useful report on the study results.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 212** in its entirety. This bill indexes the rate of pay for state-employed non-represented teachers to the statewide average for local public school teachers in Wisconsin.

I do not believe that such indexing is good public policy because formula-driven salaries make no allowance for differences between factors in force at the state level versus at public schools, such as fringe benefits or other bargaining trade-offs. Also, the provisions of AB 212 will remove some of the Legislature's control over state expenditures by encouraging other employe groups to request formula-driven salaries and benefits. Certainly state collective bargaining would be lengthy and acrimonious in the face of the heightened expectations fostered by the provisions of AB 212.

State teacher salaries had fallen below competitive levels when I took office, a situation which the Department of Employment Relations has since remedied through "catch up" pay for our teachers. I remain committed to keeping the salaries of state teachers competitive.

Several years ago I instructed the Department of Employment Relations to conduct a detailed survey and monitor on an annual basis the compensation level of state-employed teachers. Currently the state's contract with the Wisconsin Education Association Council provides an average salary increase of more than 23% over two years for state-employed teachers. This increase includes a market adjustment based on the

average of teacher salaries statewide. It is my desire that state teachers do not again fall behind in compensation levels.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 313** in its entirety. This bill changes the appropriation for the environmental education grant program from an annual to continuing appropriation. The bill also appropriates \$62,000 GPR for 1.0 full-time equivalent position in the Department of Public Instruction to staff the environmental education board.

The additional funding and position are not a priority in these times of fiscal austerity. Changing the appropriation from annual to continuing is also inconsistent with prudent fiscal and budget management. The Environmental Education Board is currently staffed by a .5 full-time equivalent GPR staff position and 1.0 full-time equivalent Environmental Education Consultant position. The Department of Public Instruction should reallocate internal resources to address any additional needs associated with this program.

Because AB 313 is inconsistent with prudent fiscal management and with my administration's policy on education reform, I am therefore vetoing this bill.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 491** in its entirety. This bill allows Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients to establish resource accounts of up to \$50,000. Assets kept in a resource account would be exempt from AFDC eligibility calculations; currently AFDC recipients can have up to \$1,000 in assets and remain eligible for AFDC. While on AFDC, a recipient could only withdraw funds from the resource account for educational or housing needs. The bill also increases the value of a vehicle permitted under AFDC asset limits from \$1,500 to \$4,500.

Several considerations motivated these provisions. To allow an AFDC recipient to save up some money and to use that money to better the lot of her family through

education or housing, rather than becoming temporarily ineligible for AFDC benefits, seems reasonable. Similarly, allowing an AFDC recipient a vehicle of sufficient value to assure the availability of reliable transportation to and from work also appears reasonable.

However, the resource account proposed in this bill is excessive. For a person with \$50,000 in assets to remain eligible for AFDC is to make this program intended for indigent families available to middle-class families. While the person is on AFDC, money sheltered in such an account may be restricted to education and housing purposes. But an AFDC recipient could shelter funds in a resource account while on AFDC and then use those funds for any purpose after terminating AFDC benefits. This could potentially lead to abuses.

This bill is also not affordable, in terms of both additional benefits paid out to recipients and additional county income maintenance administration costs for monitoring resource accounts and expenditures from those accounts. These costs could potentially exceed several million GPR annually.

Finally, I have proposed other welfare reform waivers which I believe are of greater priority to the state at this point. I am committed to aiding welfare recipients in their efforts to make the transition to the work-force, and I am open to looking at such issues as resource accounts and reliable vehicles as a part of Wisconsin's total welfare reform effort.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 567** in its entirety. This bill provides students with the right to exercise freedom of expression in school newspapers. That freedom does not permit students to publish or distribute obscene or libelous material, or materials which advocates violence or may cause substantial disruption in the school. Immunity from civil and criminal liability for student expression is provided for school officials, unless those officials materially alter that expression.

