

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED TENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

NOVEMBER 6, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOV 6 1975

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members will please be in their seats. We will be led in prayer this morning by Reverend Krueger."

Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, Bless this House of Thy service this day. Amen. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow said, 'Most people succeed in small things if they were not troubled with great ambition'. Let us pray. Oh God, by whom the meek are guided in judgements and light riseth up in the darkness for the Godly, grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the grace to ask what Thou wouldst havest to do if the spirit of wisdom may save from all false choices and in Thy Light we may see Light and in Thy straight path may not stumble through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll call for attendance. Introduction First Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3197. Gene Hoffman et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First reading of the Bill. House Bill 3198. Collins et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Lottery Law. First reading of the Bill. House Bill 3199. Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Use Tax Act. First reading of the Bill. House Bill 3200. Rayson et al. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to revise the Law in relation to Divorce. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3201. Rayson et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 537. Hudson et al. House Resolution 538. Hanahan, DiArco. House Resolution 541. Deavers, Lauer. House Resolution 542. Geo-Karis et al. House Resolution 544. McClain, Kent, Schisler. House Resolution 545. Daniels et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 537 by Representative Hudson lauds FBI Director Clarence Kelly in the 40th Anninversay of the FBI academy. House Resolution 538 by Hanahan and DiArco recognizes Julian Sow, the United Neighborly and Charity community organization which is made up of Americans. House

NOV 6 1975

Resolution 541 by Deavers and Lauer...uh...recognize the unusually large corn crop and ask cooperation by the transportation people on that corn crop. House Resolution 542 by Geo-Karis honor the Lions Club of Waukegan, Lake County, Ill. House Resolution 544 by McClain, Kent, Schisler honors Harold Hunziker. House Resolution 545 by Daniels honors Joseph Berry, citizen of Elmhurst, Illinois. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no, the ayes have it, the Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 520. In respect to the memory of Mrs. Perara of Chicago, sponsor is DiArco. House Resolution 532, Schoerberlein, et al. Respects the memory of Mr. Glenn D. Palmer. House Resolution 534. Meyer et al. Respects the memory of Arthur A. Bair. House Resolution 539. Schlickman et al. Respects the memory of Mr. Maurice Goldberg. House Resolution 540. Cunningham et al. Respects the memory of Mr. John W. Sphinz. House Resolution 543. Choate et al. Respect the memory of Mrs. Jessie Weans."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of the Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposes no, the ayes have it, the Death Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk. Order is House Bills Second Reading. We'll pass House Bill 3100 upon which there is an amendment. House Bill 3131."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3131. A Bill for an Act to Provide for Supplemental Appropriation for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee amendment. Amends House Bill 3131 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is an agreed amendment and I move for the adoption of the amendment #1 to House Bill 3131."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of amendment... Committee amendment #1. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposes no. The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 3154."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3154. A Bill for an Act to Provide for the Payment of Awards by the Court of Claims under the Crime-Victim Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "No further amendments, Third Reading. House Bill 3156."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3156. A Bill for an Act to amend Section of an Act to Provide for the Ordinary and Contingent Expenses of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3169."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3169. A Bill For an Act Making Certain Appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3170."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3170. A Bill for an Act Making Appropriations to the State Scholarship Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3179."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3179. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the Ordinary and Contingent Expense to the Dangerous Drug Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. One committee amendment. Amends House Bill 3179 by deleting line 12, page 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following, Section 2 and so forth."

NOV 6 1975

4

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiArco, 3179, the amendment.

Gentleman has moved the adoption of amendment...get on the mike for a minute. Take Lucco's. Representative VanDuyne's microphone."

DiArco: "Mr. Speaker, I would move adoption of amendment #1 to House Bill 3179."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of amendment #1 to House Bill 3179. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3180."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3180. A Bill for An Act Making Supplemental Appropriation to the Joint Committee on Legislative Information System. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3186."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3186. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to Provide for the Ordinary and Contingent Expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee amendment. Amends House Bill 3186 on page 1 by inserting between line 16 and 17, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll move for the adoption of committee amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of committee amendment #1 to House Bill 3186. All in favor indicate by saying aye, oppose no. The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3187."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3187. A Bill for an Act Making Appropriation to the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. One committee amendment. Amends House Bill 3187 on page 1 by deleting line 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

NOV 6 1975

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, are you familiar with the amendment on 3187?"

O'Brien: "Committee amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee amendment on 3187."

Bradley: "I don't have the amendment right here in front of me."

Speaker Redmond: "It's an agreed amendment, as I understand from the committee."

Bradley: "I move the adoption of the amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of amendment #1 to House Bill 3187. All in favor indicate by saying aye, all opposed no. The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Bradley for the purpose of a motion for recess of the regular session."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I now move that the regular session of the...uh...recess until the hour of 10:30..."

Speaker Redmond: "10:32."

Bradley: "10:32."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion, all in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, regular session is now adjourned until 10:32. House will come to order, the First Special Session. We'll be led in prayer by Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amend. Oh Lord, Bless this special session to Thy service this day." Oscar Wilde said, 'It is always a silly thing to give advice but to give good advice is absolutely fateful'. Let us pray. Grant Oh Lord, that all of those who shall be called to legislate or to give judgement in any matter in the interest of Thy people may ever act with justice, truth, and reverence so that they may not add to the guilt of our states by commands of variance to Thy laws and wisdom, but may acknowledge Thee as the only fountain of authority through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen ."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll call for attendance. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the roll call for this session the roll call for the regular session be used as the roll call

NOV 6 1975

6

of the First Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the roll call for the regular session will be used for the roll call of the First Special Session. Introduction, First Reading of Bills."

O'Brien: "House Bill #5. Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution #3. Resolve that the Journal Review Committee heretofore appointed by the Speaker pursuant to House Resolution 450 is authorized to direct and review the journals of the First Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I move the adoption, Mr. Speaker, of House Resolution #3 in the First Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman has moved the adoption of House Resolution #3. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, Resolution is adopted. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I now move that the First Special Session stand in recess until the hour of 1:00 p.m.."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the motion? You heard the motion, all in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it. The First Special Session stands in recess till 1:00 p.m. House will come to order and the Second Special Session will be led in prayer by Reverend Krueger."

Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, Bless this Special Session to Thy service this day. Martin Luther King, Junior said, 'We must learn to live together as brother or perish together as fools'. Let us pray. Oh God who is made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth and is sent by his blessed son to preach peace to them who are far off and to them that are not away. Grant that all men everywhere may seek after Thee and find Thee. Watch over the people of this State. Direct these Legislators and all persons who administer authority. Bring the nations into thy fold, pour off Thy spirit that harms all flesh and hasten Thy kingdom through the name of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll call for attendance. Representative Bradley for a motion."

Bradley: "Mr....Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the roll call for the regular session be used for the Second Special...the...Second Special Legislative Session, I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved that the roll call for the regular session be used as the roll call for the Second Special Session. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, the roll call for the regular session will be used for the Second Special Session. Any further business? Representative Bradley. We have no further business. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I now move that the Second Special Legislative Session stand in recess till the hour of 1:30 p.m. or do you...is that alright sir? I so move then."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, Second Special Session stand in recess till the hour of 1:30. Regular session back in order. Member still be in their seats. On the order of total veto motion appears House Bill 138. Representative Borchers. It takes 107 votes. Take that one out of the record. House Bill 169. Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question that...uh...I'm wondering when we're calling on the, in view of the fact that this is our last day to address ourselves to these vetoes of any nature at all and we're going down the calendar, what was the chair's inclination insofar as continuing to go through the calendar time after time or are we going to go through it one time and give us a chance to vote on them or what do you plan in that nature so we can..."

Speaker Redmond: "My temptation is call them but once."

Bradley: "Well, I would certainly think that that would be a good idea and if the gentlemen are here let's go ahead and call it, if they're not and they don't want to call it, let's get on with the business of the State."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 169. Representative Geo-Karis."

Speaker Redmond: "169. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

House Bill 169, it was simply a may Bill, it was a Bill giving the authority to the Board of Higher Education to enter into reciprocal payments with public institutions of higher education in other states for the remission of non-resident tuition for only designated categories of students. Actually there isn't any particular loss to the State of Illinois, it might be a gain because it is a may bill. Before the Board of Higher Education of Illinois could enter into any reciprocal agreements with the public institutions of other states, they would have to have the consent of the respective Board of Regents of the various state colleges or Board of Trustees certified through the University of Illinois. And...uh...what this Bill would allow for Illinois students to do is to attend schools other than their home state without having to pay additional amounts of resident tuition and fees. Now.....

academic institutions and was recommended by the McConnell Commission Report to the General Assembly in 1969."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn indicates he can't hear you Representative Geo-Karis. Members please be in their seats."

Geo-Karis: "Can you hear me now? Well...uh...I don't mean to be repetitive Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker except that this Bill is a may Bill. It would give the Board of Higher Education, if it desired, to enter into reciprocal agreements with public institutions of higher education in other states in relation to non-resident tuition with certain designated categories of students. This Bill would allow some students from Illinois to attend schools in other than their own state without having to pay additional non-resident tuition fees. The subsequent mingling of students enriches academic institutions and was recommended by the McConnell Commission Report in the General Assembly in 1969. However, before our Board of Higher Education could enter into any such agreement with another Board of Education...Higher Education in another state, it would have to get the consent of the respective Board of Regents of any state college in Illinois or the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Now, presumably, this

NOV 8 1975

9

legislation would allow under utilized facilities in Illinois and in other states the usual out-of-state student. In as much, as this refers to certain designated categories of students, it's not a wholesale mass exit of Illinois students to other states. We have had students, for example, let's say who want to go to the biology department of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin and that has one of the finest biology departments in the country, well, the Board of Higher Education can make a provision for one student of ours to go there, they can one of their students come to one of our designated colleges. Incidentally, Minnesota and Wisconsin have had this kind of reciprocal agreement and has had it done now for five years and it's been very successful. I would like to ask for the respectful consideration in overriding this veto in as much as it is may bill and it'd be a great help to the taxpayers of Illinois who have students, sons and daughters going onto colleges and want to get into certain designated category of training."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Very briefly I rise to oppose this motion. It seems to me with the number of schools that we have in the State of Illinois that every boy and girl has the opportunity to attend a university and I'm sure further that the curriculum that they might be looking for is certainly available to them somewhere in this great State of ours and we spend alot of money funding those universities. If some student wants to go to a school in some other state in this nation, so be it, let them go and let them pay the tuition to attend that university ...uh...I just can't see any reason at all to agree into some reciprocal agreement with other states on this particular issue. I think we would come out on the short end because we have in my opinion, as fine an institution, number of institutions in higher education and we would be giving away some times a place in school, whether it be in medical school or whatever, to a student from another state when and denying that particular place to a student in Illinois. So I rise to oppose this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

NOV 6 1975

Friedrich: "Mr. President, Representative Geo-Karis I think is being imposed upon here and I think some of the rest of us are about to be because apparently when you have a Bill that has a low number you never get a fair shot at it and I'm going to do something I've never done in my life, I'm going to question a quorum. Now if we can't get the people over in this House to hear on all these Bills, these are important to the public not just a specialized pressure group, there aren't any unimportant bills on here and I question a quorum."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has raised the question of a quorum. Clerk will take the roll. Take the roll. Attendance roll call all present indicate by voting aye, or present rather. It's a quorum call. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "There are a lot of buttons being pushed by people who aren't here and those people can't vote so Representative Geo-Karis hasn't got a chance to get a fair shake. Now if we're going to run this House, let's see that people are in their seats and here. People who have a low number have the same rights as the guy whose got 2971."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Speaker, in the past, the practice of the House as been, at least, we've only had this happen once or twice the five years I've been here. Now I think when we had a quorum call we had a oral roll call. And...uh...I wonder if that might be appropriate."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe the gentleman who made this motion, if he thinks that those people are not here has the opportunity to verify the roll up there and I think that would be the next step if he so wishes to question it. In my opinion, I think we have 89, if we have a quorum here and I think we would be delaying the time of the House. We may not have 107, he may be right that the lady may not getting a shot but we do have a quorum as indicated on the Board, I suggest that we go ahead with the business of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

NOV 6 1975

Friedrich: "Well, frankly, what I'm trying to do is see that the people are over here. As I say, the people who have low numbers on this just aren't getting fair treatment in this House. Now, I know that the rules provide for the orderly business and I think the rules should be ...but this is the third time now that this Bill has had a chance to be heard and there wasn't many people here. And I'll just be frank with you, I'm trying to stall to see that these people get over here so that Representative Geo-Karis and the rest of us have a chance to have a fair shot at getting our...we have the same rights as the other people here."

Speaker Redmond: "The clerk will take the record. On this matter, there is 130 present, 134 present. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise to support this motion by Representative Geo-Karis. And the reason is because I can recall back in the early spring when this Bill was first heard in the Higher Education Committee and there was a great deal of misunderstanding about it at the time. In fact, she postponed consideration of it in the committee meeting because the Higher Education Committee voted all but one vote to kill the Bill at the time. And the reason for those negative votes in committee was because we had a staff analysis which compared the figures of attendance from out-of-state colleges or out-of-state communities to the Illinois institutions and compared the cost and did an analysis based on what it would cost the State of Illinois to have students from out-of-state come in at the rate of residence in Illinois. We found out, however, after looking into the matter in some detail, that that wasn't the proposition at all. That we weren't indeed talking about reciprocating with out-of-state students from other states. What we were talking about, indeed what this Bill addresses itself to, and what I believe may very well have been misinterpreted by the Governor's staff is to give our higher education institutions the opportunity to, in effect, make treaties for various programs. For instance, at the University of Illinois we have a very fine engineering department in

NOV 6 1975

ceramic engineering. There aren't very many schools that have ceramic engineering. In addition to that, there are a number of engineering programs at Purdue University in Indiana which we do not have the facilities to deal with properly and give our students from Illinois the kind of training they can get at Purdue. All this does is give the Board of Higher Education the opportunity to engage in treaties in regard to programs. It doesn't open the doors to our state colleges and universities for a flood of out-of-state students paying reduced tuition paying tuitions commensurate with those from residents of Illinois. All this does is it gives the Board of Higher Education the opportunity for specific programs to have treaties with universities and colleges from other states. I think it's a fine proposition, it's something that's going to further the education of the children in our state. I do believe it was misunderstood just as the Higher Education committee in it's first attempt to look at the Bill misunderstood it. We're not talking about seeing funds flow out of our state to other states, we're not talking about a decrease in income, we're talking about providing by making available programs where our institutions can cooperate with those others from out of state and I would encourage a vote to override this veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I for one agree totally with the gentleman from Bloomington who pointed out the high quality of higher education that exists in the State of Illinois. It's my observation that Illinois has the finest complement of public universities and colleges within this nation. And within that finest complement are some of the best schools. It seems to me Mr. Speaker and Member of the House that the Governor was totally right when he stated in his veto message that tuition remission would provide a wind-fall to out-of-state students who are not Illinois taxpayers at the expense of the Illinois taxpayers. And that it's estimated that the cost of remitting the out-of-state tuition differential to all out-of-state students would exceed five million dollars annually. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that by the passage of this Bill, we're

further going to distort the imbalance between revenue and appropriations and in doing so will be benefiting non-residents of this State. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, encourage a no vote on this motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just want to reiterate what the previous has said. What we're talking about here is an expenditure of approximately \$5,000,000 that is absolutely unnecessary. We do have great universities in this State. This reciprocity concept is good possibly in normal times but in the fiscal condition that we are in today and in lieu of what happened yesterday, and I supported the override, I think we cannot afford this additional \$5,000,000 and I certainly would urge everyone to vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, can I have a little order please because this is an important issue here. Thank you. In response to the preceding speaker, I would like to call attention to Representative Beaupre's remarks and urge that everyone of you listen just for one minute to the fact that this staff analysis that we have is totally incorrect. This is an incorrect interpretation of this Bill. The State of Illinois will be ahead financially if we vote yes on this Bill. This was brought out in further study in the Higher Education Committee. Think for one minute any of you who have sons or daughters and a public college or university in Illinois right now. Think of what you are paying in tuition. That's only the tip of the iceberg as to the actual cost to the state in educating your and my youngster. There is Capitol Development investment that have been made that are never covered by just the cost of tuition. What we're talking about in this Bill is reciprocity in tuition between instate students and out of state students on a carefully screened basis for just selected programs. It's up to the universities to screen out and trade on a one to one basis that if your son or daughter is interested in journalism and all the spots are all ready filled in Illinois in the schools that excel in this your son or daughter might want to go to the University of Missouri and you are a taxpayer in the

State of Illinois and you deserve a break and if the Board of Higher Education can find a youngster in Missouri who wants to come and study at the School of Veterinary in the University you've got a good exchange here. This is what we're talking about. The state would not lose money. For every Illinois student that we can send out of state and just pay the tuition we are ahead because we're not having to spend Capitol Development money on that student. Believe me, your staff report is wrong. This is a good Bill. Illinois would save money under this program. It was demonstrated in the hearing in Higher Education Committee. I do urge a yes vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, maybe I'm a little bit thick but I'd like to know how you're going to trade one for one and come out ahead. I also have a couple of questions that I would like answered and that is for example if the person going to the University of Illinois law school decided he wasn't getting a good education there, could he then transfer to Harvard and what would Harvard in return, or the ivy league, do to send a student here? What state does he come from?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is that an inquiry to the Sponsor?" Representative Geo-Karis do you want to respond?"

Geo-Karis: "Ah, thank you Mr. Speaker, Representative this would not apply. The Bill as it is written and believe me it was well heard in subcommittees and full committee of the Board of Higher Education in both Houses. The Bill as it is written says the Board of Higher Education may enter into reciprocal agreements which includes remission of nonresidents tuition for...for designed categories of students at public institutions of higher learning. And with the appropriate state agencies and institutions of higher education in other states to better facilitate the utilization of public institutions of higher education of this state and other state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Thank you. Question number two. That wasn't clear in here. Question number two, you had mentioned utilization of space that we have available. What space do we have available inasmuch as they've come back to us and said that we need

more building so that we can accommodate our students.

How do you then come about this?"

Geo-Karis: "If I may respond Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "This is how this Bill would operate. Suppose the ...this is not a wholesale mass exodus of Illinois students. At the present time there...in excess of 30,000 Illinois residents attending institutions of public...of higher education in other states. Now, what this will do is simply say it gives the Board of Higher Education with the prior written of the respective board of regents of every state college in Illinois, or the board of trustees, the right to admit certain students from let's say Wisconsin, if they admit three, they may have three Illinois students who can't go to schools in Illinois but can go to Wisconsin because of overcrowded conditions here or...maybe in certain schools, the...the quota's all ready reached but they would pay the same tuition. Now there was...they would pay Illinois tuition in Wisconsin. And this would be a saving to the taxpayers of Illinois. Actually this would not contemplate additional Capitol Development buildings because what you're doing is reciprocating. You're not adding."

Waddell: "If you're reciprocating how can you gain an advantage? This is my point."

Geo-Karis: "Pardon me, sir?"

Waddell: "If you are reciprocating, how do you gain that advantage?"

Geo-Karis: "The...I'll tell you how we gain the advantage. We gain the advantage because the experience of the other states that have entered into reciprocal agreement shows; for example, Minnesota which has entered into reciprocal agreements with North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin which has entered in reciprocal agreements of...Minnesota, the experience is that in the long run it...it provides for utilization of facilities. It avoids duplication overlap particularly of high cost programs and it does assure a maximum freedom of choice of the individual student. And ah, ah, Illinois, like Illinois, Minnesota is an exporter of college students with large numbers of students attending schools in Wisconsin and the Dakotas. We have approximately 8 to 1 of our college

students who go to schools out of state. Public colleges out of state right now. It would seem to me we can certainly have a designated category, as I've said, take for example the veterinary medicine department in Illinois. I don't know if any of you know this or not, I'm sure you probably do Mr. Waddell, but it's always overcrowded. We have hundred of Illinois students who can't go there who want to get into that school. Well, maybe..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close there, you have exceeded your time for discussion."

Geo-Karis: "...Iowa, for example, has a veterinary school. I know occasions of students who have to go to Iowa in order to get to a veterinary medicine school."

Waddell: "Are you aware the fact that we refused to funds to staff that brand new school that we put down there; the brand new facility?"

