

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Assembly Journal
Eighty-Eighth Regular Session

9:30 A.M.

THURSDAY, February 5, 1987

The assembly met.

Speaker Loftus in the chair.

The prayer was offered by Representative Tregoning.

Representative Medinger led the membership in reciting the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Present — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Berndt, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, McEssy, Magnuson, Matty, Medinger, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Roberts, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, York, Young, Zeuske, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 98.

Absent — None.

Absent with leave — Williams — 1.

Vacancies — None.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED

Assembly amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 19** offered by Representative Potter.

Assembly amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 24** offered by Representative Notestein.

Assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 84** offered by Representative Swoboda.

Assembly substitute amendment 2 to **Assembly Bill 84** offered by Representative Swoboda.

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Read and referred:

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 86-198

Relating to disconnection of utility service and law enforcement notification procedures.

Submitted by Public Service Commission.

To committee on Environmental Resources and Utilities.

Referred on February 5, 1987.

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 86-208

Relating to updating sales and use tax rules for changes in the sales and use tax law and federal law and a Wisconsin tax appeals commission decision.

Submitted by Department of Revenue.

To committee on Ways and Means.

Referred on February 5, 1987.

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 86-209

Relating to investments of insurance companies.

Submitted by Office of the Commissioner of Insurance.

To committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance.

Referred on February 5, 1987.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE
OF PROPOSALS

Read first time and referred:

Assembly Joint Resolution 13

Relating to 4-year terms of office for certain county officers (first consideration).

By Representatives Krusick, Thompson, Vanderperren, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Volk, Williams, Deininger, Berndt, Goetsch, Ladwig, Musser, Porter, Rosenzweig, Van Gorden and Vergeront, cosponsored by Senators Andrea, Te Winkle, Risser, Van Sistine, Kincaid, Chilsen and Lekan.

To committee on Elections.

Assembly Bill 85

Relating to commencement of the fall semester at the university of Wisconsin system, vocational, technical and adult education district schools and public schools.

By Representatives Matty, Nelsen, Welch, Brancel, Linton, Farrow, Rosenzweig, Williams, Ourada, Schober, Ladwig and Merkt, cosponsored by Senator Lekan.

To committee on Education.

Assembly Bill 86

Relating to a property tax exemption for all property owned by a chamber of commerce.

By Representatives Matty, Vanderperren, McEssy and Huelsman, cosponsored by Senators Van Sistine and Kincaid.

To Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exemptions.

Assembly Bill 87

Relating to parole and probation for persons convicted of crimes punishable by life imprisonment.

By Representatives Matty, Nelsen, Porter, Hamilton, Goetsch, Huelsman, Walling, Vergeront, Welch, Lepak and Ladwig, cosponsored by Senators Andrea, Stitt and Roshell.

To committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety.

Assembly Bill 88

Relating to sexual assault.

By Representatives Rutkowski, Notestein, Huelsman, Barrett, Shoemaker, Krug, Bolle, Roberts, Carpenter, Schultz, Radtke, Bell, Black, Rosenzweig, Ladwig, Porter, Van Gorden, Magnuson, Barca, Buettner, Goetsch, Schneiders, Schmidt, Lepak, Fortis and Young, cosponsored by Senators Adelman, Lee, Roshell, Kincaid and Lasee.

To committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety.

Assembly Bill 89

Relating to use of certain school buses for nonpupil transportation.

By Representatives Magnuson, Wood and Tregoning, cosponsored by Senator Chvala.

To committee on Transportation.

Assembly Bill 90

Relating to location of correctional institutions.

By Representatives Musser, Gronemus, Van Gorden, Medinger and Roberts, cosponsored by Senators Moen and Kreul.

To committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety.

Assembly Bill 91

Relating to an income and franchise tax credit for resort owners who agree not to sell their resorts except as a unit and making an appropriation.

By Representatives Holperin, Hubler, Linton, Thompson, Shoemaker and Paulson, cosponsored by Senator Kincaid.

To committee on Ways and Means.

Assembly Bill 92

Relating to costs incurred by a town in laying a highway to provide access to certain real estate.

By Representatives Holperin, Linton, Thompson and Huelsman, cosponsored by Senator Kincaid.

To committee on Urban and Local Affairs.

Assembly Bill 93

Relating to dangerous weapons and providing a penalty.

By Representatives Krusick, Barrett, Schneiders, Barca, Black, Bolle, Fortis, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Gruszynski, Magnuson, Rosenzweig, Schober, Young and Zweck, cosponsored by Senators Andrea, Lee and Norquist.

To committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety.

Assembly Bill 94

Relating to the age at which a person may obtain an alcohol beverages operator's license.

By Representatives Schneider, Shoemaker, Holschbach, Holperin, Gronemus, Travis, Schober, Robinson, Musser and Rosenzweig, cosponsored by Senators Roshell, Kincaid, Feingold and Rude.

To committee on Excise and Fees.

Assembly Bill 95

Relating to the judicial commission.

By Representatives Rutkowski and Young, cosponsored by Senators Adelman, Chvala and Feingold, by request of Judicial Commission.

To committee on Judiciary.

Assembly Bill 96

Relating to extending the correction of palpable errors in regard to property taxes to a longer time period.

By Representatives Paulson, Berndt, Volk, Goetsch, Lepak, Musser, Bolle, Porter, Ladwig, Tregoning and Turba, cosponsored by Senators Lasee, Kreul and Kincaid.

To committee on Ways and Means.

Assembly Bill 97

Relating to the sales tax exemption for electricity sold for use in farming.