This veto should not be perceived as opposition to student newspapers, nor freedom of expression in student newspapers. Since the school newspaper is a learning experience similar to History or English class, these policies should be developed locally by School Boards and Administrators with input from teachers, students and parents. I wholeheartedly remain committed to our philosophy on local control. This legislation is also another example of state laws which offer an inadequate substitute for locally developed

policies. As a result of these difficulties, some school districts may cease publication of student newspapers to avoid litigation or parent protests, thereby eliminating a valuable educational experience for students. Rather than sign this legislation, I urge local school officials to review their policies regarding student expression in school newspapers to ensure students are learning about free expression and its inherent responsibilities.

Since AB 567 diminishes local control, the authority of local school officials and staff and provides a poor substitute for local policy development, I am therefore vetoing this bill.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 573** in its entirety. This bill creates a small business improvement council in the Department of Development (DOD) to identify subjects for legislation and rules that will improve the state's small business entrepreneurial environment. No funding was appropriated in AB 573.

In concept, I support the intent of this legislation. Addressing subjects and issues which will improve the economic climate for small business is important. However, I am vetoing this bill because no funding was provided for the Department of Development to effectively implement its provisions. The Department of Development is currently operating on a very tight budget made even more tight with cuts and lapses enacted in Senate Bill 483, the budget adjustment bill. To authorize DOD to implement AB 573 without providing funding would stretch the agency even further and would not allow DOD to adequately accomplish the laudable goals this legislation is attempting to address.

Improving Wisconsin's small business entrepreneurial environment is a significant and noteworthy endeavor. In 1991, under the direction of Lieutenant Governor Scott McCallum, the Governor's Conference on Small Business held 17 hearings around the state and heard from over 350 small businesses. In its February 1992 report entitled "Agenda for a World Class Economy," it identified the top 40 issues of concern to our State's small business community. I hope you will work with me during the 1993-95 biennium to assist small businesses in meeting those challenges.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 590** in its entirety. This bill is not a comprehensive approach to energy management, but rather a policy statement that is fatally flawed. AB 590 would accomplish little while leaving the state open to an endless stream of litigation.

Last week I announced an energy initiative that will work in conjunction with several provisions I signed in SB 483 to comprehensively address energy conservation in state facilities. Unlike AB 590, my initiative is complete and begins immediately. It goes beyond a simple policy statement to provide funding and a specific framework to actually lower the rate of electric and other energy use in state facilities and protect our environment.

Wisconsin has made good progress in energy efficiency. But we can do more. My initiative provides the policy direction, the funding, and develops new public-private partnerships to keep Wisconsin a national leader in energy conservation.

Specifically, my energy initiative sets the following goals for state agencies to attain by the year 2000:

- * 20% reduction in the rate of electrical consumption
- * 15% reduction in overall rate of energy use
- * 100% recycling of ash from state heating plants
- * 50% increase in co-generation at state heating plants

To achieve these goals, the plan calls for an investment of \$50 million over a six year period. This investment in Wisconsin's future will yield generous rewards in energy savings and environmental protection. Over the next six years the initiative will replace 100,000 tons of coal with renewable fuels, reduce sulfur dioxide emission by 6,000 tons, reduce carbon dioxide emission by 845,000 tons, and reduce the amount of needed landfill space by 145,000 cubic yards.

My initiative will also create new partnerships with Wisconsin's private sector in forwarding energy efficiency. This is a win-win situation for all of our citizens. We will save on energy costs and taxpayer dollars, forge new links with our business community, and improve our environment.

AB 590, while pursuing a worthwhile goal, provides no framework or funding to forward energy conservation. Meanwhile, the Bill's usage of broad and undefined terms is an invitation for costly and counter-productive litigation.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 638** in its entirety. This bill allows the taxpayer to elect to receive only a postcard with the pre-printed label. Taxpayers now receive each year's tax forms with a pre-printed label. The bill first applies to 1993 tax year.

While admirable in its intent to ease tax filing and to reduce printing and disposal costs, the bill would not meet its objectives. The bill would not significantly ease tax filing for those that use a tax service. For a tax preparer, it is just as easy to obtain the tax identification label from a tax form as a postcard. The bill would not lower the administrative costs of the Department of Revenue. The cost of processing postcards and the loss of bulk mail savings will offset the savings from printing fewer forms. The Department of Revenue already prints its forms on recycled paper.