Geo-Karis: "No, I'm not Mr. Waddell and actually I just gave it as an example because I know there has been people who can't to the school of their choice as a result of overcrowded conditions here in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "...I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Representative Geo-Karis to close."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to try and belabor the point. This is a good Bill. This simply is a may Bill. It gives the option the Board of Higher Education of Illinois to enter into these reciprocal agreements in certain designed categories of students. This is not a wholesale mass exodus Bill by any means. And Representative Dyer spoke correctly about it. She was on that Committee that heard this Bill in full. This Bill passed overwhelmingly in the House and in the Senate and it was vetoed. The staff analysis report say \$5,000,000 expense are wrong. In both the Republican and Democrat

staff analyses because it's contemplated mass exchange. This is only certain designated categories. I respectfully urge your vote to override this veto if you want to save money for the taxpaying parents of Illinois who have to send their children out of the state. In many instances because they can't get in certain designated categories of schools in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 169 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor indicate by voting aye; opposed nay. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, an explanation of my vote, I am very much opposed to this Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if you were to survey the number of Illinois students at Purdue you would find that there would be very few whose family income was less than \$30,000. Or at the University of Michigan, or at Indiana, or Wisconsin, or any one of hundreds of prestigious state universities outside the State of Illinois. What we're doing with this Bill and I agree absolutely with the Governor and of course it's not broad, it's not absolute now, they can't go for every purpose but soon they will be able to if we override this veto. They'll be able to go wherever they want to. What we're doing is we're supplementing the rich and we shouldn't do that. It's not right. The poor people get no benefit from this at all only the rich and I urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 33 aye, 53 no. The motion having failed to receive the necessary majority, hereby declared lost. Representative Rayson, aye. House Bill 174. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in the absence of the gentleman from Lake, I would like to call to the attention of the Chair, Rule 45B that reads as follows: 'If the motion fails to receive the affirmative vote of 107 members the motion being to override the Governor's veto the Speaker shall declare that the Governor's veto is sustained' and I respectfully..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. On the last roll

the Governor's veto is sustained."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'm sorry, my attention was momentarily diverted, Representative Choate and I and Richmond all wanted to be recorded as voting yes and we were talking and didn't get on the roll call."

Speaker Redmond: "Shame. Record them as voting yes."

Hart: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Choate, Hart and Richmond, yes. 174. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one down and you notice I didn't ask for postponement. My next Bill is House Bill 174. Now House Bill 174 is a Bill that did have a fiscal note if you'll recall and I believe our...one of our representative on this side had insisted on it and I have put it on. And this House Bill simply would have permit the Department of Conservation to pay for the reasonable cost of fire or police services, not ambulance services, that was taken out, to the adjoining municipalities or the municipalities in which part of the Department of Conservation property was in because as you know and I know the municipalities that in which some of the Department of Conservation land is located cannot tax the Department of Conservation. Now you take the Illinois Beach, a large area, the Department of Conservation area in Lake County Illinois. Those of you from Lake, who know Lake County know this, that there will be millions of tourists coming into the Department of Conservation Parks recreational facilities during the...the season. Summer or spring season. However, when there is need of additional police or fire protection from the localities within which the area is located or surrounded there is no provision for paying reasonable services to those municipalities. And yet these municipalities cannot tax the Department of Conservation and yet there'll be millions of people coming through."



There will be need for some additional police and fire service. And that's all this Bill addresses itself to. All we're asking is that the Department of Conservation pay a reasonable cost for police and fire services when they need some extra police and fire services to these municipalities. I ask you to override this veto because I think it's a very sensible Bill considering that those municipalities cannot tax the State Department of Conservation land. And I respectfully ask for your consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greisheimer. Give the gentleman order, please."

Greisheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am also rising in support the override of this particular Bill. Please understand in many ways this is a Bill which will actually save the State of Illinois money in the long run because we're now facing the situation at least in Lake County and I'm sure this is true in other high density park areas where there is state facilities where the local municipalities are just about ready to withdraw all local services so that the policing association... organization, the fire department just absolutely will refuse to go on state property. If this comes about we're going to have to increase the state payroll to have a new breed of state police or maybe even a state fire department to handle the calls at these state facilities. This is just a reimbursement for that which is necessary, it's usually localized to the good weather. I'd say this would be a move for good government and in fact an economy move for the state in the long run. I would urge these votes to override the veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis to close."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies..."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Schlickman, do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She indicates she will."

Schlickman: "I have...I have a copy of the Governor's veto



here and I have an analysis of it, unfortunately I don't have a copy of the Bill and I'm wondering if you could advise us as to what the basis for the reimbursement would be?"

Geo-Karis: "The basis would be, Representative, where the...the Department of Conservation has to...engage an additional services of police or fire departments for carrying on their operations. They have some protection of their own, the Department of Conservation does through the rangers or what have you. But if they have some fire that takes the brush in all...in all that park and starts hitting the Illinois Beach Lodge, for example, which is a \$4,000,000 state building and they need to call the additional fire squad in from Waukegan, Zion, Winthrop Harbor, and the...all the surrounding areas. They would pay for the reasonable cost of this services. This is over and above whatever...the Department of Conservation may furnish on its own for fire, police protection on their own ground. That's all."

Schlickman: "Does the Bill say reasonable cost?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, it does."

Schlickman: "Now who is to make that determination of reasonable cost?"

Geo-Karis: "Well, I'm sure that if the fire department, for instance of Waukegan, or the police department of Waukegan, sends in a bill and does not have it specified and it's not reasonable the Department of Conservation doesn't have to pay it. And then if the fire department or the police department of Waukegan, I believe, would have to go to the court of claims and the court of claims can certainly adjudicate what is reasonable. It's...it's not that much of an amount but it is important to the surrounding municipalities because as you know and I know they cannot charge taxes to state conservation areas."

Schlickman: "May I, ah, ask one more question, Mr. Speaker?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, pardon me."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Schlickman: "Well, let me pose a hypothetical question to you.

Let's assume that in one of these state parks in your district there's a drunken driver and this drunken driver strikes a pedestrian, innocent pedestrian, or innocent driver of another car, there's injury, there's a property damage, why should the state be responsible for the provision of police service in that respect?"

Geo-Karis: "I think Representative you and I both have common sense to know that the park certainly has its own protection and if they do need to call upon the local municipalities it would have to be a reasonable call. If it's an unreasonable call or it's an unreasonable service certainly that can be figured out very easily. But on the other hand when people, millions of people come and use that state park and cause damage or injury someone, don't you feel, or at least I feel, that the surrounding municipalities that are called in...for to furnish police or fire protection services should be paid a reasonable cost because they have to maintain their fire departments or their police departments whether they come to that state park or not to perform these services and no one pays for this services from the state park. So the only thing is we're asking for a reasonable...reasonable amount to pay for this services. And it is in the Bill, reasonable, sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to vote with my colleague because I know I can make some friends like she has in the local area but I...I am concerned about the precedent that this would cause because you ...in my area, for example, and I'm sure it's not much different in your area, the local fire departments have mutual aid pacts; the local police departments help other local



police departments help other local police departments and the precedent we would be establishing here would be that whenever one...police or fire department helps another that they ought to pay for those services. I don't really think that there's yet been unreasonable burden on any local government. Until that happens and then we address ourselves to that problem I think we can sustain the Governor's veto and I say that respectfully to my colleague. I...I'm one on the House floor that says we...just pass too much unneeded legislation because one or another party says address yourself to this problem. It isn't a problem of any magnitude at all and...and I really think we'll...we'll be establishing a dangerous precedent when police and fire departments help each other and they do it cooperatively. The governments understand each other's problem and...I think we'd be flying in the face of that so I would ask that you sustain the veto on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis to close. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I...just a short question of the Sponsor. Does the state park at Zion have a fire truck that it assist the Zion department with if Zion has a fire?"

Geo-Karis: "No, not to..."

Skinner: "Well then your colleague's statement is totally illogical."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies...oh, I'm sorry."

Skinner: "Wait...stop off. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, unless you own insurance on the motel at the Zion Beach, I would suggest, sincerely suggest, you vote for this Bill because Zion will let it burn down and I...if I were that fire department I think I would be sitting in the fire house watching the flames go up along the beach. How are we going to expect these local fire department to service state parks if the state never pays off if there is a fire. What if there's a forest fire in a state park as opposed to a national park? Who's going to go and put it out? Are the



local people supposed to take off a couple of weeks to go in and beat the bushes? Or are they going to have to go to the court of claims to get paid? Well, that doesn't make much sense to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "A point of personal privilege on that."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Matijeich: "...That...listen here, Skinner, keep your mouth shut. You talk too damn much anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Ah, I have I guess a parliamentary inquiry now that I've been chastised by Representative what's-his-name over there I can't mention his name of."

Speaker Redmond: "You're chastised again."

Skinner: "...A question, sir, can someone have a point of personal privilege if his name is not mentioned, if merely he is...is...comments are referred to..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you referred to them and I'd like to call the attention of the members to midnight of May the 23rd. Today is the last day that we can address ourselves to the Governor's vetoes, midnight is fast approaching. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "If you listened to all of what I said Cal Skinner, I said that there's no crying need for this. There's really only one thing that can burn down over there and we're going to have all this legislation because of that one issue. I said we don't need it and I still say you're establishing a precedent even though the state park doesn't have a...department there, you are establishing this precedent for other... other areas of local government. It is a bad precedent and I still...I still stand by that. I know what I was saying. I realize you like to help your colleague too but I still believe what I said was right. It's both a bad precedent and there's no crying need for this at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Representative Geo-Karis to close. Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to comment that if I ever have to defend an indefensible Governor's position I hope I'm more logical than the previous speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis to close."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my colleague on the Democrat side has the same friends that I do in a municipalities have asked me to sponsor this Bill surrounding Lake Michigan the Illinois State Conservation Park and I might add that this Bill was introduced at their request. Now, I might tell you sir that this...the positions of fire and police services to properties of the Department of Conservation could be a very expensive burden on local government if such properties where areas frequently and heavily used by the public. And they will be heavily used by the public, they estimate a million to two million people coming next summer in that area. Now, certainly, the local government in many areas could be serving larger areas which they are not equipped to serve from which they receive no tax revenues if this Bill is not passed. Now this Bill does not contravene the spirit of governmental cooperation because one unit of government contracting with another for the provision of certain services is a very common and economic practice in the State. As a matter of fact Section 10 of the Local Governing Articles of 1970 Constitution specifically provides for that. I might tell you that this is a necessary service, it's not fair to those municipalities of which are served by my Democrat counterpart, my other Republican counterpart of 31st District. It is not fair to those municipalities to be burdened with an onslaught of fire and police services and not be paid a reasonable cost. I respectfully urge your consideration overriding this veto which is a very important Bill on a very important Bill to these areas and any other areas that are serve a state park."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall House Bill 174 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? All voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 156 ayes, 58 no...no, 56 aye, 58 no. The motion fails and the Governor's veto is sustained. Representative Dunn is no. House Bill 182, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very simple Bill. This merely raises the exemption for the surviving spouse for inheritance tax from 20 to \$40,000. Now there were two or three other Bills which had to do with inheritance tax. This is the one I think which helps the people who need it the most. The exemption for the surviving spouse has been \$20,000 since 1906. Well certainly if \$20,000 was realistic then it's no longer realistic now. And those of you who have been dealing with it know that for federal, state tax the exemption is \$60,000 and I think probably that would be more realistic. But at least this is an attempt on my part and the part of the sponsors and those who have supported it to give some relief to those people who are thrifty, who are independent, who have worked and saved the money, worked and saved their money and tried to be independent in their old age. If there's any group that deserves a little help from this Body and from this State it's those people who are trying to be independent and work and save their money. It is...it is not an extensive thing as far as revenue is concerned. It is my estimate that for the remaining month of this year we're talking about \$2,000,000. Now time after time legislation has been passed in this Assembly to help senior citizens but this is a group that particularly deserves your help because they have been productive people during their years. They've made an effort to save their money. Now there's nothing complicated about the Bill at all. I certainly, in order to save time, I merely say that I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I want to just touch on another facet of this...situation. Our home today, an average home, would be 15 to \$20,000 and you include that in the cost...into



term of the asset of the estate, they...under present law, it may be that the only thing that the widow would get is the house. But nothing really in fact to support it. So I think this is a most just and logical approach to this problem and I certainly urge its support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, very briefly I...I think that most of my colleagues know what's involved in this Bill and the other inheritance tax exemption increase Bill. The estimate of the revenue loss to the State of Illinois is about \$10,000,000 a year from this Bill. I should also point out that in Illinois joint tenancy property is only a credit for one-half joint inheritance tax purposes and their life insurance is totally excluded in computing Illinois inheritance taxes and that in computing Illinois inheritance taxes all deductions are made for funeral bills and other debts of the deceased. I think that anyone that does any work in this field ^{will} acknowledge that the Illinois inheritance tax rate are probably among the most moderate and reasonable in the fifty states of the union. This is no time to give tax revenues to well-to-do people on inherit...in inheritance situations. An average family, a widow and two children, leaving an estate of \$200,000 would have a total net tax under the present law of only about 1%. And I think this veto should be sustained."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion. Representative Friedrich to close."

Friedrich: "Well, in the first place I don't know where the previous speaker got his figures because I'm sure there's no accurate way of determining how much the loss of revenue would be. The Governor put out the figure of \$9,000,000 but I have checked with the Attorney General's office and the truth of the matter is there's no breakdown in regard to category. But I did work and I think I reviewed as many inheritance tax returns as anybody on this floor and I can tell you for sure that it would help a lot of little people



who need their...who need your help. And it would certainly, I will say this there has never been a piece of legislation that I had anything to do with that received more unanimous approval than this particular one. It had editorials in my district, but...I...I have had mail from every section of my district and a lot of letters from outside the district. I can assure you that it is the right thing to do and I... and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 182 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All vote in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis, do you seek recognition?"

Geo-Karis: "Ah...ah...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with inflation if anyone thinks 40,000 is for rich people they're out of their tree. Because it isn't. You leave a widow and she has to pay her taxes and pay her expenses and try to figure a new life for herself, or a widower who has to manage, it's not easy. I support the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I just would like to call to the...attention of the membership that the \$200,000 estate is pretty rare in our county and I suspect in all the counties except possibly Cook. And I have an idea it'd be the same percentage there as downstate but most of these estates are 10, 15, 20, maybe at the best \$50,000 if...if the...if the widow is lucky. This 200,000 or more is ridiculous. That is not the average estate. All we're doing here would be helping people badly in need of help. The average small estate that will go to some small family of two, three and perhaps only the widow. This is something we should do and it's badly overneeded. Again, consider 1906 and the present inflationary rate."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. Now last night we were in here, we were spending money and the



very people who are going to be paying the taxes are the ones that are going to benefit from this. And I think if we can give money to senior citizens and we can help everyone else out we can certainly help out the people that's been paying taxes and I think this Bill deserves a yes vote. It needs 107 so we need - how many more - 11 more votes. A good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 101 aye, 38 no and the motion fails. And the Governor's veto is sustained. House Bill 342. Representative...Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "I've announced the roll call, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "You'd announced the roll call yesterday and we polled the absentees now we're going to do a different thing today it's all right with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn, I don't believe I did. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I...I had my light on, would have liked to explain my vote but you didn't pay any attention to it. It seems like you could take a new roll call if you would please, if we don't have..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't see any procedure in the rules on that. House Bill 342. Representative Griesheimer."

Greisheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House 342 does not involve any state funds whatsoever. I guess I should...I guess I should sit down now. This is the..."

Selcke: "Mrs. Chapman in the Chair."

Greisheimer: "House Bill 342 is the designated smoking areas bill which was passed by this House last Spring by a substantial majority, over 89. It was also passed by the Senate and provides merely that in five certain areas located in the State of Illinois that the owners or managers of those facilities will set aside certain portion of the area for



NOV 6 1975

29

smokers and nonsmokers. The Bill does not prohibit smoking in the State of Illinois but merely allows those people who have some need to avoid smoke to have a place where they can sit in a theatre or in a hospital, in an auditorium, or in a museum area facility where they are not going to be bothered by the smoking conditions. The Illinois Cancer Society, the Illinois Lung Association, the Illinois Heart Association, have worked diligently to present the facts on this issue. I feel that the facts are indisputable and anyone of you that may have a friend at home or a member of your family who suffers from emphysema or some other lung associated disease know the meaning of what it's like to prohibit those people going into public places because they cannot tolerate the smoke. The same Bill was passed in the State of Nebraska. We contacted the Senator who sponsored this bill approximately two years ago and she has indicated that there has been a monumental effect on the public in following the law without stringent need of police action. And in fact we find that the police action is minimal. Now the only reason that we're suggesting a law in this State is because of the lack of social graces in the area of smoking. You and I can remember when Victor Arrigo was on the floor of this House some two-and-a-half years ago pleading that the Speaker designate some area for nonsmokers. At the present time even this House has a nonsmokers designated area because of the Speaker of our House at the present time responding to their request. I think that this Bill will provide some considerable relief to a group of people in our...state that are only asking permission to have a clean place where they can go so that it doesn't bother their lung condition. It does not cost any money. If any of you have read the Governor's veto message you can see without question that there's not a thread of truth or fact to it. His people were not able to respond to this on inquiry from the office of the Senate Sponsor when she made inquiry where he obtained his facts. In fact this ordinance...a similar



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ordinance all ready exist in the City of Chicago and it's having a very good effect in the city. I would urge you to vote to override the Governor's veto on this motion."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?"

Chapman: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Ron, could you tell me on the violations who may file petty offenses? May the individual that controls the area or do we have to have a policeman involved here or what?"

Griesheimer: "This operates like any other law in the State of Illinois. An individual citizen could make a...a complaint to the police department and information could be filed if need be; a warrant could be issued as a result of the complaint; or it could be an enforcement official such as a policeman. However, I would point out that in the City of Chicago they are using health department officials to do this and in fact have a special court handling these in the City of Chicago. I would not anticipate that this would require a great many new or additional police officers or health officers anymore than the fact that we need a great many new or additional police officers because of speed limits and other traffic offenses. If I may just go on a little bit further on that point. A number of people have raised the issue, how can we ever enforce a law like this there is so many people smoking that violate the courtesies of other people and their needs. Well the fact of the matter is if we use that philosophy we would have no traffic laws on our books because there are probably thousands of violators each day violating the laws who are not caught by local police and law enforcement agencies. What we're trying to do is just establish a health policy of this state and in fact that is stated in the Bill so the people who cannot tolerate smoke are given an opportunity a reasonable opportunity to find a portion of a public facility where they can actually use that facility and not to their detriment."



McClain: "Ah thank you, may I speak...may I speak to the Bill?"

Chapman: "Yes, sir."

McClain: "I would oppose the motion before us now to override the total veto of the Governor. I would like to point out five points, if I may, in opposing this Bill. The first one is quite frankly that police forces throughout the State of Illinois and in fact the nation, now have to change their philosophy to turning...to police the victim crimes and not the victimless crimes. Crime is running rampant and by... bogging these institutions down with petty offenses of whether a person smoked or did not smoke; whether or not the evidence on whether or not they were within two feet of the enclosed area or not is just completely ludicrous as far as I'm concerned and I can just see what will happen. The state police will put quotas on a state policeman and they'll have to...have to have 52 or 55 petty offenses for smoking every quarter. Secondly, the cost is just outlandish. I subject to you...suggest to you that we're instituting here is another concept of patronage army throughout the area and I'm against that. Thirdly, local control, municipalities can do this now, they have the home rule powers, home rule counties can do this now and in fact the fourth point is very simply that private industry can do this now. There is no law that has been passed that mandated airplanes to designate nonsmoking areas. There is no law passed and on the statute book that said the General Assembly had to designate a nonsmoking area. I'm suggest that of anything, that this is just building up the statute books, cost too much, and we're bogging the policemen down. And I'd urge you to support the Governor."

Chapman: "Any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Chapman: "All in favor please say aye. Opposed, no. The motion carries. Does the gentleman desire to close? Mr."



Griesheimer, please."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've had an opportunity since initiating this legislation in the House early this spring to dig into the facts of the subject. I'd have to say in all deference to the last speaker he doesn't have the foggiest idea of what the facts are in this issue. The constant and stabbing effect of chain smoking even on a nonsmoker can be critical. It can bring about massive heart attacks instantaneously, it can bring about effects on births, it can bring about many other things but more often than that it can cause a person who has a chronic disease to be prohibited in using some public facility. Now this is a clean decent thing to do. It doesn't prohibit a smoker who wishes to smoke to smoke. It merely gives some guarantee that the manager of a facility who doesn't otherwise care about the smokers and nonsmokers must designate that facility. Just look at the Bill. What does it apply to? It applies to hospitals, buses, elevators, auditoriums and museums. Now certainly how can there be an objection to this? We talk about home rule and it can all ready be taken care of. There are thousands of home rule areas in this state and they haven't even touched this issue. They have not touched the issue at all. So it's ludicrous to say let's leave it in the hands of home rule. It is not being taken care of. I feel that we have an obligation under the Constitution to at least assure some degree of cleanliness and clean air to the populous of this state. More importantly we have to think about those people who are disadvantaged because of lung and heart related diseases who cannot use public facilities because of the fact that there are...is not a designated area for them. I would certainly urge you to override the Governor's veto and see that this Bill is passed into law."