By Representatives Paulson, Ourada, Musser, Porter, Berndt and Turba, cosponsored by Senators Lasee and Kreul.

To Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exemptions.

Assembly Bill 98

Relating to creating a property tax exemption for senior citizen centers.

By Representatives Paulson, Porter, Bolle, Musser, Vanderperren, Holperin, Fortis, Van Gorden, Ladwig, Goetsch and Welch, cosponsored by Senators Harsdorf and Roshell.

To Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exemptions.

Assembly Bill 99

Relating to the collection and publication of information about hazardous chemical substances, granting rule-making authority and providing penalties.

By Representatives Clarenbach, Wineke, Bell, Becker, Magnuson, Black, Barrett, Grobschmidt, Bock, Fortis, Notestein, Van Dreel, Barca, Seery, Neubauer, Looby, Hamilton, Zweck, Young, Carpenter, Williams, Roberts, Volk, Krug, Travis, Kunicki, M. Coggs, Boyle and Linton, cosponsored by Senators Czarnecki, Feingold, Jauch, Plewa, Andrea, Norquist, Strohl and Ulichny.

To committee on Environmental Resources and Utilities.

Assembly Bill 100

Relating to abolishing the marital property system.

By Representatives Matty, Hamilton, Schober, Welch, Vergeront, Coleman, Lepak, Merkt, Bradley.

Porter and Ladwig, cosponsored by Senators Roshell, Stitt, Ellis, Chilsen and Van Sistine.

To committee on Judiciary.

Assembly Bill 101

Relating to an income and franchise tax exemption for compensation for well contamination.

By Representatives Paulson, Potter, Radtke, Porter, Bolle, Musser, Schneiders, Schultz, Van Gorden, Ladwig, Tregoning and Welch, cosponsored by Senators Harsdorf, Roshell and Te Winkle.

To Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exemptions.

Assembly Bill 102

Relating to a property tax exemption for lands dedicated for highways.

By Representatives Paulson, Berndt, Brandemuehl, Goetsch, Walling, Musser, Porter, Ourada and Turba, cosponsored by Senators Rude, Davis, Lasee and Kreul.

To Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exemptions.

Assembly Bill 103

Relating to various changes in the statutes pertaining to the veterinary examining board and the licensure of veterinarians and animal technicians and granting rule-making authority.

By Representatives Paulson, Hubler, Swoboda, Volk, Ott, Musser, McEssy and Roberts, cosponsored by Senators Moen and Harsdorf, by request of Veterinary Examining Board.

To committee on Commerce and Consumer Affairs.

Assembly Bill 104

Relating to designating the Yahara river and its watershed as a scenic urban waterway.

By Representatives Magnuson, Travis, Black, Young, Gruszynski, Neubauer and Clarenbach, cosponsored by Senators Chvala, Feingold and Risser.

To committee on Natural Resources.

Assembly Bill 105

Relating to required minimum underinsured motor vehicle liability coverage.

By Representatives Barrett, Wimmer, Hauke, Tregoning and Matty, cosponsored by Senators Chvala, Feingold, Ulichny and Davis.

To committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance.

Assembly Bill 106

Relating to appeal of order granting a new trial.

By Representatives Hauke, Wimmer and Tregoning, cosponsored by Senator Adelman.

To committee on Judiciary.

Assembly Bill 107

Relating to prohibiting family exclusions from homeowners' policies.

By Representatives Hauke, Barrett, Wimmer and Tregoning.

To committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance.

Assembly Bill 108

Relating to requiring health care providers to report cases of gunshot or knife wounds and providing penalties.

By Representatives Medinger, Roberts, Zweck, Linton, Musser, Ladwig and Schultz, cosponsored by Senator Rude.

To committee on Health.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

The committee on Colleges and Universities reports and recommends:

Assembly Bill 24

Relating to employment relations for members of the university of Wisconsin system academic staff.

Adoption of assembly amendment 1:

Ayes: (10) Noes: (0)

Passage: Ayes: (9) Noes: (1)

To Joint Committee on Finance.

STAN GRUSZYNSKI

Chairperson

The Joint Committee on Finance reports and recommends:

Assembly Bill 28

Relating to income eligibility requirements for veteran's housing loans.

Adoption of assembly substitute amendment 1:

Ayes: (13) Noes: (0)

Passage: Ayes: (13) Noes: (0)

To committee on Rules.

MARLIN SCHNEIDER

Assembly Chairperson

COMMUNICATIONS

The chief clerk reports the following proposals correctly enrolled:

Assembly Bill 16

Assembly Joint Resolution 2

Assembly Joint Resolution 3

THOMAS T. MELVIN

Assembly Chief Clerk

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent for a leave of absence for today's session for Representative Williams. Granted.

CALENDAR OF THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Relating to commending Miss Patricia V. Robbins on her service to the Wisconsin State Legislature.

The question was: Shall **Senate Joint Resolution 10** be concurred in?

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Senate Joint Resolution 10** be immediately messaged to the senate. Granted.

Assembly Bill 84

Relating to correctional institutions, revising the state building program and providing for a study.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that **Assembly Bill 84** be laid on the table. Granted.

Senate Bill 26

Relating to permitting the secretary of administration, if requested by the governor, to change the biennial state budget process to an annual budget process in fiscal years 1987-88 and 1988-89.

Assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representative Loftus.