It is also premature to implement a label checkoff system in Wisconsin. Other states have had at best mixed results with such a system. Of the fourteen states that had a label checkoff in 1987, eight have discontinued the program. Further, the Internal Revenue Service is now asking taxpayers if they would prefer not to have a tax booklet. Wisconsin's system should await the outcome of the federal experience.

Because AB 638 does not improve the ease of filing taxes or reduce DOR's administrative costs, I am therefore vetoing this bill.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 656** in its entirety. This bill allows municipalities to appeal the Department of Revenue's (DOR's) decision to reclassify vacant manufacturing property as commercial property. Under the bill, the period of vacancy cannot be the sole ground for reclassification. DOR must provide an estimate of the impact of the reclassification on the municipality's shared revenue payment. This would be provided with the September shared revenue estimates. The municipality would have 60 days from the receipt of the estimate to appeal the reclassification.

AB 656 establishes a reasonable procedure in reclassifying manufacturing property. However, SB 483, the budget adjustment bill, contains an identical provision to AB 656. In approving these provisions in

SB 483, I partially vetoed the provision fixing the appeal to the September shared revenue estimate. In so doing, SB 483 allows appeals to take place within 60 days after DOR notifies a municipality of the reclassification of manufacturing property. Upon request, DOR would provide information on the effect of the declassification on a municipality's shared revenues. The notification and appeal process could thus take place at any time. This enables municipalities to make a timely appeal of the reclassification. The appeal could influence the shared revenue payments in the first year of declassification as vetoed in SB 483. This would not be possible in AB 656.

Because I have already approved the essential provision of AB 656 as modified in SB 483, I am vetoing this bill in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 712** in its entirety. This bill amends the definition of "collection agency" for purposes of regulation by the Commissioner of Banking, to include any nonstock, nonprofit corporation servicing guaranteed student loans. The practical effect of this bill would be to require one organization, Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation (GLHEC), to be licensed by the Commissioner. As a licensed collection agency, GLHEC would be required to pay annual fees, post a performance bond, and undergo regular financial audits. I am vetoing this bill because the level of regulation this would impose is unnecessary and duplicative.

The primary function of GLHEC is to service student loans. A vast majority of the loans serviced by the GLHEC are provided through the Federal Student Loan Program. As such, GLHEC is governed, supervised and audited by the federal government.

The federal Department of Education conducts regular audits of GLHEC, including studies of its collection practices as it did in response to a request made by Representative Gruszynski, the author of AB 712, in 1988.

There was a substitute amendment to AB 712 which clarified GLHEC's coverage under Wisconsin's Consumer Act which I supported. Unfortunately, the Assembly rejected that more reasonable and workable approach.

All allegations that GLHEC has used harassment and other threatening techniques in its collection activities need to be addressed. The Commissioner of Banking, under the Wisconsin Consumer Act, currently has the authority to investigate complaints of harassment. As a

result of my request to the Commissioner of Banking to respond to all complaints and to work with GLHEC to review their collection practices, the number of complaints has dropped significantly in the last year.

This legislation would increase the authority of the Commissioner of Banking in its regulation of GLHEC by requiring licensure and financial audits. Approval of this bill would duplicate existing federal oversight. Therefore, I am vetoing AB 712.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 743** in its entirety. The bill prohibits municipalities from entering into an industrial revenue development bond (IRB) project agreement with an employer unless the employer certifies that the project will result in no lost jobs, or in the event that jobs are transferred from another work location in the state, the employer agrees to offer jobs to dislocated employees at comparable compensation levels at the new project location.

As a state, we must ensure that our policies provide incentives to create jobs and further develop our economy. We must not take measures that will place our workers and our communities at a competitive disadvantage with those in other states.

This bill was intended to protect Wisconsin workers from dislocation, but in effect will actually drive jobs and economic development out of our state. When a company is in the process of deciding on a new location, they do not limit their options to locations within Wisconsin.