Chapman: "The question is, shall House Bill 342 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All signify by voting aye. All opposed by voting nay. The Chair recognizes the



gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to disagree with most of what the gentleman from Adams said in reference to this Bill. He...he apparently thinks that policemen should be taking care of crimes other than victimless crimes and he refers to this as a victimless crime. Mr...Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I think if you have a bad case of emphysema, many other respiratory diseases and someone is fogging up a pipe, a cigar, a cigarette, on each side of you and there you are with your emphysema I just can't see that you...you...that this crime doesn't have a victim because some of these diseases are very serious. Now when I first started smoking many, many, many years ago those who smoked quite often were polite and they would say if they were in a room with others, do you mind if I smoke? Many years before I quit smoking this was no longer a practice and it is not the practice now. Anyone that wants to smoke thinks he has a perfect right to bother anyone else in the room just so he can have his smoke. I believe that those who...who are ill with emphysema or other diseases and those who just don't like smoke have a perfect right to have people not smoke. Anyone that wants to smoke has a perfect right to go outside or go into another room and smoke. I believe that this was a good Bill and that the veto should be overridden."

Chapman: "The lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I not only urge you to override this veto, I beg you to override this veto. From personal experience I would like to relate from my own family which is going on right now a case in point. My brother is in the hospital suffering from emphysema and whether or not people smoke around him is a matter of life and death; not life and breath. It is urgent for this state to take action with the increasing number of respiratory diseases that are hitting the hospitals and the doctors offices today. It is not only a matter of



courtesy, it is a matter of life. One of the previous speakers mentioned the enormous cost to this state or to... patrol or...or to emphasize and control the statutes that would be on the books. I submit to you that this disease has cost my brother and his family to date \$80,000. That multiplied by the number of other sufferers of emphysema, lung cancer and other respiratory diseases can not be equated in dollars and cents. I urge you to please vote yes on this Bill."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if there ever were a Bill that deserves the whole-hearted support of the Body this is that Bill. In the name of common sense a group that could wreak such havoc on the economy of the State that has been done in the last day or so should have a momentary return to sanity by doing penitence by voting for this very fine Bill. I'm proud to join with the other enlightened Legislators and the incomparable Sponsor of this Bill. I want to tell you that I do so at great personal risk because almost every funeral director in my district is against the Bill to override and well they might be because they'll be driving business away from the funeral director's door by overriding this particular Bill. And I've gotten financial contributions from those funeral directors in the past and they may be shut off by reason of my Bill but I'm proud to stand up with the humanitarian who believe that this Legislature is competent of doing something for the people of the State of Illinois albeit the evidence to the...to the present time is counter that position. Support Griesheimer and his splendid Bill, he deserves a 107 votes; you'll feel better tomorrow for having struck that one blow for decency and clean air."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Ah, Mr...Mr...Madam Speaker, and fellow member of the House.."



Chapman: "It's not Miss."

Borchers: "Uh..."

Chapman: "Ms. I'll accept."

Borchers: "OK. Three years ago I had a fluid operation...uh...

here on my neck and was in the hospital which some of you may remember some of you may not but I have found that since that operation if someone blows smoke in my face and I take great care now to miss it, any quality of smoke I start to cough that I can hardly breathe and I start to choke. So I'm very careful about avoiding cigarette smoke. I certainly will support this Bill because of that reason. I can see how someone with emphysema would be in dire need of help in a restaurant or where ever they may be. There should be some sort of control in public places where people can go to either avoid smoke completely or at least to such an extent that they are in relatively free area. I urge support of this Bill."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Greisheimer."

Greisheimer: "Thank you Madam Speaker. As I look at the Board I see that there are 54 people who have not taken any position on this whatsoever. I cannot echo any better than Representative Lucco who stated it yesterday, that there are certain obligations to look at what we are doing down here to analyze what's right and what's wrong and what will benefit the public. We have all been concerned in the last two and three days of the financial crisis of the state is facing. The legislators from Chicago were similarly concerned in the financial crisis their schools were facing and we had to deal with that issue. How can I better tell you that there are many thousands of Illinois residents today that face a life and death crisis over the use of public facilities as it relates to their diseases like emphysema. I also relates to other diseases of the same type. Just three years ago there was a legislator standing on the floor of this House pleading with the



NOV 6 1975

38

will be a tax cost of \$15, court costs, you will pay an attorney at least \$150 to fill out all the forms and you may pay a real estate appraiser at least \$50 to appraise it for the attorney general. You will have expenses of well over the \$200 and you will come out in the hole. Now this is what is going on time after time. Now attorneys such as myself do not want to be in position of putting a fee on clients when they cannot recover when it will be a loss to them. So the main purpose of this Bill is not just the tax saving of 6 to 10 million, I estimate it will save 20 million...20 million in unnecessary, unneeded costs and this is the purpose of this Bill. I would suggest to you that we pass this Bill 155 to 4, 155 to 4, nothing is changed, I'd like to see the same vote again. Thank you."

Chapman: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, and it's good to address a speaker from Arlington Heights. Madam Speaker, Members of the House. The sponsor of this Bill said that the constitutional basis of...for this Bill lie in tax relief. I suggest to you that the ConCon Delegates did not think in terms of tax relief as such but they thought in terms of equitable fair taxation, and as a consequence provided four classifications. My conclusion is that there's no relevancy between what lies in the constitution and this particular Bill. Earlier today we defeated a motion to override the veto on House Bill 182, if you thought that Bill was bad this one is twice as bad in terms of the loss of revenue to the State. And I think when we speak in terms of loss of revenue we could equally characterize this Bill as a preparation of approximately 15 million dollars...15 million dollars without any additional service to the citizens of this State. As a gentleman on the floor previously commented and observed correctly so, the Illinois inheritance tax is a very very moderate tax and I respectfully



suggest, attempting to justify these exemptions on the basis that they have not been increased for a number of years has no basis with respect to logic or relevancy. I further comment, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, and this is a very old old thing, apparently, but we are on a constitutional mandate with respect to balancing appropriations and revenue. This Bill will compound the existing unbalance and therefore the motion to override should be defeated and therefore the motion to override should be defeated the Governor's veto should be sustained. Thank you."

Chapman: "The gentleman from McClain, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mrs. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this piece of legislation and I'd like to give you an example of what happened. I don't believe this is a loss to the State per se, what has happened is that the state has benefited from the tremendous rise in inflation to the detriment to the widow or of that particular estate, let me cite an example. Not too long ago, a farm that happen to be knowledgeable sold for \$2737/acre to settle an estate and the widow was going to have to pay the estate tax based on that amount of money. When this law was originally passed, which we're operating under right now, that land was worth \$100/acre so it's risen in increase 27%...pardon me, 270% over the time when this law...the present law became effective and what your doing is increasing, due to the inflation, the amount of dollars coming into the state and taking it away from the rightful person that should have the money coming from the state. We have simple become the recipient in the state government of the inflation again in this particular area. To the detriment of the people that the money should rightfully belong to. I think it's time that we do give an increase, and this is a small increase of the...to the estate and I think we should pass this Bill, I urge you to do so. Thank you."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."



Mugalian: "Madame Speaker, Members of the House. I did speak on the previous Bill similar to this. This Bill will be more costly to the state's revenue than the previous Bill but I'd like to add one more comment as to the previous comments made on this kind of legislation. The Federal Government imposes what is called an Estate Tax on decedents. And in the estate tax structure, Federal Estate Tax structure, there is what is called a credit for state inheritance taxes. Now the override of this veto could very well result in this situation. We're talking about what is called the pick-up tax. The credit for state taxes if not taken, that is if the state inheritance tax rates become so low or exemptions become so high that state tax credit will be paid to the Federal Government rather than to the State of Illinois. When you get into these types of exemptions, additions, or increases, what you're really doing is shifting death tax proceeds from the State of Illinois to the United States of America and I think that's utter folly."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I would just say again, this is an effort on the part of Representative Londrigan and others of us to give some relief to the people who have worked and saved...uh... to take care of their older age and so on. I think it's an effort to reward those people who are thrifty and I think it's long overdue."

Chapman: "Representative Londrigan to close."

Londrigan: "I want to thank the remarks of Representative Friedrich. I helped him on his Bill. These are both good Bills and should have passed, I think with a little more effort his would have passed, it was very close. If Bills can get out of this with 155 to 4 majority as this one did, there's no reason to change it at this date. The arguments given on the other side were so illogical that I don't even believe that they need comment. The purpose of this Bill, and the estimate if 6 to 10 million, that's what it was before



the committee and it hasn't changed and it will not be effective on the state for approximately another year. Now, the main purpose I say again of this Bill is saving 20 million estimated savings on top of attorneys and real estate people which are unnecessary. Now this is our last opportunity to give this type of tax relief and I ask for your support. Thank you."

Chapman: "The question is shall House Bill 364 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting aye, all opposed nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question...Representative Londrigan did you desire to explain your vote?"

Londrigan: "Yes, I do, Ms. Speaker., There's 55 people who obviously previously voted for this Bill who have not now and I think there's a little time for them to get here. This Bill'll succeed, we're only a few votes short. I say again that we had promised the people tax reform and tax relief. How long are we going to kid the people? We doubled their taxes on the income tax, now you say, some of you, we cannot even afford approximately 10 million dollars in tax relief and this is primarily to the average person who has bought his home and paid taxes, the income tax to get his home. Now after he has paid income tax, real estate tax for all the years, then when he dies now you want to take his widow and his children and tax them again. This tax was never meant for this purpose, the exemptions are only increasing because of inflation, I have stated it is primarily a \$20 million savings in cost that will be charged by attorneys and real estate people who do not need and do not want this type of cost. We as attorneys only want to be productive, we don't want to be charging people where we cannot perform the service. So that is why I, as an attorney, speak to you and I know the Attorney General doesn't care one way or the other about this Bill. I know of no opposition to the Bill, all of a sudden the Governor vetoed it. I say we pass this



Bill 155 to 0 and I ask you who have voted for it before to get on this, the 38 who have not voted and vote this good piece of legislation through. Thank you."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm voting no simply because your talking about who gets the tax relief. Your talking about an issue of needy versus being greedy. I think what your talking about is not poor widows, your talking about people who have to exceed a certain amount of dollars, \$20,000. Your not only talking about that which is left in the estate, your not talking about all those things which might be exempt from this estate that might have been joint tenancy that might have been passed during lifetime, that might have come along in some other time and by other devices have been exempted from the estate. What your talking about is an effort in some fashion to plug the gap and plug the need so that the State of Illinois will have some meager measure of money to meet its expenditures. We're going to be on this floor in the not too distant future...in the distant future pleading with the members to bear with us to see if they can't find it in their hearts to sit up and vote for a tax increase or some other way of raising some revenue. If we don't want to do that, if we want to delay the day of doom then we'd better start being fiscally responsible and look at some of these issues that we vote out pell mell and I vote no."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to speak in support of this Bill in explaining my vote. I come from an area where people work very very hard to save enough money to purchase and pay for a home, gather together a small bank account and create a modest estate and I see many many times a situation where there's a husband and wife who has met these goals, the husband dies and the



widow is too old to get a job, she's concerned about what's going to happen to her in her old age and if she has the security to know that she has her home paid for and a modest savings account in a bank, she feels alot better and I believe the philosophy of the State of Illinois many years ago in providing a \$20,000 exemption in the inheritance tax was to address itself to the problem, to provide the relief for these very people and now we see terrific inflation increasing the \$20,000 exemption to \$40,000 is no more than a reaffirmation of this earlier committment and I don't think this one Bill is going to cause us to be in here talking about an increase in the Illinois income tax. If we have to raise taxes, it's going to be because of other action taken not because of this Bill."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mrs. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is designed to help the middle income people. The ones that really pay most of the taxes in the United States during their lifetime and also at the time of their death. The poor people don't pay any inheritance tax and the rich people are smart enough to hire lawyers and tax people to get them out of paying inheritance taxes. But the average guy that can't afford to set up tax dodges and tax shelters and dies and his widow has to come up with the inheritance tax money is the one that this is designed to help. And I think it's a good Bill, I think we ought to support it. It isn't going to cost the State of Illinois a sufficient sum of money that it's going to make any difference in the long run. But I've had letters from many widows in my district complaining about the fact that they had to pay inheritance taxes and of course one of the reasons they had to pay it was because they couldn't afford to set up shelters to get around it. So I think this is a Bill that is designed to help the people who pay most of the taxes during their lifetime and I would



and support Representative Londrigan in his effort to override the Governor's veto."

Chapman: "Have all voted who wished? The floor repre...recognizes Representative Stone to explain his vote."

Stone: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that ^{there's} some misunderstanding about this Bill. I believe that some of you are under the...have the idea that this is for rich people. I personally believe that this Bill will help, what I consider the...the upper poor people and the lower middleclass people. Now, the rates charged a widow in the State of Illinois on...on her, the first part of her inheritance is only 2%. If you raise this exemption to \$40,000 instead of leaving it at 20 that would mean \$400 to a widow. Now I don't believe that the \$400 would mean that much difference to a rich person. Any one that owns a home; any modest in central Illinois today, the home would be worth \$40,000. Now this would mean then that the...would mean only that the tax would be instead of being \$400 would be none. I don't think this is helping the rich people. I think this is a Bill that would help the ...the lower middleclass people and I...I believe that... that it should have the 107 votes."

Chapman: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are ...Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Would the Speaker please poll the absentees?"

Chapman: "The Clerk will poll the absentees. Waiting for the roll call, just a moment."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, E. M. Barnes, Capuzzi, Fleck, Giorgi, Giorgi votes aye,..."

Chapman: "Giorgi votes aye."

Jack O'Brien: "Gene Hoffman, Kucharski, Marovitz, McAuliffe, McAvoy, Meyer, Polk,..."

Chapman: "Representative Davis votes aye. Aye for Representative Davis."

Jack O'Brien: "Randolph,..."



Chapman: "Representative Mautino votes aye."

Jack O'Brien: "...Terzich, Totten, Wall, Mr. Speaker."

Chapman: "On this question there are 103 ayes, ...Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Would you please put this on postponed consideration?"

Chapman: "Ah, the gentleman has requested postponed consideration. Postponed consideration. Representative Matijevidich."

Matijevidich: "Madam Seatmate, just to be consistent, I object to putting that on postponed consideration and have that journalized."

Chapman: "Representative Matijevidich objects and asks that his objection be journalized. He is joined by Representative Schlickman. The objection will be noted in the journal. Representative Sangmeister, did you desire to be recognized?"

Sangmeister: "Thank you Madam Speaker, at this time I...having voted on the prevailing side of House Bill 182, I now move to reconsider the vote by it failed. The purpose for making this motion, this is Representative Friedrich's Bill, is after seeing the vote on Representative Londrigan's Bill I think it's the feeling of this House that they are willing to do something for the surviving spouse in this particular area but possibly not for the rest of the relatives that would be involved so that is the basis and the reason for the motion. And I respectfully ask that a vote be taken on this motion."

Chapman: "For what purpose does Representative Friedrich rise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I...I note when I get the official roll call that were 105 ayes, at least 5 people have indicated to me that they would...wanted to vote aye on it but I was precluded by the Chair from asking for a poll of the absentees. And I think that I should be, in view of this motion, we should be accorded the motion."

Chapman: "Ah, on a point of order, Representative Matijevidich."

Matijevidich: "Madam Speaker, I make the point of order that that Bill has been declared lost and that motion now by Repre-



sentative Sangmeister is out of order. And I'd like to have you rule on that Madam Speaker."

Chapman: "Would the gentleman please put his motion in writing and we will consider it when we reach that order of...it is in writing we will consider it when we reach that order of business...motion. And now we have...oh, Representative Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Ah, well, just the understanding it is in writing, so..."

Chapman: "It is in writing."

Sangmeister: "...And we are going to get to that..."

Chapman: "When we reach the order of motions. And now on a point of personal privilege, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Fellow Members of the House, now to me this is the most serious, and I hope it's serious situation in your heart, I frankly say this could be the last time that I could address you. Now we may go to trial Monday,...I'm perfectly happy to do this, I'm not afraid of them, I... the situation is the same as in the Federal Court. But I think you have a right to know something that may happen to you and how this came about. All of you know the background I'm not going to go into that. But I wanted just to make a short resume and I hope you listen to me. On April the 9th, 1974, I was subpoenaed to go before the Grand Jury. I went. I found out they wanted to know about the young man that I had hired to go to the campuses and research for me. They wanted to know about Kickapoo Creek. I told them. But I went right home and between April the 15th 1974 and May the 14th 1974 I got 14 affidavits of people and organizations who knew what I was doing in 1969 and 70. They included the Decatur police, the sheriff's department, the public relations officer of the statewide organization of the American Legion and others. I delivered them personally to the federal prosecutor. I thought it was all over. All they have to do is check out the affidavits. I never paid any more attention to it. In the middle of November 1974 I was



indicted as you all know. In February of 1975 we received according to the law our copy of the transcripts. Not a one of those affidavits had been presented to the federal grand jury. The trial was last August in the middle of the month. Two days and three days, it was on a Monday, the trial started, two days and three days before the trial started, fifteen months after the affidavits had been given to the federal prosecutor they sent federal investigators around to find out if the affidavits were true. To their horror, I suppose, they found every affidavit was the truth. Nevertheless I have to go to trial and spend thousands of dollars. We beat them in that trial as you all know. Now we're in the same trouble again on the same identical charges. We've asked for a continuance from the judge so we could have time to get the federal transcripts to present in my defense. We were not given the time of...for continuance. They'll take at least another month before we can get the federal transcripts because they're two months behind in the printing and in the federal court workload. So last October this October of the 24th, two weeks ago, the Internal Revenue finished their second audit of my affairs. Previously they had audited everybody that had been with me. They audited my brother several times and other members of my family and they came up with nothing, except that \$1,100.00 that I spent going to Kickapoo Creek of state money. And to the campuses, so in October the 24th of this year, they did it...excuse me, a month ago on Monday..."

Chapman: "Representative Borchers, could you draw your remarks to a close, please?"

Borchers: "Pardon?"

Chapman: "Could you bring your remarks to a...to a close?"

Borchers: "I feel...I feel that everyone has a right to know about this. I'm a member of this Legislature and this is a serious matter could happen to everybody here. So on October the...about a month ago they audited again. They came up again with nothing except one thing. I owed the federal



government \$213 because when my wife died in 1964 I continued to be the head of the family in my mind. I moved the day after my wife died, my grandchildren, and my daughter and my son-in-law into the house. Because he pays the food and clothing, he became the head of the family and I didn't know it. So for 5 years, 1970, 71, 72, 73, 74, I owed the federal government a total...income tax...a total of \$213. To our best estimates, of...now of myself and others that know are knowledgeable, they have now spent, the federal government, including the trials and all of that they have spent between 50 and \$60,000 to collect \$213.50. Now just one thing, again, while I possibly have to go to court again on Monday, I feel it's a tremendous injustice; tremendous unnecessary expense, because it's the same thing the charges are again...1,100. And in the federal trial they accepted as facts and never questioned the receipts that I had...that from I have...my research assistant and was signed. They...the federal prosecutor even admitted they knew I had a man on the campuses. Well, if I had a man I have to pay him. Now the 1,100 is...in the new trial the same with...for going to the campuses. The \$100 was for me going to Kickapoo Creek with research assistant. It cost \$30 a car which I'm sure...Harber Hall was here he would substantiate and others know about it. It cost \$30 a car to go into Kickapoo Creek. I paid for two cars, my research assistant, my own. He was a black young man and poor, broke. I gave him \$40 to live off of the three days he was in Kickapoo Creek. So I could lose my seat in the Legislature over not the \$1,100 but because I went to Kickapoo Creek with a research assistant they say this is...this is official misconduct. For \$100 I could lose my seat in the Legislature because I went to Kickapoo Creek and investigators have brought out a bill that is part of it is the law of the State of Illinois that mass assembly's bill and on top of that I put in drug bills based on my... on my investigation. And to make things worse when I was in the hospital and I read, I'm tied up to those machines, last



couple weeks ago, I read in my newspapers that the...the assistant prosecutor in...the court here, the county court, was even stating he was going to go to the judge and ask for a motion that my military record could not be used in my defense. This is a...outrageous. Well, anyway, this is what I'm up against. So it's possible, if I should by some chance lose and I don't think we will, but if I should this would be...I wanted you to know the situation. I think this...business of not allowing me to...to...the thing the holding of the law unconstitutional that affects everyone here should be challenged by you. I think you should challenge this. It isn't in my behalf. I don't mind going to trial. I didn't mind going to the federal court, we beat 'em and I think we'll beat 'em again. But one other thing in closing I wanted to point out. Here are all these reporters, everyone of them as you well know, if one of us steps out of line or even...they think we get out of line they'll write all the adverse stories they can about you. They will run us down. Will do everything they can to hurt you. But never would they take up an obvious injustice, legal and morally justice to a member here and defend him on double jeopardy. I would...I don't think they'll do a damn thing about it and they should. So anyway...so anyway I want to close that and let you know exactly what has been going on and what the situation is up to date. And I hope to hell we win and shove it down their throats."