Representative Kunicki moved rejection of assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

SPECIAL GUEST

Speaker Loftus introduced Archbishop Rembert Weakland of the archdiocese of Milwaukee. Archbishop Weakland addressed the members of the assembly on the National Conference of Catholic Bishops pastoral letter on Catholic social teaching and the economy. The text of Archbishop Weakland's speech follows:

Friends,

I consider it a singular privilege to speak before you this morning. It is an honor I will long remember. The invitation I am sure was motivated by the fact that I chaired the committee of Roman Catholic bishops who drafted the pastoral letter *Economic Justice for All* that was so overwhelmingly approved by the Catholic bishops of the U.S.A. last November. I would like to point out that the preparations for writing that pastoral letter included the widest possible ecumenical input of any document ever written by the Catholic Church.

Although my remarks today will necessarily come out of the Roman Catholic tradition, I would like to recognize the ecumenical support that my committee received. This State of Wisconsin, in particular, can boast of one of the strongest ecumenical bondings

anywhere in this Nation and, although I would not claim to speak for anyone but myself, I want to acknowledge with gratitude the fine religious leadership in this State and their contribution to my thinking.

I come before you as a bishop, not a politician. Bishops have the advantage of not having to run for office at periodic intervals (though some probably wish they did) and speak of human and social issues out of a different context. I will necessarily speak out of the Roman Catholic tradition.

In his farewell address, George Washington said: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens." Since religion and politics are both flourishing in our U.S. society today, it would be worthwhile to reflect on how they should relate to one another in this democratic, pluralistic society that is ours. That is the theme of my talk.

Religion is indeed strong in America and has entered the political debate in the last decade in newer and more visible ways. We have witnessed the new political aggressiveness of the fundamentalist religious bodies, and for the first time in the history of our nation the Roman Catholic Church has been caught up publicly in the debates on many political and social concerns. For these reasons it is good and wise that we begin to dialogue on our respective roles and clarify the scope and limits of our interventions. I would like to proceed, first, with a series of interrelated propositions that enunciate how I believe religion relates to the temporal order, and then draw some conclusions that might be helpful for future discussion.

1) We all must adhere to the wise insight of the founders of our nation on the clear separation between Church and State: no religion should ever be declared our State religion and no religion before the law should enjoy preferential treatment. All Churches have a right to participate in the social and political debate, to be an active part of the social fabric of the nation, but without privilege.

But we also hold that this separation of Church and State does not mean that political and social issues are without moral and religious content. We feel that many of the political issues our nation faces do have moral and ethical dimensions. For this reason religious bodies feel they must also enter into the debate. Some issues may indeed have little moral content, e.g., administrative details, choices of contractors or whatever; others may be fundamentally moral in nature, although never exclusively so, e.g., civil rights, nuclear war, abortion, capital punishment, pornography. Most lie somewhere in the middle. Rarely are there choices between absolute good and absolute evil, but most often between one good and another good where the trade-offs have to be carefully weighed.

In so many of these cases the political and religious dimensions are a question of overlapping rugs in the same household. Politics, by its nature, must be the art of the possible. With limited resources and with so many points of view and interests to be reconciled, politicians must often find ways of satisfying all concerned and balance many conflicting currents. Religious leaders can be more prophetic, more demanding, less compromising, less flexible. Their duty to society is to keep the moral principles clear in the midst of the concrete imperfect realization of a moral ideal.

Spiritual leaders, like the prophets of old, tend to seem negative for that reason. As irritating as their voices might seem, their moral point of view is often very needed, even if the morally perfect cannot be here and now fully realized. Their intervention should not be taken just as negative carping. I guess I am asking the pragmatic politicians to be patient with the more prophetic idealistic religious leaders, since the latter, too, serve society by keeping its moral perspectives high.

2) No religion should become a political party nor align itself with only one. I can say clearly and without hesitation that the Catholic Church in our country will not align itself with any particular party. Such an alignment would be bad for politics, but worse for religion.

Thus, it should not surprise you if the Catholic Church seems to be politically ambivalent, aligning itself nationally with the conservative and right wing of the Republican party on issues such as abortion and with the more liberal Democrats on many social issues, capital punishment, and the rights of labor. At times this can be confusing and I always smile when people assume that, since a religious leader accepts one aspect of a party platform, he or she accepts a whole series of issues connected with that platform. For this same reason it is often difficult to nail down where a religious leader is coming from, since it is not from within a party system or platform but from a whole other series of considerations and traditions.

Again, what I would like to emphasize here is that no Church should align itself with a political party, since Churches have a different scope: that of proclaiming a Gospel message that may or may not be consonant with a party platform but which must remain independent to be true to its prophetic self. It is for this reason, too, that the Catholic Church does not permit, under normal circumstances, priests to run for public office: a priest's mission of preaching the Gospel could become compromised by the need to represent a constituency or to be loyal to certain party policies that may be religiously ambiguous.

At the same time, religious bodies do ask for the freedom to be themselves and to take part fully in the life of society without being discriminated against by legislation that would seem to exclude them.

3) There are two ways in which a Church enters the political debate: through the opinions and actions of individual members of that Church, and through statements or pronouncements that come from the official bodies of a religious group. It is in this area where we as religious bodies must clarify whom the speaker represents and the weight behind the voice. We, for example, consider each Catholic, by reason of baptism, truly missioned by the Church in his or her secular vocation.

I want to quote from the pastoral message that accompanies the pastoral letter *Economic Justice for All* on this point:

"The pursuit of economic justice takes believers into the economic arena, testing the policies of government by the principles of our teaching. We ask you to become more informed and active citizens, using your voices and votes to speak for the voiceless, to defend the poor and vulnerable, and to advance the common good. We are called to shape a constituency of conscience, measuring every policy by how it touches the least, the lost and the left out among us. This letter calls us to conversion and common action, to new forms of stewardship, service and citizenship (par. 27, "Pastoral Message")."

