

UW Sterling Hall
Council Split Bars
Bombing - by file
Any Action on Jury

1/26/1971
By MAUREEN SANTINI
Of The State Journal Staff

A three-way split on the City Council blocked passage of two proposals Tuesday night, one condemning the convening of the Dane County Grand Jury which is investigating the Sterling Hall bombing last Aug. 24, and one supporting it.

Five aldermen voted "no" to both motions and thereby prevented either opposing side from mustering the 12 votes needed for adoption.

ONE PROPOSAL, by Aids. Eugene Parks, Fifth Ward; Joseph Thompson, Second Ward; Paul Soglin, Eighth Ward; and Susan Kay Phillips, Ninth Ward, urged the council to "condemn the convening of the Grand Jury" because it was unnecessary and would "be used as a tool to eliminate dissent

**WARF Will Buy
Air Park Land**

SEE SEC. 8, P. 1

and criticism of national policies."

Ald. Loren Thorson, 12th Ward, offered another resolution supporting the jury.

WITH THAT choice, aldermen lined up on three sides — those for the jury, those against it, and those who felt it was none of the council's business.

While Thorson's proposal drew 10 votes, it was two short of the necessary 12. The opposing forces received six votes, with Ald. Roger Staven, 15th Ward, absent.

The five who voted against both proposals were Aids. Alicia Ashman, 10th Ward; Michael Birkley, 18th Ward; Douglas Christenson, Sixth Ward; Robert Prideaux, 16th Ward; and Jane Ruck, 20th Ward.

Although little time was spent actually discussing the two proposals, Ald. Ruck later explained she voted against both because "you simply must separate your legislative and judicial branches."

"We're a legislative body, yet

Turn to Page 2, Col. 4

**Split Bars
Grand Jury
Pros, Cons**

FROM PAGE 1

we would essentially be giving instructions to another branch of government," she said.

BUT ALD. William Dries, 21st Ward, who voted for Thorson's plan, disagreed. Those who would not take a position "had no guts," he claimed.

Although the item condemning the convening of the jury was scheduled to be considered first on the agenda, a complicated parliamentary shuffle resulted in Thorson's proposal being considered first.

During the more than one hour aldermen spent on the issue, three-fourths of the time was spent debating whether the turn-about had been legitimate, and in discussing the correct interpretation of Robert's Rules of Order.

SOGLIN URGED condemnation of the jury on the grounds that grand juries in general had deteriorated to the point where "the key constitutional factors are missing."

He cited the secrecy involved, and the inability of those called to testify to be represented by counsel.

There was no discussion in favor of Thorson's proposal except by Dries who said: "If you're going to support the government, you should indicate your position. If you're going to go out and attack it and attempt to tear it down, people ought to know that, too."

The roll call was:

For condemnation of the jury — McGilligan, Parks, Phillips, Shivers, Soglin, and Thompson —6.

For support of the jury — Brandt, Dries, Forster, George, Healy, Hill, Landgraf, Offerdahl, Thorson, and Young —10.

Against both proposals — Ashman, Birkley, Christenson, Prideaux, and Ruck—5.