Chapman: "The Clerk...the Clerk has an announcement regarding the calendar."

Jack O'Brien: "On the calendar on page 9 under item veto motions relating to House Bill 1079 the calendar incorrectly lists Kosinski as the Sponsor of the motion. It should be John D'Arco."

Chapman: "Ah, Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Madam Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to withdraw my motion to override House Bill 2988. This is the Bill that changes the primary date from March to May."



And I just want to say candidates circulate your petitions."

Chapman: "Ah, does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections the...the Bill...the motion is withdrawn. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, relating to total veto motions on House Bill 1610, two weeks ago Senator Schaffer came over to me and said John I'm working with the Governor's Office to try to increase next year's budget for dredging of the Chain o Lakes to \$500,000. He said if I'm successful, and he's the Senate Sponsor of House Bill 1610, he said I'd like to have that withdrawn. He came over to me yesterday and said he's been successful in that effort and I'm going to now withdraw on my motion of House Bill 1610."

Chapman: "Does the gentleman have leave? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the prior as he said mentions...spoke to me the other day and said he did have information, that he did meet with Senator Schaffer; since this Bill affects my county and he did say that the speaker who just spoke, Representative from my 31st District, said that he thought he could get a commitment from the Governor. Is that correct, ah...ah..."

Matijevich: "That...that's right, Adeline, and that's why I wanted to mention on the floor of the House, it's going to be on the tape. The commitment is there. We're getting a letter from..."

Chapman: "Ah, there will be no demonstrations. Ah, I...I would hate to ask the guards to clear the gallery, so there will be no demonstration. Ah, will the guests in the gallery please remove the sign. This is not permitted. The House rules do not permit this. Will the guests please remove the sign so that we do not have to ask that the gallery be cleared? Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "There is also a photographer up there, I don't see the light lit for photographer."

Chapman: "Under the rules there will be no pictures, no cameras"



please. Unless the red light is on it is not. Okay.

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Adeline, I really didn't have those cheerleaders come in our behalf but all I can say is that we are also getting a letter from Mr. 'Eisele' to have this commitment in writing and for...for the first time we're going to have an ongoing dredging program in the Chain o Lakes."

Chapman: "Ah, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the reason I asked Representative Matijevich is that Senator Schaffer told me that he discussed with you and that you told him you thought you could get a commitment from Governor Walker to clean up that awful mess in the Chain o Lakes because you know and I know that all of our representatives, you and I and...."

Chapman: "Thank you Representative Geo-Karis. The Chair... recognizes Representative Shea." Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, perhaps our guests are not familiar with the Rules of the House and perhaps if the Speaker explains to them the Rules of the House and that they are our guests here they would understand more."

Chapman: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Shea, I...I believe that...that your point is well taken. We do not permit demonstrations under the House Rules. Representative Geo-Karis, I beg your pardon, have you and Representative Matijevich concluded your conversation?"

Geo-Karis: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to finish as long as Representative Matijevich has assured me of that then I don't have any objection to him withdrawing his motion."

Chapman: "Is there any objection? Then the...hearing none, the motion is withdrawn. Are there any...are there any further motions? Representative...Representative Shea."

Shea: "Again I ask the Speaker if she would kindly explain the Rules of the House to our guests."



Chapman: "Ah, Mr. Shea, it appeared to me that our...our guests did understand that, they will listen quietly and...and we're following the...the rules, we do not permit demonstrations. We do not permit signs or pictures to be taken unless the red light is on. I will have to request that you leave unless there is order. I believe that our guests are maintaining decorum and I would ask that the House cooperate. While we have had some requests for motions to be withdrawn is there anyone else who would like to assist in cleaning up our...our calendar? Representative Palmer from Cook."

Palmer: "In the melee here, Madam Speaker, I...we got lost in the order of business. As Mr. Matijevich had a Bill that he with...motion that he withdrew. I don't know what the Bill number was, I...and I don't remember the Speaker having said what the Bill number was and I'd like to get some sort of...of memorandum or at least know what Bill we're talking about."

Chapman: "Ah, it's House Bill 1610, and it was announced Representative, and Representative Matijevich should provide a fairly lengthy discussion as to the subject..."

Palmer: "Well, I'm not...he did withdraw his motion to override. Is that correct?"

Chapman: "That is...that is correct."

Palmer: "All right. Thank you."

Chapman: "Ah, on the calendar under total vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 396. The Chair recognizes Representative Younge.

Younge: "Would you put that on postponed consideration please?"

Chapman: "Did you wish to take it out of the record, Representative Younge?"

Younge: "Temporarily, yes."

Chapman: "It will be taken out of the record. We may not get back to it, however, Representative Younge.



Chapman: "On the Calendar under total vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 729. The Chair recognizes Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 729 provides for assessment of real estate used for at least three years for open space purposes based on its value as open space rather than as some alternative use. Under the Bill, open space would be valued on the basis of fair cash value estimated at the price it would bring at a fair, voluntary sale for use by the buyer for open space purposes. House Bill 729 provides for treatment of open space of ten acres or more just as the present law treats agricultural lands. It permits the assessment of such land on the basis of its current use rather than its highest and best use. In this manner, I hope to aid the retention of open space for the scenic and ecological enhancement of communities in my area as well as other areas in the State of Illinois. This measure passed the House by a vote of 119 to 6 and passed the Senate by a vote of 54 to 2. Now many of you have heard there is debate on this Bill and I'd like to point out to you briefly some of the safeguards against abuses. Number 1, this Bill excludes land used primarily for residential purposes. Number 2, the owner of the land must file an application for an open space use. This application will be defined by the Department of Revenue and the assessors or supervisor of assessments of the various counties must approve and use the application it set forth. The current use value, in number 3, the current use value is still up to the local assessors. For instance, an area up in the northern part of Illinois might be valued differently as an area down in the southern part of Illinois. Also, if the land is sold, then a three roll back provision applies with a 5% interest if it's sold at a higher assessment than the assessor places on it. And lastly, counties over 200,000 population may define or adopt their own classification ordinance which would exclude them from the application of this Bill. What that means is all of Cook County is presently excluded from this Bill since they have adopted a classification ordinance. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one phone call, one phone call is all that was away from this Bill being signed into law. One phone call that the Governor of



this State could of placed to the Sponsors of this Bill. That phone call was not coming. I think he made error in not passing this Bill into law and I urge your continued support of this Bill and for you to vote to support, to override the Governor's veto."

Chapman: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman. Is, is your mike on now? Representative Greiman's mike."

Greiman: "Thank you, Ms. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah... Bills often have a tag name, a shortened common name. For example, Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act, Senior Citizens Tax Relief Act, but if I was going to give this Bill a short title, I would call it the Country Club Tax Relief Act of 1975 because in a sense, that's precisely what it is. It uses some vague concepts of open space purposes and that's, those, that's a quote from the Bill which is supposed to instill in us some notion that it's an environmental Bill. It's an environmental Bill indeed if you happen to own a country club, I think. It serves no real public purpose in that sense. It does nothing for the environment as its Sponsors would somehow try and convey to you. To the contrary the areas that are most often the beneficiary of this are not in the public domain, are not public purpose property, but are very much restricted. Restricted by who you are, by what kind of use you would make of it. I think to give ah... relief to this particular classification of citizens may be noble indeed, but we have many other people in need before we get down to the country clubs. I should say that there is another group also which would benefit ah... in this and that's real estate speculators who've taken land, who will be buying land at the edge of a city, waiting for the urban area to cut, to need it and during those few years, there will be a period when real estate speculators will also be benefited. Somehow in a General Assembly which has talked about serving the needs of really needy people, I think this Bill is out of place. I think we should not just lay off our buttons, but I think we should vote 'no' on this. 'No' on this special interest Bill such as this. Thank you, Ms. Speaker."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. If the Sponsor would yield to a question?"



Chapman: "He says he will yield."

Palmer: "My ah... my notes indicate that the ah... it exempts counties under 200,000. Is that correct?"

Chapman: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "No, no, it does not exempt counties under 200,000. Counties over 200,000 by constitution may classify real property. Those counties that have adopted a classification ordinance are excluded. For instance, Cook County is excluded from this Bill."

Palmer: "Well, does this meet the constitutional requirement ah... in Article IX, Section 4, in your opinion?"

Daniels: "Specifically, your question is ah... what, Representative?"

Palmer: "Well does it uniformity of ah... of ah... real estate assessment ah... and there is some classification in the constitutional provision, does it meet those requirements?"

Daniels: "I don't think the Bill causes any problems for the constitutional provisions at all, Representative."

Palmer: "Thank you."

Chapman: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Will the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions please?"

Chapman: "He indicates he will yield."

Stubblefield: "Representative, is it correct that this Bill makes an exclusion of clubs ah... country clubs that would not come under the provision of present use?"

Daniels: "I'm not sure that I completely understand your question, but country clubs would be included under the terms of this Bill as would historical land sites, ecological areas, recreational areas, hiking areas, camping areas, and other defined uses within the Bill."

Stubblefield: "And the effect would be what?"

Daniels: "The effect would be that the assessor or supervisor of assessments would assess the use that it's put to as that use. The fair cash value as that use. For instance, a camping area would be assessed as a camping area and not based upon the surrounding land values that might be a great deal higher. The purpose of that, Representative, is to encourage the retention of the open space."

Stubblefield: "Now if the veto is sustained and the present law in is, in



existence, isn't it correct that clubs could be assessed ah... at a rate that would almost preclude their existence?"

Daniels: "Well, as a matter of fact it's absolutely true and that is exactly what's happening in some parts of our state. The ones that are primarily concerned with the enactment of this Bill are rapidly developing urban areas such as DuPage, areas around Peoria and as a matter of fact, right here in Springfield where we have areas that are developing quickly that will have assessments based upon surrounding land values and if these clubs or recreational areas or ecological areas as defined in the Bill are assessed based upon highest and best use then will, in my opinion, be taxed right out of business. Now there's another part to that, Representative, because if they are developed as residential communities or condominiums on this open space land, there is a fantastic drain on the municipal services that have to furnish services to them. For instance, there will be a need for fire protection, police protection, sewer and, and ah... sanitary systems development which is very expensive to municipal services. And in actuality, it's my opinion, that it would be extremely expensive to the taxpayers if these areas were lost to our development societies."

Stubblefield: "Thank you."

Chapman: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Madame Speaker, will the ah... Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Chapman: "He indicates he will yield."

Griesheimer: "First, I'd like to inquire what the effect of home rule is on the ah... on the present Bill?"

Daniels: "There is no effect of home rule on the present Bill."

Griesheimer: "Under the present Bill as submitted and passed previously ah... are we facing the situation where the land speculators in the Lake and DuPage and Will will be able to latch on to this property at cheap prices and cheap taxes and then cash in on it a few years later?"

Daniels: "Representative, I'm glad that you asked that question for the following reason. I want to point out very clearly that first of all before land can qualify as open space under this definition it must be held as such for a period of three years. Then if it's sold for a higher



assessment, there is the three year roll back provision. Number 1, this law, this Bill has been patterned after our agricultural exemption that's already law. Many of the provisions in that exemption and alternate evaluation are contained within the open space Bill and I think that's important thing to keep in mind. Did that answer your question?"

Griesheimer: "Yes, it does. One other question if I may, is this a new statute ah... in the United States or are there any other states that have similar legislation?"

Daniels: "Representative, there are 16 states in the United States that have passed similar legislation to this. The Bill that's before you now has been patterned after the State of Oregon's legislation which is in effect. It's operating and to my knowledge, operating well."

Griesheimer: "Ah... The last inquiry I'd have ah... We're talking about this applying to country clubs. I know there are many other areas involved. I wonder, ah... would this cover private airports?"

Daniels: "I believe that ah... this particular Bill in its present state ah... would not apply to private airports, Representative. All right, I would invite you to review the definition that's contained in the first part of the Bill. The definition as I mentioned earlier has been patterned after the Oregon law and is set forth almost identical to the law of that state that's in, in ah... force right now and applies mainly to areas of open space which are dedicated to the purposes set forth in the law."

Griesheimer: "Thank you."

Chapman: "Ah... When we conclude our action on this proposal, we will break for about an hour for lunch. Ah... The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 729 would make a significant change in our Revenue Act. The real estate assessment practices in 101 counties and thereby the real estate base therein would be permanently changes. At the outset, I think this measure is probably unconstitutional under Article IX, Section 4 as has been pointed out on unit... that's the Uniformity Article. No one knows what the cost of this Bill would be to school districts and other units of local government. Conceivably under the



definition in this Bill, hundreds of thousands of acres would be taxed at their open space use value. Here we are contending public school aid, concerned both about increasing state taxes and also about increasing local property taxes, faced with a proposal not to provide equitable tax relief, but about virtually taking untold millions of dollars in land assessments permanently off our tax rolls. The Sponsors referred to lowering, not eliminating the assessed value, but how will 101 assessing counties lower the value. What is open space value of a 20 acre track that enhances the scenic resources. I have received some mail as far as I can exclusively from members of country clubs. They almost all complain that without this Bill their club will be taxed at quote, 'highest and best', unquote. That term is not applicable to assessment law. It is strictly a concept used in zoning law. The statutory and case law refers to three standards in assessment, fair cash market value, replacement costs, and annualized returns. The County of Cook uses annualized returns in making its assessment and it does so on the basis of the present law. This is apart from his power to classify. If he can do so, so can the assessors and the other 101 counties. This is really not an open space Bill in the sense of legitimate preservation of ecological, historical, or environmental value, but to the extent that it is, there are far better approaches. This is no time for the State to open the pocketbook of local schools, parks, libraries, and municipalities to the country club set or to real estate developers and speculators. To the, to the talk about urbanization and I'm sympathetic to those, to those values, I suggest that we do something meaningful about land use practices. The nostrum of tax subsidies of the Federal, State, or Local levels should of long been abandoned. It's been said that there's a safeguard here on the three year tax roll back. Now three years taxes, back taxes for a 10 year tax break is a deal that any land owner would grab. Moreover on a sale, the two year tax pick up is probably all deductible in that year as an ordinary expense. In conclusion, if we have a genuine concern for the preservation of open spaces, we should go back to the drawing board. Our subsidies should be clear, direct, controlled and measurable. It should not make a shambles of our already greatly weakened local property tax base."



Chapman: "The gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I wonder how many of us as we go back to our districts pick up the local paper and read about your county forest preserve appropriation and their desperate attempt to buy open land wherever it comes up and the peoples willingness to pay for it. I wonder how many of you recall the Department of Conservations appropriation budget that had line after line after line of acquiring new open space. Now I remind you of existing facilities that are open. Now the investments in them of peoples lives invested in them and they are open spaces. They are some of the more attractive peop... pieces of our environment particularly, of course, in the urban settings. Now I suggest to you that regardless and the previous speaker made some good points, but regardless of those points keeping somebody in business is one hell of a lot cheaper than starting up back at the drawing board ah..., Mr. Speaker and the previous speaker. There just is no comparison to the ecological principle that we hang on to what we've got. We all know what happened to the South Shore Country Club if you want to talk about country clubs. We all know what has happened to pieces of property after pieces of property that had to go the public route to be saved because they could no longer be kept up because of the increasing tax burden and I submit to you that this approach is a fair one. It's a responsible one and we do not have to go back to zero to preserve the land we've got and I suggest and 'aye' on this override."

Chapman: "The ah... Representative from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I stand here in full and complete ah... support of the Sponsor in what he is attempting to do here. I certainly think that we have had a precedent set here ah... by ah... actually by this Hous here in that we have recognized that land for agricultural purposes certainly is not taxed at its highest and best use, but is agricultural land and I'd like to point out, too that open space whether it be public or private golf course, certainly is an asset to any community and it does attract some mighty fine housing and residential ah... community around it. I'd like to emphasize it is not a burden actually to the



schools or to anything else and I know this has been answered, but I'd like to point out again to the people who were saying that this would probably add to the increase of some speculation. I think the Sponsor is certainly addressed himself in this legislation where he has a roll back there for three years plus a 5% interest on the basis of a higher assessment if it did result from any new use and I'd like to emphasize again I support the Sponsor 100% in what he is attempting to do. Thank you."

Chapman: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah... Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is nothing wrong with this Bill. There no school districts opposing this Bill. The reason they don't oppose is it helps them. There's nothing worse for school districts than having a golf course which is and I don't play golf by the way, a golf course which is paying taxes cut up and divided up by some developer throwing a burden on the school districts and not paying proper taxes to support those children. These golf courses that are private will continue to pay taxes, but they will pay taxes at the economic use to which they are devoted. Now is the highest and best use by some developer is going to come in as happened in Edgewater Golf Club, rip it up, put in a high-rise and the State finally had to, had to take part of it for a State Park. That didn't even work out very well. Why not keep the open space which is often in flood plains, have it pay its reasonable share of taxes, and at the same time avoid the overdevelopment of the metropolitan area. Now many Cook County people spoke against this Bill, yet Cook County is exempt under this Bill. Why is Cook County exempt? Because Cook County has this now. You're living with it now. Open space in Cook County is assessed at 22% of fair market value. Apartment buildings are assessed at 33% of fair market value. Commercial industry at 40%. You have this so-called break right now in your own county and yet you deny it those counties that don't classify real estate. These golf courses will continue to pay taxes. They do not produce children. They do not produce police and fire department obligations and responsibilities. They serve as flood plain. They serve as run off area. They're flooded in the spring in many cases and it's



a legitimate use of open space. We did this with the Farmers in the metropolitan area by allowing them to be taxed as farm areas until sold the three year pickup. That's worked out well, there hasn't been abuses there. That Bill worked and so will this and therefore I don't think this Bill has any negative features that we have been told about. The schools don't oppose the Bill. Not one school district in the State that was park district in the State has written any one of you opposing this Bill. The only one that opposes it is the assessors, why because they like to stick the country clubs so they can give breaks to industry and apartment developers in their community, they stick the country clubs because those people don't vote right in their township where there are elected assessors. That's why the assessors in their narrowness, their rigidity, their backwardness oppose this Bill because they say let's give it to that golf course they don't vote in my Township and then we'll give a break to the sub-divider that gave me my campaign contribution. And that's why the assessors in McHenry County and these other counties oppose this Bill. The school teachers don't oppose it, the school administrators don't oppose it, the school boards don't oppose it. This is a good Bill. It preserves open space and the only one against it are those few assessors who like to stick it to absentee owners."

Chapman: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Except as otherwise provided in this section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation appertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law. This Bill is the most blatant violation of that section of our State Constitution that I have seen. Neither the Sponsor's County of DuPage or any other County with more than 200,000 people including the County of the previous speaker need this Bill. All their County Boards need is the guts to pass a classification ordinance like Cook County has passed. And Lake County, they indeed too like to subsidize industry, they indeed do now subsidize country clubs. And you know who ends up paying the Bill in Lake County. It's the poor little homeowner who doesn't have a lawyer to go to the County Board of Review and get his taxes lowered. House Bill 729 in my opinion will allow private country clubs with greens that cost over \$22,000 a piece to be assessed much lower than the homes your taxpayers live in. You



may find that defensible, but I do not. A key issue which Representative Kane raised on this Floor when the issue was first debated was that this will be this will allow Illinois to become one of two States according to the Washington Post editorial of April 15, 1975 which has been distributed that will allow that will force not allow force every homeowner in this State to subsidize the playgrounds of the rich. Now if the country club liberals and my colleagues who are conservative country club members but believe in equal protection under the Law except when the Law gets to them want to pass this Bill, fine. But I have confidence that the Illinois Supreme Court even though it may take them six or seven years will figure out finally that this is an unconstitutional Bill. The definition of open space in this Bill is as loose as a goose. The unsold portion of an industrial park would qualify as open space. They are offering it for \$50,000 an acre good old Arthur Rubwaw for someone like that in DuPage County. But it would be assessed for no use because it is supporting open space. Now you try justifying that to your local homeowners organization. Now the assessors are opposed to this. At least the Northern Illinois Assessors association and you ask why. This is not the State Assessors Organization which I would certainly agree is not your most progressive organization running around as far as property tax evaluation and reform goes. This is what the State organization would call a rough group. There for making things work the way the Constitutional Fathers and Mothers God Bless them want things to work. I would suggest to those of you in Counties like myself which have under 200,000 people that Representative Maragos the Chairman of the House Revenue Committee introduce this week a Constitutional Amendment which will allow every County the same privilege that Counties of over 200,000 people now have to classify property for purposes of property taxation. 14 members of the Revenue Committee are Co-Sponsors which assures that Bill will get to the Floor. All we have to do is convince our State Senators to pass a similar Constitutional Amendment. To pass it and allow us to vote on it in November, 1976 and be legitimate and I would stress the word legitimate goals of the Sponsor of this Bill which I think are real and that is to preserve open space can be accomplished. I would urge a no vote on this override and a yes vote on the Constitutional Amendment that will really solve the problem that Representative Daniels



seeks to solve."