But we certainly would not want all Catholics to feel, however, that the positions they take or the opinions they voice must be the official positions or opinions of their Church. Yet, we know that some issues will be much more central to their Church's teaching and, thus, less open to compromise and debate. We wrestle with the need of the politician to be true to that faith-commitment and yet free to work out the pragmatic solutions that are realistic in any given situation. We do not have absolute clarity on those points yet.

At times the officials of a Church, acting in their teaching capacity, will sense a need also to enter the debate, either on a national or local level. We bishops have done so more recently with the pastoral letter on nuclear deterrence and again on the economy. We do so regularly through organizations such as the United States Catholic Conference of Bishops office in Washington, D.C. or the Wisconsin Catholic Conference here in Madison. Here, too, Churches tend to be selective, often picking issues of direct concern to their well-being, for example, school issues - public or private, or issues of larger societal implication where the Church feels that moral dimensions dominate - pornography, abortion, living wills, for example. In this latter category it is often difficult to determine the degree of specificity with which a Church should speak out, as its role is not to draft specific legislation. Sometimes, however, one cannot talk about a moral issue without being very specific; this is especially true about medical ethics. Here, too, we as Churches have to clarify how we enter the debate on such societal issues of a moral and ethical nature so that our moral authority does not get lost in

contingent details that change rapidly. I am sure we will continue to learn by experience in these areas and become more explicit on how to differentiate between individual and corporate voices.

4) The areas of chief concern for the Roman Catholic Church today and that do indeed overlap with political concern are those that touch human life and society. The bishops of the world at the Second Vatican Council in Rome in 1965 laid out three areas where the Church would hope to contribute to the whole of society: 1. safeguarding human dignity, 2. strengthening the seams of human society, and 3. imbuing everyday human activity with a deeper meaning and importance (*The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, #40).

Safeguarding human dignity was the reason the Church for a hundred years now has been involved in the rights of the working person and has developed a strong tradition of moral values concerning the workplace. The Church's concern about family and what may weaken family structures is characteristic of the second category of those elements that strengthen the seams of human society. Giving meaning to life should overarch all the Church's interest in education and human development. In sum, one could say that the issues most important to the Catholic religion today deal with the human person, the dignity, well-being, and social integration of that person.

5) Finally: The Church's role cannot be defined solely in terms of her temporal involvement. The role of preaching the Gospel and of sanctifying human persons, that is, of continuing the mission of Christ on earth, has a transcendental dimension that one could not call *per se* political. Preaching the Gospel will change the hearts of people, make them more virtuous and honest, and, thus, transform or change society; but the result can only be called indirectly political.

From these propositions that enunciate how I believe religion relates to the temporal order I would like now to draw three conclusions.

1) The Catholic Church is still struggling with how it should relate to constitutional governments. Its history in this area outside the U.S.A. has been mostly a post-World War II phenomenon - a period relatively short in the long history of the Roman Catholic Church. Here in the United States the Catholic Church has enjoyed great freedom, but only after the period of John F. Kennedy has it begun to enter more fully into the national debate on social and political issues. Before that it spoke mostly to its own constituency and on very specific political issues where Catholics had a direct involvement. Since the U.S. Experiment of the separation of Church and State was seen by most European nations as good, it was imitated for the most part in the formation of the Christian Democratic parties around the world, with a certain amount of struggle. These debates coalesced into a statement of the bishops of the Second Vatican Council on Religious Liberty that I quote: "The Vatican Council

declares that the human person has a right to religious freedom. Freedom of this kind means that all people should be immune from coercion on the part of individuals, social groups and every human power so that, within due limits, nobody is forced to act against their convictions in religious matters in private or in public, alone or in association with others" (*Declaration on Religious Liberty*, #1).

Having assumed this position (put forward by the American bishops and vigorously sustained in debate by Albert Cardinal Meyer, former Archbishop of Milwaukee), the Roman Catholic bishops of the world accepted as normative for the future a religious pluralism in society. One could not have it both ways. That was 1965. We struggle with how that is to take place so as to avoid religious indifferentism, on the one hand, and uncompromising rigor, on the other. We can never ask that all law under such a constitutional government mirror Catholic morality; but we do see that law also has its own didactic force in the morality of a society. We know that under such a constitutional arrangement we must do more to alert our people that not everything permitted by law is morally acceptable to Catholic standards. We have been negligent in this regard. The Church must also be concerned about private morality, while the role of the State is more restricted to public order and, thus, public morality. We have yet to learn how all of this should work out to allow the freedom to the politician that must be there, but to keep religion as a vital social force for good and not just as a private affair.

My first conclusion is that we as Church are still struggling with this recurring theme: political compromise on moral issues.

2) It seems to me that Washington was indeed correct and that religion and government have more interests in common than one would at first surmise. Government, too, must be concerned about justice for all and the common good of all.

Earlier I mentioned the Church's concern for human life and human dignity. In Catholic teaching human rights include not only political and civil rights but also economic rights. Pope John XXIII stated that all people have a right to life, food, clothing, shelter, rest, medical care, education, and employment. Striving to fulfill these rights is the duty of the whole of society of which government is indeed a part. The "Pastoral Message" states: "This does not mean that government has the primary or exclusive role, but it does have a positive moral responsibility in safeguarding human rights and ensuring that the minimum conditions of human dignity are met for all. In a democracy, government is a means by which we can act together to protect what is important to use and to promote our common values (par. 18)."