This bill will put all Wisconsin communities at a competitive disadvantage to their out-of-state counterparts in attracting economic development. It will also put the entire state economy at a disadvantage, and could jeopardize the creation of good jobs.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 870** in its entirety. This bill repeals the provisions in 1991 Act 39 which require that all fines, forfeitures and penalties in excess of \$150 for violations of local ordinances regarding vehicle size,

weight or load be deposited to the transportation fund, if the violations occur on a highway over which the local authority does not have primary maintenance responsibility. Under AB 870, 100% of moneys received for violations of local size, weight and load ordinances in these situations would go into the city or village treasury.

I am vetoing AB 870 because it creates an incentive for local units of government to pass and enforce vehicle size, weight and loan ordinances solely as a revenue-generating measure. Size, weight and load limitations are imposed to prevent damage to highway surfaces caused by overweight vehicles. Because AB 870 applies only to highways "over which the local highway authority does not have primary maintenance responsibility", local units of government have no responsibility for repairing the damage done by these violations. If local units of government are not responsible for costs related to overweight violations, it is inappropriate that they should receive revenue from the penalties.

The effect of this veto will be to retain current law which transfers all fines, forfeitures and penalties in excess of \$150 to the transportation fund where they contribute to the repair of damage attributable to the overweight offenses.

I have no disagreement with those who wish to stop consistent and repetitive overweight violations. However, this bill does not appropriately address that issue. In my 1991 Act 39 veto message I requested the Department of Transportation to prepare recommendations to deal with the repeat offenders issue. Those recommendations will be ready for legislative action in the next session.

In summary, this bill creates an inappropriate incentive for local units of government to create and enforce laws simply as a revenue generating measure. At the same time it deprives the transportation fund of revenue which can be used to repair the damage caused by weight and size violations. I see no justification for permitting this bill to become law. Therefore, I am vetoing AB 870.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 876** in its entirety. This bill significantly expands the list of persons entitled to an interpreter at public expense and removes the current standard that interpreters be provided without a charge based on an individual's ability to pay. This bill also requires that any person with a language/speech/hearing difficulty who is taken into custody be immediately

informed, by an interpreter or through an alternative communications system, of a list of five warnings/rights.

While I believe this bill has merit and addresses some of the sincere and legitimate concerns of the deaf and hearing impaired community, I have serious concerns that the language is too broad and may result in significant expenses to both state and local government. Further, the bill as drafted could seriously hamper law enforcement investigations.

I am totally and without qualification in support of the right of an individual who has a speech difficulty or difficulty understanding the English language to have an interpreter appointed to them. However, while that may have been the original intent of the bill, that is not what this language will accomplish.

District Attorneys in Wisconsin have unanimously requested me to veto this bill in its entirety. AB 876 would grant to a person taken into custody with a hearing impairment a set of warnings or rights that are much broader and more restrictive than the warnings that are known as "Miranda warnings." Also, the bill would require a judge, court commissioner or hearing officer to authorize the use of an interpreter in a contested case proceeding for a person who is not a party to the proceeding if that person requests an interpreter. The cost of the interpreter would need to be covered by the court.

While I am not able to approve this bill as drafted, I welcome the opportunity to work with its proponents to develop a proposal which addresses these concerns without unnecessarily infringing on law enforcement's legitimate interests in criminal investigations or significantly increasing the costs to Wisconsin's taxpayers. I want to emphasize that I am not against the concept of having interpreters appointed for impaired individuals, but the broad language in AB 876 may yield significant dire consequences for law enforcement, local units of government and the state.

It is my intention to work in cooperation with the Wisconsin District Attorneys Association, the law enforcement community, courts and members of the deaf and hearing impaired community to reach a proposal supported by all to include in my next biennial budget.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 915** in its entirety. The bill modifies the method of adding territory to the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) by requiring concurrence by MMSD on any request for

membership by a community located outside of the District.

I am vetoing the bill because it has the effect of imposing a method of capital cost recovery from communities located outside of the District which would only exacerbate the on-going "sewer wars." My veto of the bill should not be viewed as favoring one side over the other. Rather, my veto provides a way for the state to maintain neutrality and allow for local resolution of this matter, and others such as future service territories and future capacity needs.