Chapman: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Chapman: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question now be put. All in favor please say aye, opposed no. The ayes have it, does the Gentleman from DuPage Representative Daniels desire to close."

Daniels: "Very briefly Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have heard alot of debate on this Bill and I want to point out to you a few facts. The fact of the matter is that this Legislation that we have before the House right now is already in law in several other states and working well. The fact of the matter is that if these properties are taken off our tax rolls by the purchase of forest preserve districts that will cause harm to the homeowners and the people in our areas. That is what will be disastrous. This Bill is pure and simple. Pure and simple meant to maintain the open space areas of this great State. That's the purpose for it. I ask you and solicit your yes vote to override a mistaken veto. And I thank you very much for your previous support and for your present support."

Chapman: "The question is shall House Bill 729 pass the veto of the Governor not withstanding. All in favor please vote aye, opposing nay. To explain his vote, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a measure that those who oppose can find all kinds of cliches and zero in on the country clubs and so forth, but the truth of the matter is that we are talking about a question of equity and justice in taxation. Regardless of what it said about who will benefit from this we are really not talking about any provisions of tax relief. We're talking about whether or not uses of real estate shall be taxed at their actual use or whether they shall be taxed on the basis of the property that surrounds them. I support this measure and I support it for a number of reasons. I think that it is basically a question of fairness. We may be talking about people who belong to country clubs and country clubs and country club owners, but country club owners are entitled to as much fairness under our tax laws as any other citizen. I think the comments that were made by some of the prior speakers



in support of this measure were absolutely true. What's happening is as urban areas encroach upon our open spaces and surround them the assessors are being forced to assess property at least under our law though in fact they do not they are being forced under the law to assess property at its highest and best use. It is not the use which it's being put to. And if we are going to preserve those uses which none of us would quarrel with the idea that those uses are beneficial to the community, then we have to tax them fairly. All this Bill does is say tax that use at its actual cash value. Not at an inflated value as a result of the urban encroachment around it. I think it is a fair proposition. It is one that is going to be helpful in preserving some of the natural resources that we have in this State and I would urge your support."

Chapman: "The Lady from Dupage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you Madame Speaker, I would like to affirm what the previous Speaker has just said and in explaining my yes vote I would like to state one more point in the light of fair play and equity in taxation. We're talking about classifying really land according to its actual use which Cook County of course is already privileged to do. Now for those of you who are surrounding homeowners in a school district and you have a golf course that would fall into this category and if your afraid that this alternate assessment would make your tax bill go up, let me give you just one fact. The real estate association in DuPage County and Commonwealth Edison did a study of the affect of classified taxation of holding land for open space. They did it for the DuPage County forest preserve commission. They brought out the fact that a single family home in DuPage County and this would apply to Lake, McHenry, Will and Kane, that the single family home only picks up 82% of what it demands in services. In other words you as a homeowner are 18 percentage points ahead to have this land classified as open space. You come out ahead. Now, not only do you benefit by the quality of the environment but by keeping these golf courses and other kinds of open space from falling to the developers bulldozer and having the developer put 100 single family homes in this area and sending 2 and a half children to your school system and adding your tax Bill, you have a chance here to provide equity for the homeowners in this District. You remember the Case of the Edgewater Golf Course



South Shore has been mentioned. This is a good bill for the whole metropolitan area and I urge the Representatives from the populated Counties to get on this Bill and vote yes for fair play and to preserve open space."

Chapman: "Just a moment for a slight announcement regarding a slight change in plans where lunch is concerned. It has been called to our attention that there is a special session due to convene at 1:00 so the lunch break at this point will not be until after the two special sessions are concluded. Now the Lady from Cook, Representative Catania to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you Madame Speaker and Members of the House. I do feel that it is necessary for the record to clarify the matter of the South Shore Country Club which has been mentioned a couple of times in this discussion. What happened to the South Shore Country Club is the people that use to support it moved away because they didn't want to live in that part of the City anymore. So its basic support is gone and I think we all know about that although we may not all know what happened to the South Shore Country Club. Where it is now is in a situation where maybe the public will finally get a chance to use that section of the Lake Front so I think that it is in a different category and I just think that it is important to have that in the record to clear that up."

Chapman: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo Karis: "Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I think we had better keep in mind that when the forest preserve buys land, that land goes off the tax rolls, but if somebody privately owes land or a country club owns land they still pay taxes. Now if you would rather see open spaces messed up with these horrible developments of housing that look terrible in some areas and we have them in mine well that's fine but just remember if the owner of the land can have some tax incentive to keep it open at least it won't be messed up as fast and Representative Pierce from the 32nd District was absolutely right when the developer cuts up a country club as he is planning to do in the west end of my County and make these housing units he is going to overrun those schools. I have been in school I know something about it and I have dealt with these elements and made finances against them. I don't think we are being very fair. If we do give certain status to agricultural lands



I certainly think we had better keep in mind that if forest preserves County Bodies buying your land certainly it is a less burden to the person who owned it and you have not tax coming in. I think this is a good bill for your areas and I urge more green votes up there."

Chapman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I just wanted to acknowledge a conflict of interest. I do belong to a country club but since it is in Cook County I think it removes the conflict so if you have no objection I will vote on this measure."

Chapman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Nevermind."

Chapman: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will please take the record. On this question there are 87 ayes 46 naves and 10 voting present and this Bill failing to receive the necessary three-fifths vote, the motion is declared lost. And on this motion, veto is sustained."



Chapman: "Introduction of Bills."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3202. Berman, etal. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3203. Schneider. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capitol Development Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise for a very brief moment on a point of personal privilege, if I might."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Tipsword: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had just had occasion very recently in the last few minutes to see an article in a newspaper which I very seldom have the opportunity to read. This was in the Chicago Tribune purporting to be a story about pressure exhibited upon various Legislators in regard to the override of House Bill 2971. In that article I am quoted extensively. I wish to state absolutely and unequivocally that on this purported issue I have been quizzed many times; I have each time refused to make any comments and I have made no public comments whatsoever in regards to this purported issue. I disavow every quotation included in that article and regret that I even had the opportunity to see it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, many Members have asked me to make the question be...you've been very good during the regular Session and probably have extended our heartbeats because you've allowed us to go to lunch but a number of them have asked me that...to ask the Chair because this is our last day they think if we go to lunch and then it always takes an hour after lunch to come back that maybe we should just keep on working. And maybe if we could get an expression of the Membership, I think maybe if we got an expression of the Membership whether they'd like to have lunch or whether they'd like to keep on working because it is our last day."

Speaker Redmond: "The frustrating thing about the gentleman from Lake is he's clairvoyant and he reads the mind of the



NOV 6 1975

68

Chair. It was my intention to put that matter to a vote, informally. The question is whether we're going to take a lunch break for about one hour after we recess. All in favor of the break indicate by saying aye. Opposed, no. Unable to determine. All in favor vote aye; aye vote is that you want an hour lunch break; no is that you want to work right through. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. It's very unofficial and informal but it looks like the House would rather...is customary that the House wants to stay in order. Representative Bradley. Representative Bradley. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move that the Regular Session stand in recess until 1:30..."

Speaker Redmond: "After the recess of the..."

Bradley: "After the recess of the First Special Session and the Second Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. The opposed, no. The ayes have it. Stand in recess until after the adjournment of the Second Special Session. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived the First Special Session is now in order."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of motions. On the order of motions appears the motion with respect to House Bill 2 by Representative Bradley. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I filed two motions in respect to House Bill 2 and I would like to...ah, in fact I have to move on the second motion which is to discharge the Committee and on that motion, I would like to first say that I've always had a high respect for our committee system and in no way does this reflect upon the Education Committee and the action during the hearing or what took place at that time. It's



simply a matter that because of the delay, in fact, to my knowledge, the best of my knowledge, as of this morning when we came into Session in the First Special Session there was no report from the Committee Chairman regarding that action of that Committee. And I have no other recourse than to make a motion to discharge that Committee to bring that before the...this Body, the House Bill 2, and I fully realize that we cannot talk about the issue and I do not intend to because the issue today in the motion is simply to take from that Committee and bring to the floor of the House. The ...the night of the meeting, there were also three members of the Education Committee who were replaced by other members and therefore I believe is a point to consider when considering the discharge motion. The action of the House yesterday also makes it of paramount importance that we have a vehicle such as House Bill 2 available to us, in lieu of the fact that we have some \$20,000 available to us without a method of distributing those dollars in any way at all. And House Bill 2 does do that. I would respectfully request that every member I know that is not the habit of the...this Body to support a discharge of a Committee because we all have great respect for it. However, this is the first time to my knowledge since I've been here that after a Committee hearing that we failed to have a report placed on the Clerk's desk of what the action was in that particular Committee through no fault of mine and I'm simply asking you to give us every consideration and it...I think a precedent that has been set here that we did not have a report and I think no matter what your feelings might be towards the particular Bill and the merits of it on Second or Third Reading, so be it. But I do think that every Bill should be given the opportunity to have a hearing in the Committee to be brought from the Committee to the floor one way or the other. And that simply did not happen in this particular Committee so I ask for your consideration on my motion to discharge that Committee and keep that Bill alive. Thank you Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education has in fact submitted a report with respect to House Bill 2. I was not aware of that at the time. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Ah, could I ask, sir, when that report was filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "It was filed this morning."

Bradley: "Well, again, I don't think that it does a whole lot with my motion except it was filed this morning, the...the Committee met last Wednesday evening. It took over a week for that report to get here and does nothing insofar as affecting the motion that I make now to discharge that Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Bradley, it would seem to me that the other motion to take from the Speaker's table requires the same vote and I would prefer that...to keep the order..."

Bradley: "I...will change my motion and I was not aware that that was filed and now we can take it from the table so..."

Speaker Redmond: "The first thing we have to do is to read committee reports. Go back to that order."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 2, First Special Session was referred reported the same back with the amendments thereto with the recommendation the amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do not pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Now Representative Bradley with respect to the motion."

Bradley: "All right, Mr. Speaker, now the motion...I would change my motion to take from the Speaker's table House Bill 2 in the First Special Session and I renew that motion for the same reasons I reiterated regarding the discharge of Committee and I personally like this motion much better than the discharge but to take from the Speaker's table and I renew that motion. I think I might...clear up because I've been asked as to just why we're in this situation. For a number of reasons. Number one, a member of the Committee



from what I understand after the hearing made a motion to reconsider the vote of that particular Committee and so it necessitated the...Bill being left in that Committee evidently, they could not make a report until this morning. So there were some people in that Committee, evidently, that after consideration for one reason or another made a motion to reconsider, at least were thinking about making that motion evidently did, I don't know what action was taken on that motion. But evidently they had some second thoughts so again, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion to take from the Speaker's table House Bill 2 of the First Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Well, first,...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first I rise on a point of order pursuant to Rule 65, motion to take from the table may not be taken up until it appears on the daily calendar and I don't believe that it appears so I think you..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been on the calendar for several days."

Berman: "The motion to take from the table? Well..."

Speaker Redmond: "Right. There were two motions filed. One to take from the table and one to discharge the Committee."

Berman: "Well,...."

Speaker Redmond: "And they've been on the calendar."

Berman: "...Let me ask a parliamentary inquiry. I'm confused here. The Bill was in the Committee and if the Committee did not report it out is it proper to take from the table, the Bill was still in Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "It wouldn't have been...whether it was originally put in there but it is now; the motion is here, it is on the calendar...the...it has the same affect as the other motion to discharge. It's either here on the Speaker's table or it's not and it takes 89, same majority, same results, same everything. So...the ruling of the Chair it is in order and you desire to address yourself to the motion."

Berman: "All right, then I...I will pursue on the motion, this Bill received a full and complete hearing in the Committee



on Elementary and Secondary Education. Witnesses were down and testified both for the Bill and against the Bill. I think one of the most relevant issues that were testified to was from...the Board...from the Office of Education that indicated that the Bill was..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I refrained from talking about the legislation completely and the Rules of the House as the gentleman now speaking realizes, he can only address himself to that motion not to any testimony given by the Board of Education. We're on the motion. I wish he would keep his remarks to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The point is well taken. Confine your remarks to the motion."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill received a full and complete hearing in the Committee. If we are going to have any basis for relying upon our Committee action I think that the motion has to be opposed. The vote in that Committee was 13 to 8. That's 21 people being present that evening in that Committee. It was a full and complete hearing. The Bill was voted down and I would urge a no vote on the motion to take from the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was present at the hearing on House Bill 2 and I just want to add my voice to Representative Berman's voice. I was one of the 13 who voted that this Bill do not pass. In fact, I made the motion. I do feel there was a full and complete hearing. Everyone that was present voted the way they voted for whatever the reason but the hearing was a full and complete and I believe that the hearing was fair and the Committee worked well. We worked late into the night and I would urge a negative vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I share



the convictions of the previous speakers, there was in depth hearings on legislation, in fact some of the best I think we've heard in this Session and I would ask that the Bill not be taken from the table. And solicit a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I appreciate the gentlemen's keeping their remarks to...to the motion and I will certainly do the same. But as I said earlier, and I didn't hear anybody say that I was wrong, at least in the seven years that I've been here that I can ever remember a Bill being left in a Committee after a vote was taken for a period of over a week so to delay the action of the floor of the House and Representative Berman makes a...a excellent point in requesting, you know, how can we address this when it was just filed. The motion was just filed by the Committee Chairman. Or the results of the vote and the action of that Committee and that brings about...it magnifies the frustration of the Sponsor of that legislation that the Chairman would not get that report to the table...and leave me no alternative but the take the action that I have taken. And as I say, I think it is a precedent. I simply ask you to give the motion every consideration, regarding...regardless of your feeling about that particular legislation. But I hope you can feel as I do and put yourself in my situation in struggling for a piece of legislation and having it delayed in a Committee for whatever reason and never having had that done to the best of my knowledge before. It simply leaves me no alternative but to make this motion to take from the table so we can keep it alive and I ask...for your support on the motion."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, do you seek recognition? Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "Explain my vote. I was waiting to explain my vote. I thought you had called for the question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...no, that well, that was the closing. The question is shall House Bill 2 be taken from the Speaker's table and placed on the order of Second Reading. All in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Takes 89 votes. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As one of the members...the Elementary and Secondary Education that heard this Bill I would like to add my voice with Representative Bradley in saying that the procedure...the procedure we followed was most unusual. I cannot recall ever having taken the...this much time to allow the Sponsor the opportunity to override...to discharge Committee. I think it's an excellent Bill. It was a close vote in Committee; there is much sympathy for it. We do not know what the Senate will do with the override of the School Funding Formula. If we choose to kill this one today and the Senate chooses to kill the full funding measure we stand to lose this \$22,000,000 for the schools. We all ready had a direct commitment yesterday from 89 people on the floor of this House that said the schools must have the money. This is another opportunity to do precisely the same. It needs only 89 votes as did the Bill yesterday and I suggest that the people up there should change their votes and pass this...this Bill to the floor of the House. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, anyone putting a red light up on there is a gambler of course and we have a lot of gamblers I suppose legislatively. If we kill this vehicle we are burning one of the bridges behind us. A green light up there is a light in favor of bringing out onto the House floor so that we have it available as a vehicle a Bill that simply says we want to help out our schools and provide that no



Illinois school is going to get less money this year than they got...last year. It's a hold harmless Bill. Now you can gamble, you can say let's kick to the Governor's idea here, let's kill it. But imagine this. Suppose the override Bill, the big one is killed in the Senate. Suppose 1493 doesn't emerge from the Senate. And suppose Representative Hoffman who is also voting red here, suppose his idea doesn't fly? We have killed this one and we go home with nothing. And then a lot of you are going to have to answer to this...roll call. They'll say where were you when the hold harmless Bill. There's money in here for Waukegan. There's money for school districts all over the place. And I would think at least you want to keep alive an option so that when all else fails if it does you can go back and say I did something for my schools. And I strongly encourage an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "To explain my vote..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bradley: "1493 has all ready been killed in the Senate. Just a...just a few hours ago and I would like to call the attention to those members who voted green yesterday for whatever reasons. In that Bill there was \$81,000,000. \$61,000,000 can be used to fund that formula and \$20,000,000 to do something else. Now if you don't have a vehicle and you don't have a way to spend the \$20,000,000 you don't get it. So any downstate member that's sitting here today and voted green yesterday and he's voting red today is doing absolutely nothing for his school. There's no guarantee that 493 is going to come out of that Senate and back over here. So all you get is the full funding/\$61,000,000 and the 81...including that 20 goes right down the drain. So if you think you want to do something for your school and that's what you indicated yesterday with the green light, you better keep something alive and some way to distribute those dollars. And if they uphold the veto in the Senate



and that Bill, that 81,000,000 goes to the Board of Education there is nothing in the statute that gives them the ability to distribute the dollars anyplace. 1493 is gone. 493 needs a lot of amending. It has to be...go to a conference committee...or we have to bring it back over here to concur with what action might be taken. So I'm saying to you this proposal may not be the greatest in the world but it's going to do something for a lot of schools in Illinois and it gives us a way to distribute funds that need to be distributed. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman...Gene."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House just to briefly explain my vote. This isn't...this is not only the greatest...is not the greatest proposal that has ever been made in my judgment it's the worst I've ever seen in fifteen years of working with the school finance and that is no reflection upon the Sponsor who I think is one fine fellow and one outstanding legislator. I would just like to point out that we do have distributive mechanism now at work. I have filed in the Regular Session House Bill 3197 which embodies the proposal I made. I saw Representative Berman moving around the floor today doing something that I suspect had something to do with the suggestion that he had. He holds his hands up, that's why...maybe his proposal is hold harmless that's why he has his hands up like that. But nevertheless let me tell everybody here, make it very clear, that any of these proposal will not become effective this school year. They will not become effective this school year unless we get an extraordinary majority, 89 votes is not going to change the way we distribute state aid in this state for this current fiscal year. And all of these proposals unless they get an extraordinary majority will only have an impact, only impact on FY77. And we're going to be back before that time when we think this thing through more carefully. So I just want to make sure you understand that. I don't think that was made too clear



last evening."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very briefly

I want to lend my support to that...statements made by the previous speaker. Ah, by way of explaining my vote, I just like to illustrate to you how inequitable this proposal really is. In the 34th Legislative District which encompasses Rockford, the Rockford School System, they would stand to get an additional \$1,539,000. The 35th Legislative District, the neighboring district would stand to gain \$288,000. I don't see how anything could be more inequitable than that. I'm sure that the number of school children are approximately the same in the two districts but what we're doing here we're asking those schools who have retained their same enrollment and even in some cases have increased enrollment, we would be asking them to subsidize the schools who have lost enrollment. These schools had an opportunity to plan for this problem. They had their projected enrollment. They knew that they weren't going to get as much money this year as they had last and they could have planned for it but these other schools couldn't. And I certainly hope those red lights stay on the board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to Representative Bradley's comments about no other vehicles, I filed this morning along with some sixty some other sponsors House Bill 3202. That's the other part of the commitment that we talked about yesterday to get the downstate school districts that \$18,000,000 of transportation money that we're talking about and I would solicit Representative Bradley's support to solicit all the green lights up there to join us in moving that Bill along as expeditiously as possible. I've also received commitment from Senate sponsors who want to move other vehicles out of the Senate also addressing themselves to the downstate problem. And this is not the best approach. I solicit continued red lights. And I solicit cooperation from



everyone to address ourselves with the extraordinary majority and help the downstate school districts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by these red lights you are telling the Senate by the package we sent them yesterday and don't give them any alternative. And I would just suggest to you that we've had enough arm twisting in this Session in this last couple of days. Let the Senate make their own decisions. Give us an option and then give them an option. Put those green lights on so we do keep this Bill alive."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 51 ayes, 88 nays. And the motion fails. Order of business, House Bills Second Reading, appears House Bill 1. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I thought we were on the order of motions and I do have motions filed..."