Our tradition makes a distinction between charity and justice, and the Church must be concerned about both. Charity must indeed increase, yes, even radical charity. But it is not the answer to all of society's ills. It

does not create jobs nor necessarily help people develop their skills for the job market. We see justice in its biblical roots as a broader concept, one that permits everyone to participate in sharing the goods of society. Here Churches must talk about both greed and laziness in the same breath. For these reasons Churches will be interested in unemployment, welfare, and all those areas that affect human dignity and help or hinder participation in society.

It is a religious belief that all people are equally sacred to God. This leads to a special concern for those who are not making it in a society. It leads to a special concern for the poor and any whose human dignity has been harmed. It should not be strange if the Church feels it must be that voice of the poor and continue to call out for those who are marginalized in our society. We are asking that we all work to integrate all others into society. If this is not a priority of our Nation, we will be forced to continue to call out. We have not found the answer to minimizing the human costs of a dynamic capitalist economy. The displacement of people, the retooling of their skills, and the resulting fears of insecurity are real costs that affect the human person deeply. They must be religion's concern for that reason; but they are also, and one could say primarily, government's business, for elected government, as was said, is the instrument of our common concerns.

A dynamic economy is, of course, the way to put people back to work and the only ultimate remedy for the poor. But in the meantime we cannot slacken our concerns and our efforts and must work together toward humane solutions.

I am convinced, too, that religion should be of greater help in eliminating some of those evils of our society that militate against incentives to work and in this way Church contributes to the whole of society. Here religion should become a more active voice against those breakdowns of morality and customs that affect the whole of society, such as, sexual promiscuity, bearing children out of wedlock, divorce, and the like - all of which affect the stability of the family, the primary cell of any sound society. My second conclusion is that religion and government have many common goals in this area of creating a more stable society.

3) Thirdly and lastly, the tradition of Catholic social teaching has always been positive toward government, seeing it as having a necessary, positive, if limited, role. The role of the politician is seen as a calling, a noble vocation of service to others. Earlier I cited a document of the bishops of the world on the relationship between religion and the temporal order. That same document from 1965, after encouraging civic and political formation for all, but especially for youth, states: "Those who are suited...should prepare themselves for the difficult, but at the same time, the vary noble art of politics."

It is good to repeat those words: "the noble art of politics." We have too easily today forgotten that

politics, rightly understood and practiced, is indeed a noble art. We have lost such positive words as "statesman" and "diplomat" to express this noble art. I salute all of you for taking up that vocation and thank you for it.

I would hope that you would strive to avoid the temptation of letting that art be debased by a lack of civility and decency, such as scandalized some in the last electoral campaigns and which only lowered esteem for the vital positive role of the politician in society.

If I were to sum up the major theme of this talk, it would be that alluded to in Washington's farewell address: politics and religion, both being concerned about the human person in society, have so much in common. When both function properly, they reinforce each other and both contribute to a just and peaceful society where the individual person can flourish and develop. Catholic social teaching accepts the threefold division of society into the State, the private economic sector, and what are often called "mediating structures." Religious groups belong to those mediating structures. A society functions best when the State, the private economic sector, and such mediating structures as Churches can agree on a basic vision of society, one that supports the rights of the individual but that also reinforces the ethical duties and obligations that accompany such rights. Working to foster the common good of all becomes then the task of each one of us, working within our own specific area of competency.

Again, I emphasize my respect and admiration for those of you who serve in the political arena. I am pleased to be here this morning to thank you for your dedication to the mutual aims I mentioned and pledge to do my best to uphold those moral, ethical, and religious values that will help to make our Nation, our State, a better society.

Thank you for permitting me to address you this morning.

Representative Thompson asked unanimous consent that the assembly stand recessed for fifteen minutes. Granted.

The assembly stood recessed.

11:10 A.M.

RECESS

12:24 P.M.

The assembly reconvened.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the assembly stand recessed until 2:00 P.M. Granted.

The assembly stood recessed.

12:25 P.M.

RECESS

2:05 P.M.

The assembly reconvened.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

By Donald J. Schneider, chief clerk.

Mr. Speaker:

I am directed to inform you that the senate has concurred in:

Assembly Bill 50

Concurred in as amended:

Assembly Bill 30 (senate amendments 1, 2, 5, 6, 1 to 8 and 8 adopted)

Passed and asks concurrence in:

Senate Bill 24

ACTION ON THE SENATE MESSAGE

Senate Bill 24

Relating to special registration plates and identification cards.

By Senators Norquist, Czarnecki, Plewa, Van Sistine, Kincaid, Moen, Andrea, Feingold and Jauch; cosponsored by Representatives Becker and Hauke.

To committee on Highways.

Assembly Bill 30

Relating to operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an intoxicant, drugs or both, administrative suspension and court-ordered revocation of operating privileges, chemical tests for intoxication, occupational licenses, granting rule-making authority and providing penalties.

By Representatives Neubauer, Rutkowski, Barrett, Buettner, Carpenter, Magnuson, Becker, Rosenzweig, Bell, Travis, Goetsch, Ourada and Weeden, cosponsored by Senators Adelman, Chvala, Strohl, Czarnecki, Norquist, Lee and Jauch.

To calendar.

Speaker pro tempore Clarenbach in the chair.

Senate Bill 26

Relating to permitting the secretary of administration, if requested by the governor, to change the biennial state budget process to an annual budget process in fiscal years 1987-88 and 1988-89.

Representative Loftus asked unanimous consent that assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be laid on the table. Granted.

Assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representative Robinson.

Representative Prosser moved rejection of assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Berndt, Black, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fortis, Foti, Goetsch, Gruszynski, Holperin, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 49.

Noes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Lepak, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 49.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion failed.

Representative Nelsen moved that assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be laid on the table.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be laid on the table?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 44.

Noes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt,

Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Lepak, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 54.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion failed.

POINT OF ORDER

Representative Radtke rose to the point of order that assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** was not germane under Assembly Rule 54 (3)(f).

The chair (speaker pro tempore Clarenbach) ruled the point of order not well taken.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 2 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be adopted?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Lepak, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 54.

Noes — Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 44.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 3 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representative Antaramian.

Representative Antaramian asked unanimous consent that assembly amendment 3 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be placed after assembly amendment 4 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**. Granted.

Assembly amendment 4 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representatives Antaramian, Panzer, Mark Lewis, Lepak, Fergus, Rosenzweig, Young, S. Coggs, Notestein, Hamilton, Van Dreel, Robinson, Zweck, Linton, Barca, Schober and Radtke.

POINT OF ORDER

Representative Welch rose to the point of order that assembly amendment 4 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** was not germane under Assembly Rule 54 (3).

The chair (speaker pro tempore Clarenbach) ruled the point of order not well taken.

Assembly amendment 1 to assembly amendment 4 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representative Magnuson.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 1 to assembly amendment 4 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be adopted?

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 4 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be adopted?

Motion carried.

Representative Neubauer moved rejection of assembly amendment 3 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 3 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Boyle, Clarenbach, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gruszynski, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holschbach, Hubler, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Neubauer, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Seery, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Vergeront, Wineke, Zeuske, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 30.

Noes — Antaramian, Berndt, Bock, Bolle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Carpenter, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Foti, Goetsch, Gronemus, Hamilton, Holperin, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krug, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Medinger, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, Wood, York and Young — 67.

Absent or not voting — Krusick and Williams — 2.

Motion failed.

Representative Krusick asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "Aye" on the previous question. Granted.

Representative Rutkowski asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "No" on the previous question. Granted.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 3 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be adopted?

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 5 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representative Loftus.

Representative Schneider moved rejection of assembly amendment 5 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

Assembly amendment 1 to assembly amendment 5 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** offered by Representatives Goetsch and Welch.

Representative Loftus moved rejection of assembly amendment 1 to assembly amendment 5 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 1 to assembly amendment 5 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Johnsrud, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Panzer, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Walling, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 56.

Noes — Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 41.

Absent or not voting — Coggs, S. and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 5 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Becker, Berndt, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Looby, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York, Young and Zeuske — 54.

Noes — Barca, Barrett, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Bradley, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Mark Lewis, Linton, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Rutkowski, Seery, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Wineke, Wood, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 44.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Representative Loftus asked unanimous consent that assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be taken from the table. Granted.

Representative Kunicki asked unanimous consent to withdraw his motion for rejection of assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**. Granted.

Representative Nelsen moved rejection of assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 1 to assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Becker, Bell, Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Holperin, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krug, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Looby, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Van Dreel, Van Gorden,

Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York, Young and Zeuske — 62.

Noes — Barca, Barrett, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hauke, Holschbach, Hubler, Krusick, Linton, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Potter, Roberts, Rutkowski, Seery, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Vanderperren, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 36.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Representative Prosser moved rejection of assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**.

The question was: Shall assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Becker, Bell, Berndt, Bock, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Goetsch, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Holperin, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krug, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, Looby, McEssy, Magnuson, Matty, Medinger, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Seery, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vergeront, Volk, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Young — 58.

Noes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Black, Bolle, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Clarenbach, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Fergus, Fortis, Foti, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hauke, Holschbach, Hubler, Krusick, Lepak, Mark Lewis, Linton, Radtke, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Walling, Wineke, Wood, Zeuske, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 40.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall **Senate Bill 26** be ordered to a third reading?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Barrett, Bell, Berndt, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Clarenbach, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, McEssy, Magnuson, Matty, Medinger,

Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Roberts, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, York, Young, Zeuske and Speaker Loftus — 84.

Noes — Antaramian, Barca, Becker, Carpenter, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Hasenohrl, Krug, Robinson, Schneider, Seery, Travis, Walling and Zweck — 14.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Senate Bill 26** be given a third reading. Granted.

The question was: **Senate Bill 26** having been read three times, shall the bill be concurred in?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barrett, Berndt, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Clarenbach, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Matty, Medinger, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Roberts, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, York, Young, Zeuske and Speaker Loftus — 82.

Noes — Barca, Becker, Bell, Carpenter, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Hasenohrl, Krug, Lepak, McEssy, Robinson, Schneider, Seery, Travis, Walling and Zweck — 16.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Senate Bill 26** be immediately messaged to the senate. Granted.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Assembly Bill 30** be withdrawn from the calendar and taken up at this time. Granted.

Speaker Loftus in the chair.

Assembly Bill 30

Relating to operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an intoxicant, drugs or both, administrative suspension and court-ordered revocation of operating privileges, chemical tests for intoxication, occupational licenses, granting rule-making authority and providing penalties.

The question was: Shall senate amendment 1 to **Assembly Bill 30** be concurred in?

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall senate amendment 2 to **Assembly Bill 30** be concurred in?

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall senate amendment 5 to **Assembly Bill 30** be concurred in?

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall senate amendment 6 to **Assembly Bill 30** be concurred in?

Motion carried.