I have advocated negotiations as the best way to settle this and other related disputes. I am convinced that both sides have bargained in good faith in the past and remain hopeful that continued negotiations will result in a negotiated settlement. However, in the absence of a negotiated settlement, this matter may be resolved by the courts.

There is one thing that is certain: it is time for the so-called "sewer wars" to end.

The objective of this veto is to structure what I believe is the most neutral and viable scenario for settling this issue.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

May 1, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 931** in its entirety. This bill does not address the problem it was intended to, and further complicates the law with regard to surveillance of individuals. I am also concerned, as is the Department of Justice, with the unintended problems this legislation could cause for law enforcement.

Wisconsin presently has a finely tuned process designed to scrupulously guard the rights of all persons whose conversations are to be overheard. I completely support the continued protection of that right.

However, this bill will not help extend or guarantee the rights of privacy for individuals. At the same time it could cause difficulty for the Attorney General, district attorneys and law enforcement officers in the legitimate, and legal use of electronic surveillance in the course of carrying out their responsibilities.

Further, the bill could be used to weaken the present protections that our citizens have against electronic surveillance. The bill gives an appearance that a wire-tap may be conducted simply by obtaining approval from an "appointing agency", which would clearly weaken the current provision which requires the approval of a judge.

Only a Judge can authorize the use of electronic surveillance. This protection will remain for all Wisconsin citizens. I am confident that the authors of this bill did not intend to create even more confusion with regard to this area of law. I urge them to isolate any problem they may wish to address and deal with it in a manner that does not infringe upon the current protections afforded in Chapter 286.

I have attached a copy of a Department of Justice memo outlining their objections and opposition to this bill.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 942** in its entirety. This bill extends collective bargaining rights and grievance arbitration rights to unclassified attorneys employed in the Office of the State Public Defender. I am vetoing the bill because it places the Public Defender attorney positions in a separate collective bargaining unit from the current attorney units in state service. Currently, one unit is comprised of attorneys in the classified service and another is comprised of unclassified district attorneys. I believe this bill as drafted will lead to excessive fragmentation of state employe bargaining units. Also, the bill will result in a significant additional workload for the Department of Employment Relations, yet provides no additional funding or staff to the department.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 29, 1992

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 947** in its entirety. This bill creates a joint committee on information policy which is directed to review information management practices and policies of state and local units of government. The bill also directs the committee to review the impact of proposed legislation on existing technology utilization on governments as well as review any bills in this issue area.

I am vetoing this bill because it creates an unnecessary new legislative committee to review issues which are adequately addressed within the current legislative committee structure. Also, the existing Council on Information Technology, which has several legislative members, currently oversees these issues and advises the

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [May 5, 1992]

Department of Administration regarding many of the same issues, including data security and integrity.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

COMMUNICATIONS

State of Wisconsin
Department of State
Madison

To Whom It May Concern:

Acts, joint resolutions and resolutions, deposited in this office, have been numbered and published as follows:

Bill or Res. No.	Act No.	Publication date
Assembly Bill 34	201	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 311	202	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 324	203	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 538	204	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 542	205	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 623	206	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 677	207	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 770	208	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 788	209	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 949	210	May 4, 1992
Assembly Bill 994	211	May 4, 1992

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS La FOLLETTE
Secretary of State

COMMUNICATIONS

May 1, 1992

Honorable Donald J. Schneider
Honorable Thomas T. Melvin

Dear Chief Clerks:

The following rules have been published:

- Clearinghouse Rule 89-25 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-102 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-104 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-105 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-111 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-119 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-140 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-141 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-152 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-167 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-175 effective 5-1-92
- Clearinghouse Rule 91-176 effective 5-1-92

Sincerely,
GARY L. POULSON
Deputy Revisor

Representative Travis moved that the assembly stand adjourned until 10:00 A.M. on Thursday, May 7.

The question was: Shall the assembly stand adjourned?

Motion carried.

The assembly stood adjourned.

3:40 P.M.