Speaker Redmond: "...I was...I was looking at...to see if you sought recognition and I didn't see...I'll be back at that one."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1. A Bill making appropriation the State Board of Education for...Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends House Bill 1 First Special Session on page 1 line 5 by deleting 20,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof 22,700,000."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could we just leave this Bill on Second Reading right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Remain on Second Reading. Order of motions. Appears House...the motion with regard House Bill 4. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I am going to move to discharge the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education and place House Bill 4 on the order of House Bill Second Reading Second Day. Ah...it's a very, let me tell you, give you the history and tell you why I'm doing it."



This Bill was assigned to Committee by the Rules Committee and it went to the Education Committee and never had a hearing at that particular time. Although the Bill was assigned to the Committee and although we were ready to go ahead with that particular Bill and although we have witnesses in favor of that Bill and no witnesses, I might tell you, against the Bill, the Chairman who I have the greatest respect for ruled that that Bill was not within the province of the Governor's call and said that we could not hear the Bill at that particular time. Let me say to you that I think the Bill is within the Governor's call although I don't think we can get into that argument at this time and because the Rules Committee had all ready ruled that it should go to Committee and should be heard. What the Bill is a modified hold harmless Bill and it's the only alternative that we actually have in the special assessment...Special Session to the Governor's program. It deals with weighted average daily attendance and it deals with the problem of declining enrollment. And I might say that's why school districts are getting less money now is because primarily because of declining enrollment. I think this Bill did come within the confines of the Governor's Proclamation and I thought we should have been given a hearing at that time. We were not given a hearing, although as I say, many people came here to testify. That being the question, I think that at this time I would move to discharge the Committee and put House Bill 4 on Second Reading Second Day."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Ah, thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, again I just want to remind Aaron about the ruling I did make was consistent with the Proclamation. I don't happen to have a copy of it, so...yes, I do. Ah, I think the language is pretty specific on the Proclamation. It says excerpting from 'each public secondary and elementary education school district shall be entitled to receive...'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe, for what purpose do



you arise? Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker,..."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Jaffe: "...Well, certainly, we're going into the Governor's Proclamation at this particular..."

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct. Confine your remarks..."

Jaffe: "...is not germane at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "...to the motion."

Schneider: "I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Jaffe raised the Proclamation as part of his explanation for the discharge but again it's just simply a matter of the ruling confining it to the Proclamation. There was no language for a modified hold harmless as it was just described by the Sponsor. I would suggest a no vote and a new proclamation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative Jaffe's proposal is one that we ought to be able to... have available for evaluation and to take a look at it. I think that we really did not address ourselves to it in Committee. I think it ought to be out on the floor and I'm going to vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Ah, Mr...Mr. Speaker, a point of inquiry. Would you make the ruling now or after, whether it comes into purview; or is this after we take the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the motion now is to discharge the Committee so any discussion about the germaneness I think is inappropriate."

Anderson: "It would be after that? If the ruling is asked for?"

Speaker Redmond: "My...my grandmother used to say never bid the devil good morning until you meet him. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schlickman: "Who does have the authority to determine whether or not a Bill fits within the purview of a proclamation?"



And I continue by saying if it does not lie with the Chairman of a committee, and I don't think it does, then the motion to discharge is out of order, based on that improper ruling in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's the ruling of the Chair that the order for discharge is in order, where I am not faced with the problem of whether or not it's beyond the call."

Schlickman: "You don't know the answer, that's why. And I'd like an..."

Speaker Redmond: "Four times in the history of the State of Illinois this question has gone to the courts and the courts have decided whether it is or is not within the call. This is a...judicious matter and very frequently it does end up in court. Sometimes if it obviously is beyond the confines of the call, why the presiding officer will make it. But my impression is that in most close cases that latitude is granted when the matter is litigated. Representative Hoffman, Gene."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this motion. It seems to me that a...the committee chairman's ruling was proper from a reading of the proclamation. The proclamation is very clear that if..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe. Jaffe, for what purpose do you arise?" Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to ask to object again, we're going..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Confine your remarks to the motion."

Hoffman: "The motion...the motion to discharge the Committee is a motion which I believe should not be supported for the same reason...remain the same reasons that were mentioned on the last Bill. I think the decision of the Chairman was fair and equitable. There are other courses that the gentleman can take with his Bill just as a number of us have in terms of filing Bills in the Regular Session. If we want to uphold the Committee system I think this is another



opportunity to do it and I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion. As I listened to the previous speaker he indicated that he opposed this motion for the same reasons that were given on the previous issue. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, on the previous issue we were dealing with whether or not the Bill had a fair hearing. For whatever reason, Mr. Speaker, this Bill did not get a hearing, fair or unfair. There was no hearing on the Bill. There was no chance for any of us as members of the committee to vote on the merits, demerits of the Bill. For that reason, I think that this Bill...the motion should prevail. The committee system in this particular instance, it seems to me, broke down for whatever reason and, ah, this Bill should get a fair hearing which it did not get in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Jaffe to close."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say is I...I...I would...just echo what Representative Madison has said. There is a great difference between this Bill and the last Bill. This Bill was assigned to Committee, was assigned by the Rules Committee and it never did get a hearing. We never had a hearing before the Committee and I therefore move to discharge."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, the gentleman has filed a motion to discharge the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education and place House Bill 4 on the calendar on the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Legislative Day. The question is on the gentleman's motion, shall...all those in favor of the motion indicate by voting aye; opposed vote no. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison, do you seek recognition?"

Madison: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote. Mr. Speaker, I would rather...this procedure not be taken. I'm not totally



in favor of discharging the Committee. It seems to me by failure of the Chair to rule on whether or not the chairman had the purview puts us in this position. If the Chair had ruled then it seems to me that the...the Chair could order the chairman to give this Bill a fair hearing. The Chair has not decided in its wisdom to do that and so we have no other choice but for this motion to discharge."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 92 ayes, 30 nays. The motion prevails. House Bill 4 will appear on the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Legislative Day. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I now move that the First Special Session stand in adjournment 'til..."

Speaker Redmond: "Recess."

Bradley: "All right we'll recess it until immediately after the Regular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of explanation the Senate is originating the adjournment resolution and it's not over here yet, so we..."

Bradley: "I renew the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Stand in recess. The order...the hour of 1:30 having arrived, the Second Special Session is called to order. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the... the Assignment of Bills Committee met and all the Bills, 1 through 8 in the First Special Session, I think that, or the Second Special Session have been assigned to the Committee on Elections."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "...Speaker, Members of the House, if these Bills have been assigned to us I would like to have leave of the House to have these Bills heard Thursday, what's the date Jerry, what's the date? November the 13th."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."



Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not need leave but simply to post these Bills. That's six and a half days from now."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you objecting to granting leave?"

Walsh: "There's no need for leave. I'm objecting to the procedure."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, the Chairman will post. You do have six and a half days. What I understood was that he was announcing that there was a meeting...in the event that the Minority Leader didn't read the bulletin board. Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "I just...I just wanted to have the House aware that these Bills are going to be heard next Thursday. And they will be posted."

Speaker Redmond: "What room, do you know, Representative Fennessey?"

Fennessey: "Haven't been assigned a room yet..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "To recess the Second Special Session, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Correct."

Bradley: "'Til the...immediately upon the adjournment out of the First Special Session this evening."

Speaker Redmond: "Right. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Stand in recess until the adjournment of the First Special Session. And now return to the Regular Session. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a motion on the Clerk's desk asking to post House Bill...not post, rather to place House Bill 3203 on Second Reading Second Legislative Day because language on House Bill 3050 was accidentally deleted by Enrolling and Engrossing. It has all ready gone through the House, the Senate, the Governor has signed it and was on file in the Secretary of State's Office before the error was detected by Chapman and Cutler and...other firm Isherman and Beale and I would ask that we...the only way apparently we can correct that is through statutory and legislative action and I would ask that that be done by



allowing us to bypass committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Trying to bypass committee and put it in the order of Second Reading with reference.

Stand at ease for three minutes. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think my motion is probably not appropriate, I believe the right procedure is probably to go before the Rules Committee in order to be certain that we do not any...an exception to this Bill and open the floodgate for others. So I would ask that a time that's convenient to the members of the Committee and to yourself and the House that the Rules Committee be called for that purpose and then I can make my case there."

Speaker Redmond: "And you're withdrawing that motion."

Schneider: "I'll hold my motion. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order...in the Regular Session on the order of total veto motions appears House Bill 1121 to which purpose Representative Collins is recognized."

Collins: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1121 attempted to address itself to the problem of the so-called shadow agencies. Now I don't think I have to tell anybody in this House what those shadow agencies were or how they came about. But I would like to remind everyone in here that one the Auditor General attempted to ascertain what payrolls were carrying these people who were carrying out the functions of agencies which we in the Legislature have refused to fund he met with resistance at every turn. He was told that they couldn't be...they couldn't talk to him; that they couldn't tell him about these ...these employees. And that they'd have to go to the Governor's Office for permission before they could talk to the Auditor General who is charged with this duty of finding whether people are conducting the business of the State and are actually performing the duties for which they are being paid. So 1121 merely requires that agencies would promptly cooperate with the Auditor General and if he ran into a similar situation as he ran into last year investigating



these shadow agencies that he would report this inability to cooperate to the Legislative leaders so that they can consider appropriate action. I don't think there's anything unreasonable about this Bill. It was sponsored by all of the members of...Legislative Audit Commission on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the rotunda. And I... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for a favorable vote in overriding this veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could one question the Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Totten: "Ah, would this...Representative Collins, would this in any way allow the Auditor General to preaudit questionable ventures?"

Collins: "There is no new duty, or no new responsibility accorded to the Auditor General under this Bill. It just... it merely...it...it merely faced the one he is carrying out the functions he all ready has on the statute books. But when he is carrying out the dictate of the Legislature that agencies do cooperate with him and cooperate with him promptly."

Totten: "He could, if questionable vouchers were submitted to him, he could proceed with those, is that correct?"

Collins: "If he...if he...if he has that...if he has that power now, yes."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'd be very brief in closing. I think that every member of this House no matter where he sits deplored the action of putting people on payrolls that they... to do...to be paid for jobs they were not doing. But be that as it may and putting that aside, I think that everyone of us who voted to create the Office of Auditor General and who by a three-fifths vote did approve this gentleman in the



office would hope the state agencies offer him the cooperation which the statutes require them to...to offer them to him. And I...so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a 107 favorable votes to override this questionable veto. A similar Bill, or I should say an identical Bill, passed almost unanimously in the Senate yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "May I address the question to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Think you're a little tardy, but it's up to him."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, I'm sorry are we...may I speak on the...on the vote then, is that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed." When we...when we call the..."

Geo-Karis: "All right, I'll wait...I'll wait."

Speaker Redmond: "...the question yet. The question is shall House Bill 1121 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been one of those vilified in this Assembly cause I dared override the Educational veto and one of the reasons I did is I know there have been many leaks in contractual services. We have about \$45,000,000 a year that go for contractual services and yet the Auditor General doesn't have the right to find out who it is and how much they're getting and what relationship they have to the various departments. This is a good Bill. This is a Bill the Governor should never have vetoed because if his credibility is to stand this Bill should pass. We should know, as taxpayers, every cent that goes for expenditures in the State of Illinois. We pay taxes; we're entitled to know. And I'm asking for 107 votes in order to clean up some of the dead rot that exists in all the various departments."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109...Representative Byers. Representative Byers."



Byers: "I'd like to ask for a verification of the roll call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Selcke: "Arnell, Birchler, Boyle, Brinkmeier, Caldwell, Capuzi, Chapman, Darrow, Darrow, aye...DiPrima, John Dunn, John Dunn, aye. Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Fleck, Flinn, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hirschfeld, Jim Houlihan, Hudson, Jacobs, Jaffe, Kane, Katz, Leverenz, Londrigan, Luft, Luft, aye. Madison, Mann, Maragos, Maragos, aye. Matijevich. Matijevich, no. McAuliffe, Mudd, Mudd, no. Nardulli, O'Daniel, Palmer, Randolph, Rayson, Sangmeister, Schlickman. Schlickman, aye. Schneider, Schuneman, Sevcik, Stearney, Tipsword, Van Duynes, Von Boeckman, Von Boeckman, aye. Wall, Washington, Younge, Younge, aye. Yourell. That's it."

Speaker Redmond: "Count now is 117 ayes, and 17 nays. Does the gentleman persist in his previous motion? You desire verification? Gentleman has requested a verification of the affirmative roll call. The members please be in their seats. The Clerk will call the affirmative roll call."

Selcke: "Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Selcke: "Gene Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Barnes, here? How is he...there he is. Byers."

Selcke: "Jane Barnes, Beatty, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Brandt, Brummet, Campbell, Capparelli, Carroll, Catania, Choate, Coffey, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, Deuster, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Farley, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kozinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Lucco, Luft, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Maragos, Marovitz, Mautino,



McAvoy, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Mulcahey, Neff, Patrick, Peters, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Schisler, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Shea, Simms, Skinner, E. G. Steele, Cissy Stiehl, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Walsh, Washburn, White, Willer, Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Ah, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Jaffe: "Ah, would you vote me aye, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Hirschfeld: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Representative Ewing. How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Absent."

Ewing: "Would you please vote me aye?"

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Representative... Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, how am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Schuneman: "Please vote me aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson, how is he recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your pleasure, Representative Hudson?"

Hudson: "Yes, would you please vote me aye, sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman as aye. Representative James Houlihan. Vote the gentleman as aye. Representative Mann."



Mann: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Mann: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Representative Ewell. How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "He's recorded as being absent."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him aye. Representative Sangmeister. Record him as aye. Representative Giglio. How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Ah, absent."

Giglio: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman as aye. Representative Lundy, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be verified now, I have some place to go off the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to go with Representative Madison? Representative Lundy verified...Representative Lundy...Representative..."

Selcke: "Wall, aye."

Madison: "May...Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded? Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Madison recorded?"

Selcke: "Ah, absent."

Madison: "You can vote me please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzzi. How is he recorded?"

Selcke: "Absent."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as aye. Representative Stearney. Record the gentleman as aye. Would it be easier to dump the roll call and vote over again? All right. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Pierce: "Will you please change that to aye?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change it to aye. Representative Downs."



Downs: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman as aye. Representative Nardulli?"

Nardulli: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Nardulli: "Vote me aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "How am I recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Leverenz: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Anyone else? Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman..."

Selcke: "Absent."

DiPrima: "Vote me aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Any questions?"

The gentleman withdraws his request for verification of the roll call. On this question there's how many?"

Selcke: "130...130..."

Speaker Redmond: "136 aye, 15 nay. The motion is adopted and the Bill is passed over the veto of the Governor. House Bill 1144. 1144 out of the record. 1317. Representative Laurino. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am reluctantly tabling my motion to override House Bill 1317. I would like to explain the reasons why...if it's possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Further consultation with the Secretary of State's Office has convinced me that although the time for the...idea of compulsory insurance has arrived, to implement the idea would place great hardships on the Secretary of State's Office. Most of us thought the date on insured drivers



was readily available. It is not. And the question...inserting that data into the Secretary of State's computers cannot be done...without great hardships...there's a possibility that if this Bill did pass and become law, the effective date is immediate. Therefore, all the license plates that have been issued and there are approximately 2,000,000 out now and all the license plate applications would have to be recalled. I think this would place an unreasonable burden on the Secretary of State's Office and it would be financially improper at this moment. I requested and been assured by the Secretary of State to lend his expertise in this matter and set a target date for approximately two years from now. That and many other management ideas have to be ironed out. And that's the reason why I'd like to table the motion for this Bill at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection tabling the motion? Hearing no objection the motion is tabled. 1588. Representative Mautino. Out of the record. 1592. Representative Taylor. Representative Taylor. I can't see Taylor. Out of the record. 1615. Representative McCourt. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill I'm glad to say cost no money. It merely is permissive legislation to permit the Board of Vocational Education which will soon be succeeded by the State Board of Education to encourage private and public schools to institute or expand programs in cooperation with private business for training disabled and educationally disadvantaged persons by providing grants for this purpose. This Bill is a product of the Commission on Urban Education which has been concerned with the high dropout rate in...in many of our urban schools. The Governor by his veto would appear not to favor the expansion of vocational or career education for the disadvantaged youth of our state. This Bill encourages Commerce and Industry to become a real partner in the educational system. Under the Bill, business organizations may be compensated for their participation in aiding the direct



education of our youth. When the Bill was originally introduced there was a companion appropriation bill for \$300,000 which I asked to be tabled in the Senate. The appropriation of the Office of Education is sufficient to implement the purpose of this legislation. I'd appreciate your favorable support to override the veto of the Governor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Totten: "Representative McCourt, you've indicated that there would be no additional cost this year, would you anticipate that this legislation may impose additional cost in future years and if so, how much."

McCourt: "Ah, I can see no additional cost, the...all Office of Education is interested in...in many programs of career and vocational education. Unfortunately, under the existing legislation they cannot enter into any programs with private industry or private schools and this just gives them the authority, a little flexibility in their endeavor to provide adequate education for the disadvantaged students of the state."

Totten: "In the veto message, I believe there was an indication that there would be significant cost implications. You're saying that that may not be true?"

McCourt: "I'm saying that's completely incorrect."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that in my recollection of this Bill we had this Spring that it really comes close to duplicating programs that we all ready have and that the school boards are authorized to provide. There are many vocational programs and other services rendered not only by the high schools but also by junior colleges and I think not only am I concerned the possibility



of additional money but also the problem of duplicating legislation in duplicating programs that all ready come close to meeting what this proposal intends to do. So I would ask that the members vote in opposition to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? James Houlihan, Representative."

Houlihan: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Houlihan: "Ah, Jim, you indicated that there is no cost on this, could you tell me what the companion appropriation Bill was, the dollar amount in that appropriation Bill?"

McCourt: "\$300,000 but the Bill was introduced before we had the Commission on Urban Education had a chance to see the budget of...for vocational education as submitted by the Office of Education. And after that budget was reviewed it was apparent to us that it was not necessary to have an appropriation Bill."

Houlihan: "I can't...I don't quite understand how you can suggest there ought to be additional programs without there being some cost to those programs."

McCourt: "The...the whole point is that at the present time, the Board of Vocational...Vocational Rehabilitation Education is limited to...in their main dealing with the problem in that they must only go through established school districts. Now many times you might have private industry or even private schools that would like to participate in the current problem that we have in our urban centers. For an example, last the University of DePaul wanted to establish a program for 100 Latino dropouts. Now they had made an arrangement with various companies including Montgomery Ward certain banks in the city that they would actually take these students, they would end up with an associate type of degree from DePaul University and they'd help motivate them by having them in direct contact these eight employers that had agreed to become participants in the program. Now under



the existing legislation the Board of Vocational Education can not reimburse a private institution or any other private business that might be willing to partake in such an endeavor and it's high time as I see it that we...we cannot expect Commerce and Industry to help in this vital problem without giving them some compensation their services. And basically that's all this Bill does."

Houlihan: "Representative McCourt, then we're not involving ourselves in an approval of a program one year and in the next year coming back for funds saying that well the Legislature approved this program therefore we have to fund it? And frequently we do involve ourselves in situations like that where somebody gets up and says this is a worthy program, it's not going to cost any dollars and then the next year they come back and say, well, since the will of the Legislature was to approve this we have to spend the money to implement it. Are you reassuring me that that's not the case?"

McCourt: "I'm assuring you that all we're doing is just opening up avenues for the Office of Education to have a greater latitude in trying to solve an existing problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall House Bill 1615 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor vote aye. Representative Beaupre, do you seek recognition?"

Beaupre: "I wanted to ask a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Ask your question."

Beaupre: "Our staff analysis would indicate that this Bill has some technical problems and the Governor in his veto message indicated that it was inconsistent with House Bill 2160 placing the responsibility for administering program with the Vocational, let's see, the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation when that Board no longer exists. Can you clarify that? What...what would happen?"