The question was: Shall senate amendment 8 to **Assembly Bill 30** be concurred in?

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that the assembly's action on **Assembly Bill 30** be immediately messaged to the senate. **Granted.**

Representative Thompson asked unanimous consent that the assembly stand recessed for thirty minutes. **Granted.**

The assembly stood recessed.

5:15 P.M.

RECESS

6:30 P.M.

The assembly reconvened.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

By Donald J. Schneider, chief clerk.

Mr. Speaker:

I am directed to inform you that the senate has concurred in:

Assembly Bill 22

Passed and asks concurrence in:

Senate Bill 54

ACTION ON THE SENATE MESSAGE

Senate Bill 54

Relating to correctional institutions, revising the state building program and providing for a study.

By committee on Senate Rules, by request of Governor Tommy G. Thompson.

To calendar.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Senate Bill 54** be withdrawn from the calendar and taken up at this time. **Granted.**

Assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Medinger, Musser, Gronemus, Mark Lewis, Roberts, Hamilton, Looby, Shoemaker, Johnsrud, Foti, Van Gorden and Schmidt.

Assembly substitute amendment 2 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Krug, Travis, Gronemus, Swoboda, Musser, M. Coggs, Bolle, Holschbach, Notestein, Young, Hubler, Barca, Bock, Seery, Becker, Larson, Boyle, Bell, Magnuson, Fortis, Linton, Zweck, Wineke, Kunicki, S. Coggs, Medinger, Volk and Van Dreel.

Speaker pro tempore Clarenbach in the chair.

Representative Medinger asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54** be taken up at this time. **Granted.**

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Bradley, Buettner, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Gruszynski, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Huelsman, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Lepak, Magnuson, Matty, Merkt, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Wimmer, Wineke, York, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 67.

Noes — Berndt, Boyle, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Byers, Coleman, Foti, Gronemus, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hubler, Johnsrud, Larson, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, McEssy, Medinger, Musser, Panzer, Roberts, Schmidt, Schultz, Seery, Shoemaker, Van Gorden, Welch, Wood and Zeuske — 30.

Absent or not voting — Van Dreel and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Representative Van Dreel asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "Aye" on the previous question. Granted.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly substitute amendment 2 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly substitute amendment 2 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Hauke, Huelsman, Krusick, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tesmer, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 52.

Noes — Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fortis, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Johnsrud, Krug, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Musser, Neubauer, Notestein, Roberts, Robinson, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 46.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representative Schneider.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Bock, Bolle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Hauke, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Radtke, Roberts, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York, Zeuske and Speaker Loftus — 55.

Noes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Berndt, Black, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Cowles, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Kunicki, Lepak, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Ourada, Prosser, Robinson, Schneider, Schneiders, Seery, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young and Zweck — 43.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 2 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Goetsch, Panzer and Radtke.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 2 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 2 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Brandemuehl, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Matty, Medinger, Musser, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schultz, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Weeden, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 73.

Noes — Berndt, Brancel, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Foti, Goetsch, Johnsrud, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Merkt, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schober, Walling, Welch, York and Zeuske — 24.

Absent or not voting — Bradley and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Representative Ott asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "No" on the previous question. Granted.

Assembly amendment 3 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Goetsch, Radtke, Panzer, McEssy and Schneiders.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 3 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 3 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 52.

Noes — Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 44.

Absent or not voting — Brandemuehl, Thompson and Williams — 3.

Motion carried.

Representative Brandemuehl asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "No" on the previous question. Granted.

Assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Goetsch, Radtke, Panzer, Matty and Musser.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54**.

Representative Panzer requested the following division of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54**.

1. Lines 1 through 5 of the amendment.
2. Lines 6 through 10 of the amendment.

The chair granted the request for the division.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of section 1 of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall section 1 of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren,

Van Dreel, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 49.

Noes — Antaramian, Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Swoboda, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 49.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion failed.

Representative Hauke moved that section 1 of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54** be laid on the table.

The question was: Shall section 1 of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54** be laid on the table?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 49.

Noes — Antaramian, Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 48.

Absent or not voting — Hasenohrl and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of section 2 of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall section 2 of assembly amendment 4 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

Motion carried.

Senate Bill 54

Relating to correctional institutions, revising the state building program and providing for a study.

Assembly amendment 5 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Musser and Gronemus.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 5 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 5 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Brandemuehl, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Matty, Medinger, Merkt, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ourada, Potter, Radtke, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Schneiders, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, York, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 68.

Noes — Berndt, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Foti, Goetsch, Gronemus, Johnsrud, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Musser, Ott, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Roberts, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schober, Schultz, Van Gorden, Welch and Zeuske — 29.

Absent or not voting — Larson and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Representative Medinger asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "No" on the previous question. Granted.

Assembly amendment 6 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Seery, S. Coggs, Becker, M. Coggs, Travis, Clarenbach and Carpenter.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 6 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 6 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Bolle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Potter, Prosser, Radtke, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer,

Wineke, Wood, York, Zeuske, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 65.

Noes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Berndt, Black, Bock, Boyle, Byers, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Johnsrud, Krug, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Porter, Roberts, Seery, Travis, Vanderperren and Young — 32.

Absent or not voting — Van Dreel and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 7 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Musser, Goetsch, Panzer, Buettner, Radtke, Welch and Lepak.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 7 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 7 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Merkt, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 49.

Noes — Berndt, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Gronemus, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Medinger, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Roberts, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 48.

Absent or not voting — Swoboda and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Representative Swoboda asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "Aye" on the previous question. Granted.