McCourt: "Well, the...the Board of Vocational Education Rehabilitation will continue until July 1st 1975 and this is..."



resulted from an amendment made in House Bill 2160." "

Beaupre: "This was the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 2160 so this is a transition that is going to take place between the Board of Voc Ed and the State Board of Education. So this is not consistent in that respect."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's...39 ayes and 30 no's. And the motion fails and the Governor's veto is sustained. House Bill 1592, Representative Taylor was in the first aid room at the time this Bill was called. So with leave of the House we'll take House Bill 1592."

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we override the Governor's total veto in regard to House Bill 1592 simply because I think House Bill 1592 would do a great service to aid the community in terms of many of these problems that we have today. House Bill 1592 deals with the fact that after seven years that a prisoner is out of jail and has not had any previous problems with the police that at that particular time he should be given a right to work. Many of our city and state agencies today will not give them that opportunity simply because in many cases that an arrest appears on the record. Not even a conviction. But I say if some major crimes the statute of limitation is seven year it should be for some slob that steals tire off a car and it's been held against him because of that. The Govenor did veto this Bill and he said that...and he said that a school bus driver...a school bus driver that had been accused of murder or rape or some other devious crime that he did veto it on that particular measure. Sure you might have these type of problems but I say to you if anyone ever goes to jail for murder he should have the length of time that if he gets out he would not be able to work. And if he does get out and he's able to work after seven years of being free out here he should be too old at that time. I ask for your favorable support on House Bill 1592."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose this motion to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 1592. This Bill makes no distinction whatsoever in types of crimes that ^{an} employer may make inquiry about whether it's the most heinous felony that has been committed or the lightest misdemeanor, it's just all inclusive. I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that it's about time we in the General Assembly stop shackling employers of this state. Allow them to do the job that they want to do and thereby provide employment and maintain the economy of this state. I think this Bill is just another step in the wrong direction and I encourage a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Taylor to close."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe that House Bill 1592 is needed. It would correct...correct a grave injustice on a large number of citizens in our country today. It will eradicate the major fact that lead into why many criminals repeat the jail. I say that give him a chance at the end of the rainbow that he will have an opportunity to go to work. I solicit your support for House Bill 1592."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 1592 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my aye vote..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mann: "On this matter. Why in the world would we close the door on any human being opportunity to gain employment if we do so then rehabilitation is really a hollow word, it's a phony word, it's a false word, it has absolutely no meaning whatsoever. If a man pays his dues to society by his period of incarceration then we ought to be able to give him an opportunity to stay out of criminal activity. If you shut the door on him you push him into criminal activity and he's



going to be another statistic, another recidivist, another reason for spending more money on our prisons, another reason for discouraging other people who have been in prison from seeking rehabilitation. You've got to give people a stake in society if you expect them to have respect for society's law and mores. I think this is a good Bill and I think it should be supported."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the...Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "I think that we ought to fully realize the economic impact. We talk about public aid and we talk about the corrections budget and yet you want to paint somebody into a corner. You want to take an opportunity to put a brand on him for life. You want to make a mockery of the Judaeo-Christian tradition of forgiveness. You want to say that once a man or a woman has done wrong he should pay the penalty for the rest of their life. Why have a sentence? Why have a parole? Why have a discharge at all? If you're going to sentence a man to a lifetime, or a woman to a lifetime of unemployment, that is perhaps a worse sentence than keeping him in jail another ten years. So what I'm saying is, unless you find an opportunity to give these men and women the chance that every American should have to redeem himself and then show that we respect that redemption. So I'm asking for some more green votes up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Taylor. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. I'm voting for this Bill not only just because of me as the Sponsor because of the district I represent and knowing the needs in many of the communities in the State of Illinois. I happen to be one of the members with the City of Chicago that works with the program dealing with the Section 7. That Section 7 program is when exconvicts is given a chance to work. And sometimes they'll work in one in two and three years. It calls for the one year program. And in all of the cases



were we have gotten employees that was out of jail and they had an opportunity to work they went on and made a gain for living. They worked hard. But the minute the program was shoved up in their face you would find out that that is the very individual that goes back to jail. And if you want to keep crime as high as it is in the State of Illinois today you keep on turning your back where the need exists on those types of individuals and you'll be the one to pay not them out there. I solicit your support for House Bill 1592.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we talk here constantly about what it costs for welfare, what it costs for our correctional institutions and here's an opportunity to get some of those peoples off the welfare roll. Get them back into a fruitful employment within this state and for the life of me I can't understand why we won't support this type of legislation. You know you can't just put somebody in an institution and then when they get out throw the key away. We talk about programs we've spent millions of dollars and here's an opportunity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone, you seek recognition?"

Stone: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I...I've opened my digest up to the explanation of this Bill and all it says is it makes it an unfair employment practice to require a job applicant to disclose a conviction of a crime if the end of the sentence imposed for such crime is more than seven years prior to the job application. Now I think that Representative Taylor is exactly right when he says that if a person has paid his debt whatever that debt was to society and has come out of the penitentiary or whatever and been able to...to walk the narrow path for seven years. It seems to me that any...job application form if it just said have you been convicted of a crime, the sentence of which has been completed less than seven years ago would be enough information for any employer. It seems to me that we may be losing sight of



fact that people who have paid their debt to society should have one more chance. And that three more votes up there, in my judgment, would give a lot of good people that have truly repented and want to go straight and want to earn a living a chance to earn a honest, decent living. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 ayes, 28... Representative Duff, pardon me."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I have been...had my light on for some long time on this and I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House, knows how much work I put in on the concept of rehabilitation and my belief in it. But is it relevant for an employer who wants to hire somebody to drive a school bus to know that the applicant might have been convicted for child molesting. Does he have a right to know if he's going to put somebody in charge of his cash register that that person did in fact in the past take money out of a cash register? It is not against the concept of rehabilitation... say or to admit one's errors in anything. The first thing that they teach in Alcoholics Anonymous is the ability to say I'm an alcoholic, to know one's...flaws and faults. An employer has a right to know if a crime has been...committed by the person that is relevant to the kind of employment that he is offering. Just as an employer has a right to know where somebody went to school, should they not be allowed to ask that somebody was convicted of a heinous crime and yet be allowed to ask whether they were thrown out of school for ditching class. It's irrational for us not to allow an employer to ask the legitimate facts pertinent to the kind of employment that he is seeking to fill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 aye, and the



motion is adopted and the Bill is passed over the veto of the Governor. House Bill 1659. Representative Carroll."

Carroll: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1659 establishes a Legislative Committee to study and recommend a cost rebate reimbursement formula for facilities providing sheltered care, intermediate care and skilled nursing care. The Federal Government requires that State reimbursement, that they provide that under the new cost related system it must be in effect as of July the 1st '76. If this Bill does not pass, Federal matching funds will be or may be in jeopardy. This Bill has the unanimous support of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. It passed this House by a vote of 120 to 4 and the Senate by a vote of 42 to 6; has the recommendation of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiner."

Kempiner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this motion. As the Sponsor of the Bill has indicated by July 1st of 1976 the Illinois Department of Public Aid is going to have to provide a cost reimbursement program for the providers of this type of health care. Whenever we on the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid query the Department on what program they are developing the response pretty much seems to be the same thing. Well, we have until July 1st to develop that program so we'll let you know. Well, I'm getting a little tired of the Department of Public Aid making secret back room decisions on how they're going to reimburse people for caring for the needy of this State. We recently saw the Department setting up a three member commission and sending contracts to hospitals saying sign this contract and maybe in a year or a year and a half we'll let you know how you're going to get paid. This is no way to do business. I'm sick and tired of this type of thing. There ought to be communication



with Legislators, with providers and the Departments of Public Health and Public Aid in these matters. I think this is a good Bill. I think that we ought to override the veto. We are the ones who appropriate the money and we, in the Legislature, ought to know what is happening in this decision making. And I would urge your support for this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I attended the meetings of the Illinois Legislative Commission...Investigative...Legislative Commission into nursing homes. I'd like to tell everyone here that the evidence showed that the state and county supported facilities first of all do not pay any taxes, second of all they have...an allowance of about 50 and \$60 a day per patient and yet the private homes only have 18 to 20. Now, and they pay taxes, I certainly think the Legislature should set the pattern on this. As a matter of fact, during the summer the druggists...profit...cost was cut way down to the bone in spite of the fact that they have to file many, many forms and hire people for at least 2 and \$3.00 an hour to help them do it. I do feel this is a very good Bill. I do feel, also, that the Legislative Committee should be established to determine a cost computation formula and...get...let's have a common sense approach about this thing. I'm sick and tired some do-gooding people thinking it's a sin to pay someone some profit when they're doing the job and doing it well. And let me tell you Ladies and Gentlemen many of the public homes are a disgrace also. And I think this would be a good step in the right direction."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall...Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, fellow Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I've been looking into nursing homes...and long care facilities for...seven years."



One...there's one thing involved right now that's important in relation to increasing cost. The State is not paying the equal share and therefore private individuals in nursing are...are picking up the tab and the...nursing homes, long care facilities are charging these people who themselves in many cases are barely getting by a much higher cost, owing to the home of course and it's location in the state, than the welfare is taking...there's a welfare is doing in taking up this tab. I think it's needed to make a study of this to more equalize the payments and care in long term facilities."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 1659 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "...vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 aye and 17 nay. The motion's adopted and the Bill is passed over the veto of the Governor. Representative Tipword, no. Aye. Representative Tipword, aye. Representative Madison. Aye. Representative Lechowicz, aye. Representative Stubblefield, no. Representative Schoeberlien, aye. On the calendar under total vetoes appears House Bill 1704. A motion to override the Governor's veto. Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Geo-Karis. Have we got the record on 17..."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Governor has vetoed House Bill 1704 which is an amendment to the Illinois Coal Development Act which would have allowed ten million out of the seventy million all ready appropriated for general development...general obligation bonds for coal development act to fund alternative energy products. Several feasible products...using projects using alternative energy resources in Illinois have been proposed and could be considered for funding under 1704.



These include projects using, one, solar energy for heating buildings; two, solid waste from municipalities for production...electricity; three, biomass production methane gas; four integrated utility system; five, corn-gasohol which is a mixture of corn alcoholic gasoline as Illinois energy sources. The Illinois Energy Resources Commission is vitally concerned with the development of Illinois Coal through gasification, liquification and other processes. Last night the Illinois Energy Resources Commission allocated \$10,000,000 to the General Electric and Associates to develop high sulphur coal in what is known as the fluidize bed process in the Wood River... installation of General Electric. We know that coal is our first priority; however, the General Assembly mandated that the Illinois Energy Resources Commission study and make recommendations to setting a long range energy program relating to all energy sources and related problems. To...fulfill this mandate Illinois' policy must include all possible, and I stress all possible energy sources, we cannot be limited. Coal conversion projects require about 8 to 10 years before they can be made available for commercial use. Another reason why we should develop alternative energy is based upon public opinion. In twelve statewide hearings and energy held by the Commission during the past several months witnesses repeatedly urged the Commission to explore alternative energy. Many of those who testified are experts in the field of energy who recognize the critical urgency of having energy available. Now in regard to the Governor's veto of this Bill, one of the things he claims is the question of legality because the votes were 109 to pass the House; it was a question because some of them came as well and that was covered by an opinion from the parliamentarian saying that as long as this Bill had received concurrence vote of three-fifths in each House it covered any possibility of this legality. However, the thing that bothers me is the following. I

don't want to see the Coal Development Bond jeopardized in any way. And what...occurs to me now is quite possibly if this Bill were to pass the override of the Governor it might affect the bonds all ready set aside for coal development. Since we should develop our best bituminous coal reserves in Illinois, I feel at this time, that I should take another approach. I do feel this, this is a good Bill but rather than jeopardize the Coal Development Bonds that have all ready been allocated by statute by this General Assembly and rightfully so because we are running short of energy and petroleum, we are running short of natural gas, I would rather bring you a new Bill in January and take it away, not have anything to do with the Coal Development Bond and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking in the basis of time and consideration and asking favorably of this Assembly to consider funding alternative energy projects in January because we need them so badly, I ask for leave to table this Bill at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Representative Bluthardt, do you object? Representative Meyers, do you object? Hearing no objections, House Bill 17...motion...House Bill 14...Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "No, I don't have an objection, I do want to take this opportunity because I had a long speech prepared in opposition to the motion but I do want to commend the Sponsor because it is the first time that I have seen such reasonableness come out of her this entire Session. And I am sure that she has served the state many, many thousands of dollars in avoiding a law suit that certainly would have come about if this had been overridden. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, do you seek recognition? House Bill 1716, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like leave of the House to have House Bill 1716 and 1717 heard together, they're companion Bills."



Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, Representative Mann. 1716, 1717 be heard together. Proceed, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "I move to override the Governor's total veto in regards to House Bill 1716 and 1717. They're work study programs that creates pilot programs for high school students. This Bill has passed through this House on two separate occasions under the present administration. Last year when this Bill was vetoed the last Session. The Governor gave the message that it was duplicating programs and that was the reason for the veto at that particular time. This Bill only asks for a \$100,000 and I think that a state as rich as Illinois should be in a position to try to train our kids, give them opportunities to get off of the welfare rolls and that's what this is designed for. House Bill...1716 and 1717 this year was vetoed because the Governor said that it was not in the...State Board of Education budget. For that reason it was vetoed. But I'll tell you that we need this type of measure. Many of our kids living in my community are not getting the type of training that they need. I feel that if we give them the training or the work study program where they work 20 hours a week during things other than what they're doing in normal school days, that we would train them how to work and learn how to be on time when they do get those particular jobs. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your support for these two measures."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would the gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

McClain: "Representative Taylor, could you tell me how many areas in the State now and not two years ago would qualify for the...the standard here you have set here in the Bill of five percent or more unemployment?"

Taylor: "Ah, the five percent I think right now most of the State of Illinois would qualify with the present



unemployment rate."

McClain: "Thank you. Uh...Mr. Taylor would you say that when you first put the Bill in a couple of years ago...um... that the average unemployment was not that high throughout the state."

Taylor: "It was in Decatur, it was in East St. Louis, it was and is in Chicago."

McClain: "Well, I would think that that's the reason why it passed. Would you see now that maybe the appropriation for this Bill is not high enough?"

Taylor: "The appropriation is not high enough but dealing with the Appropriation Committee I got what I could get. You know Roscoe Cunningham from down in....., he said that if you can't get a whole loaf let's take a half. So I'm getting that half in order to get retraining to the kids that they need."

McClain: "Representative Taylor, would you say this to me, what would you think, what you would project the cost to be for the State office of education."

Taylor: "\$100,000 is all it would be."

McClain: "Well, I mean, would they, since we're only appropriating \$100,000, does that mean it's just the...uh...first \$100,000 that vouchers into the Office of Education will be paid and anything after that will not be."

Taylor: "No, the State Board of Education would have the right to designate the area that they feel that this program should be implemented and at that particular time there would be X amount of kids that would qualify for the program. I'm certain that certain standards could be set up so that we could regulate this program."

McClain: "Well I didn't realize on reading the Bill that the State Superintendent could designate which areas would comply with the 5% and which areas would not. I thought the Bill was pretty clear that any area that had 5% or more unemployment would qualify. Is that not true?"



Taylor: "That isn't the intent of the Bill. The intent is that the superintendent of instruction, Public Instruction could designate the area in which he felt that this program would be utilized for a pilot program."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill very quickly?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I voted for this Bill, as many of us did, the last two times Representative Taylor has presented it. I think it's a laudatory approach, I think it would be great if we had amended it to say Chicago would be a pilot program or Decatur or Rockford or whatever but because of the drastic unemployment situation in the State now, the entire state now qualifies under this Bill and I think the cost would be insurmountable. We cannot pay, we could pay the \$100,000, there's just no way we can pay for this kind of Bill and I would respectfully ask you not to give the 107 required vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I may shock some of my conservative colleagues and this may sound funny coming out of my mouth because I'm not known as one of the last big spenders but I'll tell you what I've done a complete turn around on a few things and my Dad would probably roll over in his grave if I told you that I think that the longer I go WPA looks better and better to me. At least, it's a program that makes people get up in the morning and go somewhere and do something specific everyday and we've gone the whole circle and in my town and in your town we've got people who are on the third generation who are on public aid and never done a days work in their life and their eating better than I am. So if we can start some kind of a program where we could



at least suggest that somebody ought to go to work, I'm for it and if this would encourage young people to learn work habits, maybe it's the best money we ever spent here on this floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Palmer: "Was this the...uh...didn't you have a summer program in the City of Chicago last year funded by the Federal government?"

Taylor: "Yes, they have the NYC program funded each year by the Federal government."

Palmer: "Well how many, how much money was involved in that funding if you know and how many people were employed?"

Taylor: "Just with the Department of Streets and Sanitation there was somewhere in the neighborhood of 1200. I could not give the figure in the entire city."

Palmer: "Well, was this the program that came under a lot of flack by people who were not needy being on the program? Is that the same program?"

Taylor: "I don't remember any flack that this particular program, especially with the Department of Streets and Sanitation was involved with that had any flack."

Palmer: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further question? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well I don't know whether to say that I am proud of this or not but I want you to know that in our community we have those on the fifth generation on welfare for whatever that means."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 1716, 1717 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor signify by voting aye, all opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Yourell aye. Have all voted who



wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Is it too late to explain votes at this point?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yea."

Lundy: "Alright thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. Representative Londrigan aye. Representative Hoffman no. On this question...Representative Geo-Karis is not in her seat but she votes aye. On this question there are...Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I feel that this measure is quite important to the community, to the kids throughout the State of Illinois, therefore I'm going to request a poll of the absentees so I can try to get every member to vote that I possibly can."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The clerk will poll the absentees."

O'Brien: "Arnell, Beaupre, Boyle, Brummet, Caparelli, Capuzzi, Chapman,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman votes aye."

O'Brien: "Choate, Coffey, Collings, D'Arco, Deavers, Deuster, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Fleck, Friedland, Getty, Giorgi, Hart, Hill, Hirschfeld, Ron Hoffman, Jim Houlihan, Jacobs, Kane, Katz, Keller, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Lauer, Mautino, McAvoy, McCourt, McGrew, McGrew votes no, McMas...D'Arco votes aye, McMaster,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs for what purpose do you rise?"

Jacobs: "How am I registered up there?"

O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Jacobs: "Vote me aye please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Would you change my vote to aye, please."

Speaker Redmond; "Change the gentleman to aye. Representative Williams."



Williams: "I change my vote from present to aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to aye. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Change me from no to aye, would you please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the gentleman from no to aye."

OK, Clerk has requested that we have a new roll call.

Dump this roll call. We're going to do it over again,

Clyde. Question is shall House Bill 1716 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor vote aye,

all opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have

all voted who wish? Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Briefly explaining my vote, Representative Taylor has hit upon a very important concept in this Bill and that is

in areas of high unemployment, especially in some of the inner city areas, it's very important that the state

become involved in helping young people find something constructive and productive to do...uh...to help them

get through school which they not otherwise be able to do.

I think this concept of a work study program is a valuable

one...uh...for the life of me I can't see why it would have been vetoed but it does respond to a very current

and a very pressing problem that is now afflicting many

of our neighborhoods and urban areas and I would hope the membership would vote to override."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker on a point of order. You previously announced that it was too late to explain our vote."

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct. You are correct. The purpose of this is just, no explanation of votes now. We had a confused roll call so, have all voted who wish?"