Assembly amendment 8 to **Senate Bill 54** offered by Representatives Matty, Zeuske and Volk.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 8 to **Senate Bill 54**.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 8 to **Senate Bill 54** be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Brandemuehl, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Deininger, Fergus, Fortis, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Musser, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Schneiders, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Walling, Weeden, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, York, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 70.

Noes — Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Farrow, Foti, Johnsrud, Larson, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Nelsen, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schober, Schultz, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Welch and Zeuske — 28.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 9 to Senate Bill 54 offered by Representative Prosser.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 9 to Senate Bill 54.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 9 to Senate Bill 54 be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Krusick, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Weeden, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 53.

Noes — Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Roberts, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 45.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Assembly amendment 10 to Senate Bill 54 offered by Representatives Travis and Krug.

Representative Hauke moved rejection of assembly amendment 10 to Senate Bill 54.

The question was: Shall assembly amendment 10 to Senate Bill 54 be rejected?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Foti, Goetsch, Grobschmidt, Hauke, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, McEssy, Matty, Merkt, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tesmer, Thompson, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, Wood, York, Zeuske and Speaker Loftus — 54.

Noes — Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Fortis, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Musser, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Young and Zweck — 43.

Absent or not voting — Bock and Williams — 2.

Motion carried.

Representative Bock asked unanimous consent to be recorded as voting "No" on the previous question. Granted.

Representative Goetsch moved that section 1 of assembly amendment 4 to Senate Bill 54 be taken from the table.

The question was: Shall section 1 of assembly amendment 4 to Senate Bill 54 be taken from the table?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Berndt, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Byers, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Foti, Goetsch, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Ladwig, Larson, Lepak, Margaret Lewis, Matty, Merkt, Musser, Nelsen, Ott, Ourada, Panzer, Paulson, Porter, Prosser, Radtke, Rosenzweig, Schmidt, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Tregoning, Turba, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, York and Zeuske — 46.

Noes — Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coggs, M., Coggs,

S., Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gronemus, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Krug, Kunicki, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Magnuson, Medinger, Neubauer, Notestein, Potter, Roberts, Robinson, Rutkowski, Schneider, Seery, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Travis, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Volk, Wineke, Wood, Young, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 51.

Absent or not voting — McEssy and Williams — 2.

Motion failed.

The question was: Shall **Senate Bill 54** be ordered to a third reading?

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Senate Bill 54** be given a third reading. Granted.

The question was: **Senate Bill 54** having been read three times, shall the bill be concurred in?

The roll was taken.

The result follows:

Ayes — Antaramian, Barca, Barrett, Becker, Bell, Berndt, Black, Bock, Bolle, Boyle, Bradley, Brancel, Brandemuehl, Buettner, Carpenter, Clarenbach, Coleman, Cowles, Deininger, Farrow, Fergus, Fortis, Grobschmidt, Gruszynski, Hamilton, Hasenohrl, Hauke, Holperin, Holschbach, Hubler, Huelsman, Johnsrud, Krusick, Kunicki, Ladwig, Larson, Margaret Lewis, Mark Lewis, Linton, Looby, Matty, Merkt, Nelsen, Neubauer, Notestein, Ott, Ourada, Paulson, Porter, Potter, Prosser, Roberts, Robinson, Rosenzweig, Rutkowski, Schmidt, Schneider, Schneiders, Schober, Schultz, Shoemaker, Swoboda, Tesmer, Thompson, Tregoning, Turba, Vanderperren, Van Dreel, Van Gorden, Vergeront, Volk, Walling, Weeden, Welch, Wimmer, Wineke, Wood, York, Young, Zeuske, Zweck and Speaker Loftus — 82.

Noes — Byers, Coggs, M., Coggs, S., Foti, Goetsch, Gronemus, Krug, Lepak, McEssy, Magnuson, Medinger, Musser, Panzer, Radtke, Seery and Travis — 16.

Absent or not voting — Williams — 1.

Motion carried.

Representative Hauke asked unanimous consent that the rules be suspended and that **Senate Bill 54** be immediately messaged to the senate. Granted.

Representative Shoemaker asked unanimous consent that the assembly adjourn in honor of Steve McKay who is leaving the assembly staff. Granted.

Representative Ott asked unanimous consent to be made a co-author of **Assembly Bill 28**. Granted.

Representative M. Coggs asked unanimous consent that the assembly adjourn in honor of the birth of her granddaughter. Granted.

Representative Schneider asked unanimous consent that the assembly adjourn in memory of Liberace who passed away on Wednesday, February 4. Granted.

Representative Krug asked unanimous consent that the assembly adjourn in honor of Church of England envoy Terry Waite. Granted.

REFERENCE BUREAU CORRECTIONS

Senate substitute amendment 1 to **Senate Bill 26**
Page 6, line 2: delete "both" and substitute "**both**".

VISITORS

During today's session, the following visitors honored the assembly by their presence, and were welcomed by the presiding officer and the members:

Mary Lou Bohlen from Mauston, guest of Representative Brancel.

Government class students from Oakhill Christian High School in Janesville, guests of Representative Wood.

Seventh grade students from St. Stephen Lutheran School in Beaver Dam, guests of Representative Goetsch.

Verna Panzer from Brownsville, guest of Representative Panzer.

Representative Hauke moved that the assembly stand adjourned until 2:00 P.M. on Thursday, February 12 pursuant to **Assembly Joint Resolution 1** and **Senate Joint Resolution 7**.

The question was: Shall the assembly stand adjourned?

Motion carried.

The assembly stood adjourned.

8:20 P.M.