NOV 6 1975

112

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 aye, 36 no, the motion fails and the Governor's veto is sustained on House Bill 1716, 1717. House Bill 3137. I thought you might be interested in the progress we made. We have, with those two, we have addressed ourselves to eighteen motions, we have a total of 42 remaining on the calendar. House Bill 1317. Representative Collins. 1837, I'm all tongue tied. Representative Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "To expedite the operation I'm directed by the Assistant Minority Leader to move any motions except his be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think you have a second, I don't whether you needed it. You want 1837 taken out of the record. Ok, take that out of the record. 1851, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1851 is the restrictive abortion bill which passed from this House in the late session of the spring. I would ask for you to join with me in overriding the Governors total veto on this measure for several reasons. One, the Governor in responding to the Bill had given me and given the members of the General Assembly a one paragraph explanation why he felt that the Bill should not be adopted, and that was the applier clause was not in bill and therefore Illinois would be left with an abortion Bill 1973 abortion bill and 1975 abortion bill. Well I'll you this, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have requested on numerous occasions in letter form and phone calls to the Governors office all summer long trying to meet with him, now members of the Right to Life Society, Illinois citizens, several other agencies have all tried to meet with the Governor to at least discuss, sit down and discuss the matter. Now I would have been amenable to a change. This Bill went out of here without, originally from this House, with the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

repealer clause in the Bill. Now the reason that the repealer clause was removed was over in the Senate there was great opposition from various individuals, organizations, such Illinois Medical Society in Illinois; also from individuals that have claimed that it...the Bill would be totally and completely unconstitutional and that Illinois would be left without any abortion regulation. Well I accepted the...their request. I accepted the request of these people that were afraid that we would not have any abortion regulations in our state. And now the people that...were fighting the hardest to...to keep the 1973 abortion law in effect have fought just as vigorously to defeat it for technical reasons which they supported in the first place. Now I'll tell you a little bit about the Bill for those of you who have not reviewed the matter for some time. I call this Bill the truth in abortion bill. The reason I call it a truth in abortion bill because it's very similar in many respects to the truth in lending bill which we have which requires the lenders to disclose the fact...the fact ladies and gentlemen to the perspective borrowers. Well this particular bill would require the doctor to disclose to the woman seeking abortion what the physical and mental future would be for her if she does go forward with an abortion. It also requires that the doctors describe the size and physical development of a...of a baby to be aborted. You know many people that seek abortions have no idea, they've got a...an idea that it is not a baby and that it is nothing but more than a form of skin or protoplasm. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill discloses, this Bill states the fact and tells them as they are. It also has some other aspects. In a Bill which requires the husband's consent...it...if...if the mother seeking the abortion has a physical or mental problem. It would require parental consent of at least one parent if a child is below the age of 18 to have a...the abortion. Now it also prohibits the use of the



saline abortion in late stages of the pregnancy. A saline which is a salt solution is actually placed into the... womb and it causes a premature delivery and this is a salt solution that actually burns the baby out of the womb. It's the worst, most violent and to my knowledge I don't know another country that approves of a saline abortion. And the Supreme Court, Ladies and Gentlemen, in reaching their decision in 1973 had pointed out very vividly and very emphatically that in the last trimester states could in fact regulate abortion provided it didn't affect the physical or mental health of the mother. So they did give us the right and the authority to place some restrictions, the present statute places no, hardly any restrictions. I think it's abortion on demand myself and I'm...certainly will ask for you to support this measure. I'll be happy to answer any questions you might have about it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Kelly: "Yes. Yes, Representative."

Madison: "Representative Kelly, can you explain to me what would be the effects from the standpoint of people who are interested in abortions, where this Bill were to be passed given the fact that we all ready have an existing law on the books that will not be repealed by the passage of this act."

Kelly: "Yes, Representative Madison, if this Bill actually is signed into law and Illinois has two abortion laws on our statutes, the latest abortion ruling would supersede in any case where there's a conflict between the two. There are many laws in our state, in our state statutes, that are duplicate or similar in nature. I can tell you one right off the bat, it's the fetal experimentation, prohibiting it appears in more than one place in our state statutes. Many, many of our laws are of this nature and of course when it gets down to it the legal people, the



courts, would make the legal decision and they would be aware, though I'm sure if they would go through an attorney or to a judicial member they would find out the law of the state is."

Madison: "My question, Mr. Kelly, is simply this. If a woman wanted to have an abortion after this Bill is passed and there's been no test case, we could be operating under the abortion laws as it relates to the Bill that exists now or we should be operating under the abortion laws as it relates to the Bill that you have here."

Kelly: "She would be...she would be relating the Bill, if we pass this Bill and it becomes law in the State of Illinois, she would be relating the Bill of...the 1975 abortion law."

Madison: "And not the '73 law?"

Kelly: "Yes, sir."

Madison: "Even though they're both on the books?"

Kelly: "Yes, sir."

Madison: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, when House Bill 1851 came up for concurrence, I voted against this Bill and I vote against it for one basic reason and I challenged at that time and I will continue to challenge any constitutional attorney who can tell me the effects of having two bills on the books in direct conflict with each other. It seems to me, Mr...Mr. Speaker, that while the...while the Sponsor's explanations of court action may be very well true but the fact is until the court speaks to this question we have two Bills on the books. Now, the speaker has suggested that...that this came about because some of the supporters of this Bill felt that if the repealer were not removed we could possibly end up with no abortion...law. Well, my question is simply this, are we better off with no abortion law or are we better off with two laws in direct conflict with each other. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in no instance do we come out ahead by having that



situation exist and I would therefore request of the members that we withhold our affirmative votes from this Bill. Hopefully at some point in time the Sponsor or other Legislators might consider either having this come about by attempting to amend the existing law rather than writing a new act and not repealing the old one. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will address my remark to the gentleman's question or statement that just recently spoke. There's always been a rule of law, as I understand it, that any acts that are enacted subsequent to another act which is in conflict with that Act that the succeeding or the latest Act applies if there is an actual inconsistency. And there's no reason why this...this Bill would be any different. We...we would have two laws where they are identical, of course, they would be the same where they differ the later law would apply. Now regarding the Bill itself, and it has been charged by many that the Bill appears to be in the face of what this...the United States Supreme Court ruled in 1973. I challenge anybody to point out any where in the Rowe vs Bolton or the other abortion case of January 1973 where anywhere where the United States Supreme Court addressed itself to any of these particular measures in House Bill 1851. In fact the opposite is true. Now, we may, we may imply or you may think that the Supreme Court if it considers this Bill may find portions of it unconstitutional. That is subject to anybody's interpretation. Anytime we pass a Bill it is subject to an interpretation, various interpretation, the final interpreter of course is the Supreme Court. But there is no reason why we have to presume that what I consider to be probably one of the worst decisions that the United States Supreme Court has made since Dred Scott that the...that that Supreme Court will continue along that rather absurd line of reasoning that they exhibited in



January of 1973. I would certainly hope and trust that they would not. I think this is a very good Bill. It does restore some protection to the fetus which is a living thing. These are and I don't see why we should single out a fetus as some living thing that does not deserve any type of statutory protection. We have, in this Legislature, passed laws to protect fish, deer, muskrats, even walnut trees, and I don't know why in the world we can't pass a Bill to protect fetuses. So I would certainly urge along with Representative Kelly an aye vote for House Bill 1851."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Representative yield for a question, a couple of questions?"

Kelly: "Yes, yes, I will, Representative Huff."

Huff: "Ah, Mr. Kelly, as I understand your Bill, it would prohibit the use of the saline solution application, right?"

Kelly: "Ah, it would, it would prohibit the use in the later stages, it would prohibit..."

Huff: "Right. And...and as I understand also the other feature in your Bill is that it would create some sort of reporting apparatus on the part of amendatory reporting procedure, on the part of the doctors that will be performing these abortions, is that correct?"

Kelly: "Ah, yes, that is also correct."

Huff: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "I...I'm going to support Representative Kelly's Bill because...I think it's a good Bill. I...I recognize that for the most part we as Representatives must reflect the will of our constituents and I suppose that abortions is the wish preponderance of the people. But I don't think that we should close our eyes to those who would seek to abuse it and turn this thing into a butchery for a buck. And for that reason I'm going to support Representative Kelly's Bill and I'm going to urge everyone else to do



so too. I know for a fact that the application of the saline solution in many instances bring about a premature fetus that in most instances is a living fetus. and therefore makes it incumbent upon the physican, attending physician, to commit an act of murder. I, and for that reason, I'm going to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly to close."

Kelly: "In...in closing I would just like to say that I hope that every...everyone in this chamber would vote their conscience on this particular subject. We're talking about ...about life. Life and death. And I'll tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, I was approached just a short while ago asking me about what the chances were for the passage of this Bill. This is from one of the local newspapers up in the Chicagoland area. And the reporter I talked to mentioned to me that the word that she has heard is that possibly it would be caught in...in the middle of some other political issues which were going to occur down here. And I told her that I had a lot more confidence in the members of the General Assembly than to think for one minute that they would permit anything political to enter into a subject so tender as this and particularly when you're talking about individual babies that can't even say anything. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask for your support of the override."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall House Bill 1851 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happen to be against abortion. I am personally opposed to abortion but I recognize that there are other people who are not. However, I did have legislation in this General Assembly a couple years ago to attempt to address the problem because I recognize that there are many people in this State who feel very strongly that we must protect



the rights of families and that we must offer an opportunity for fetuses to go to full term and to be born and to have a physical life. However, this Bill does not address that problem. This is not a matter of whether you are in favor of protecting the rights of fetuses or not. This Bill contains a number of provisions some of which are potential genuine horrors. One of the provisions of the Bill is that no doctor can conduct fetal experimentation unless that doctor truly intends only to save the life of the fetus. Now nine years ago I happen to have had two amnion centesis. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has just now this Fall released a report saying that amnion centesis is safe. So obviously nine years ago amnion centesis was still very clearly fetal experimentation. We spent a great deal of time last Spring talking about malpractice and I think it's pretty clear that any doctor who would have conducted an ammonia synthesis nine years ago that would have resulted in the death of the fetus could have opened himself or herself to all sorts of malpractice suits. We're trying to ward off that kind of possibility in the malpractice legislation that we passed. I think it's totally irresponsible to invite that kind of problem with kind of legislation. That's one thing that this legislation does. Another problem is that this Bill is not endorsed by any of the hospital associations. It is not endorsed by the Catholic Hospital Association. This is not something that is being sought by Catholics who are pretty generally recognized as the people who are against abortion. This, I think, is flying under false colors. I think that we need to discern what the problems are with the Bill and to vote responsibly not to vote the way we think that a couple of pressure groups might expect us to vote."



1.

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Downs."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too am personally opposed to abortion, but I say now, as I have said before and as I have said in the mail that I have...ah... returned to those who have contacted me that this Bill does not now as it did not before represent a bonafide effort to reconcile the very difficult questions that are raised by this issue. Certainly that it is not endorsed by the Catholic Hospital Association tells me a good deal and I sat on the Human Resources Committee as related issues to this came before that Committee and no effort was made to reconcile the sincere and conscience disturbing questions that we had. When this vote came up before I voted 'present' because I wanted to send a signal that I wanted to discuss something in this area that might reconcile these differences. I received no response, there has never been any indication that this is anything more than an effort to ram a piece of poor, poorly drafted, unconstitutional Legislation through this Legislature. So let there be no mistake about my vote this time. It's a bad Bill and I'm going to make no misunderstandings. I'm voting 'no'."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was asked today by several people who were lobbying in behalf of the Bill about my knowledge of abortion clinics and what effect they have on those who come for an abortion and whether they give counselling. And my answer is if we're concerned about the abortion and the abortion clinic in counselling then what we should do is upgrade the quality of the abortion clinic. Tighten the licensing requirements and standards for these clinics. But this Bill doesn't address itself to that; this Bill doesn't solve the problem. Making a husband give written consent for an abortion for his wife, I think that's an abortion in and of itself. And I think it's ridiculous and I think this is one of the worse Bills I've seen before the House this Session. And contrary to...to arguments of my friend on the other side of the aisle this Bill is a legal travesty. There's no question about it. And we'd be doing the wrong thing if we passed this Bill knowing that it has very serious constitutional ramifications. And I would urge a red vote for this Bill and I'm going to vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, explaining my vote I have always voted for anti-abortion legislation in the past. I am personally opposed to abortions, I find morally that I can not approve of legalized abortion but at the same time I can not vote for legislation which is blatantly unconstitutional, that has serious problems that very well may negate the abortion statute that Representative Hyde enacted into law in past Sessions of the Legislature. Until that time when we can come up with a better Bill that does meet the constitutional guarantees, reluctantly and with a great amount of regret I have to vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis. Will the gentle-



man standing between the Chair and the Members please be seated?"

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in order to explain my vote I'd like to point out faith and I are against abortions but a prior speaker said that this Bill automatically repeals the existing law on abortions in the books of the State of Illinois. I understand that the Illinois Catholic Hospital Association is not for this Bill, has not endorsed it. Now I certainly did vote for 1851, it had a repeater clause but I can not in good equity vote for this...way and those of you, some of you who are voting for it figure the court will throw it out. Well, this Bill is patently unconstitutional the way its drafted and therefore I have to vote present even though I'm against abortion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly, do you seek recognition?"

Kelly: "Ah, yes, Mr. Speaker. We're awful close to a 107 votes and I know there are some Representatives that haven't voted or possibly have voted present. I know the last time this Bill came up there were something like 12 or 14 representatives that came up to the front and...and had their vote added onto the passage of the Bill. Now I'll tell you right now if this Bill is defeated by one vote because someone wants to wait until after the vote has been taken to go up and tack their vote on, God bless you because that is the...this is one of the most conscious votes that you'll ever make in your life. So I say I need some help now and the unborn need it now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer." Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote in this. As I was voting in favor of this Bill when it was first presented to the House and passed the House last Spring, I would like to explain my no vote at the present time. Aside from our general feelings that we may have with regard to constitutionality I do feel that



we have to give some credence and credibility to the decisions of the courts of this land. It's my understanding that the Federal Court for the northern division of Florida has ruled specifically on the question of the need for consent from the natural father of a...of a... child to be aborted and has ruled it unconstitutional. I feel that as an attorney, if for no other reason, I am bound to listen to that court's decision and at this point in time regardless of any other consideration that portion of the Bill being present I must vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Hudson. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "I see we have the votes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to ask for a verification of the roll call if I have leave of the House to consider this a verified roll."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "I'd like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines, do you seek recognition?"

Gaines: "Well, I've been seeking it for the last ten minutes to explain my vote but I guess it's too late unless the House gives me leave. Well, I want to say this..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Explain it if you want to, Representative."

Gaines: "...All right. I want to say this. I see a lot of green lights up there by people who think the children should arrive but they don't want to feed them. They think children should arrive, they don't want to clothe them. They think children should arrive, they don't want to educate them. All they want to do is have them get here and fend for themselves. What you have, talk about morals, how moral is it to insist that a child arrive and then don't look after it? How moral is it to insist that a child arrive with parents who are incapable of looking



after it. How moral is it to say a child should arrive and then shirk your responsibility to look after it after it gets here? So don't talk to me about morals. I'm asking for verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "I'd like to have a poll of the absentees if we're going to have a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record, then he will have a poll of the absentees."

Selcke: "Arnell, Boyle, Fleck, LaFleur, Mautino, McAvoy, Palmer, Randolph, Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "Chairman has requested a verification of the affirmative roll call. The Clerk will proceed with the call of the affirmative roll call."

Selcke: "Anderson, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, Byers, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzzi, Carroll, Choate, Coffey, Collins, Craig, Daniels, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Duff, Ralph Dunn, Ewing, Farley, Fennessey, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hill, Hirschfeld, Ron Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Jacobs, Dave Jones, Keller, Kelly, Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mahar, McAuliffe, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pouncey, Richmond, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Cissy Stiehl, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Van Dyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Waddell, Walsh, Washburn, Willer, Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative roll call? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Please vote...please vote me aye."



Speaker Redmond: "Vote the gentleman aye. Any questions of the affirmative roll call? Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, can we hear from the Clerk what the present count is?"

Selcke: "Ah, present count is 110 ayes, 45 nays, 14 present.. 13 present."

Lundy: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers? How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the roll call."

Lundy: "Representative D'Arco."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D'Arco is in the center aisle. Representative Davis."

Davis: "We won't have any...we won't have any law at all, I was simply trying to help a friend but I think it goes a little farther than that. Record me as voting no."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as no. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "He's over here."

Lundy: "Representative Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers in the back."

Lundy: "Representative Keller."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller, he's in the center aisle."

Lundy: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld. Representative Hirschfeld on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the roll call. Representative Byers has returned to the Chamber. Put him back on the roll call."

Lundy: "Representative Klosak."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Klosak. Representative Klosak. How is the gentleman recorded?"



Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the roll call."

Lundy: "Representative Fennessey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fennessey. He's here."

Lundy: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne. He's in the back."

Lundy: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lundy: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa is in his seat."

Lundy: "Representative McMaster."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lundy: "Representative Craig."

Speaker Redmond: "Is in his chair."

Lundy: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Lundy: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "Stearney is here. Who was that one?"

Lundy: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lundy: "Representative Sevcik."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik. Is he here? How
is he recorded? Sevcik."

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the roll call."

Lundy: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Lundy: "Representative McCourt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt, is here." Any
further questions?"

Lundy: "Representative Lucco."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco, he's in the back there.
With his new colleague Representative Wolf."

Lundy: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk. He's here."

Lundy: "Representative Jones."



Speaker Redmond: "Which Jones?"

Lundy: "J. David Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "They're both here. Any further questions?"

Lundy: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Before you conclude the...where we stand I'd like to have an idea the ah...what the number is right at this time. Is there some way?"

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead and tell him."

Selcke: "106 ayes."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Getty."

Getty: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting present."

Getty: "Change it to aye, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as aye. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker I'd like to have my vote changed from no to aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Dunn...Beaupre. Representative Dunn, aye. John Dunn. John Dunn. Any further questions? What's the score?"

Selcke: "Well, let's see. 109 ayes, 44 nays to about 12 present."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there are 109 ayes, 44 nays and 12 present. The motion is adopted and the Bill is passed over the veto of the Governor. 1996. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schuneman: "The House Chamber today is decorated with flowers and I'm sure we all enjoy the beauty of the flowers. Some of our lady colleagues were recognized today by organized labor I understand for their vote yesterday to override



House Bill 2971. And we all appreciate the...the beauty of the flowers and appreciate having the ladies here. I think this is a very laudable gesture on the part of the donors but unfortunately their gesture failed to recognize some^{of} our other lady colleagues who cast some very conscientious votes yesterday against the override. And in an attempt to show appreciation to those ladies who voted against the override yesterday some of my Republican colleagues have joined in the purchase of a small floral tribute to them. Now it has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that there's just a little bit of symbolism involved in these bouquets. It has been pointed out that some of the bouquets are quite large, quite costly and they are red. The others, Mr. Speaker, you'll note are really quite modest. They're much less expensive but they are just as dedicated to the principle which is simply to show our appreciation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of personal privilege is well taken.

House Bill 1996. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would consent to the Rules Committee holding an emergency meeting with regard to a motion presented on House Bill 3203. It would take a few moments and I understand it to be none, well, it would not interfere, interrupt with the House at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I've been led down the primrose path before, I'd like to know the subject matter of the Bill and I'd like to see a copy of the synopsis."

Katz: "Well, ah, Mr. Skinner, this is^a motion presented to the Rules Committee by Representative Schneider, we...does not get to the merits of the motion at all. He simply had asked to have the same opportunity that the Rules Committee afforded to you on two occasions which was to hear your motion to have your Bill heard notwithstanding the joint rules. And so...the merit of the Bill if it does ever emerge from the Rules Committee will be before you



I had not really thought this was in any way controversial.
It is simply a procedural matter....more..."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it now becomes controversial,
I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner I can tell you the
nature of the Bill if you desire."

Skinner: "Well, I think that would be appropriate./the Chairman
since
of the Rules Committee apparently can't answer the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, inadvertently, when Enrolling and En-
grossing was enrolling and engrossing a Bill which we
passed they failed to take out some language which had been
intended to have been deleted and the mistake was not dis-
covered until after it had been signed by the Speaker,
the President of the Senate and the Governor and it was
called to the attention of the attorneys that that's in
there and that's what the purpose of the Bill is."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to be dilatory but I would
like to know for what purpose will the bonds which are to
be issued be used?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, isn't there...I
understand that it's school bonds but I'm not sure."

Skinner: "What kind of school bonds?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know."

Skinner: "I mean is this going to go to subsidize my district..."

Speaker Redmond: "Here's Representative Schneider."

Skinner: "...Representative Katz's district or Representative
Schneider's district?"

Schneider: "Ah, thank you Mr. Speaker, I think I heard the
question and the answer is that when we passed House Bill
3050 which went out of here overwhelmingly the other day,
or this Spring, after it had passed the House and the Senate
Enrolling and Engrossing stuck a short line that should
not have been stricken. It then went on to become law
and consequently what happened is that we now have, first
of all a sentence that is incomplete but more importantly
we now have a Bill which creates some problems for school



districts that are trying to stay within the limits of their bonding power. What the Bill would do then is basically exactly what you're looking at, Cal, but frankly the deletion creates a serious problem because it does not allow schools to exceed their limit which they normally could do when they get assistance on the Capitol Development Board."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may ask...I'm still waiting for the type of bonds. Is this the part of the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea, for what purpose..."

Skinner: "...Bond program to survive the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, as I understood Representative Katz' motion it was to hold the meeting of the Rules Committee while the House was in Session in the Speaker's Office to have the Rules Committee take up this Bill. Now if the House would give leave for that, the Committee could meet in the Speaker's Office and we could go on with the business of the House so we could finish up here today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, certainly I support Chairman Katz' request and we should meet and it'll only take a few minutes to dispose of this Bill in Rules, one way or the other."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has...has asked leave to have the Rules Committee meet, a short meeting in the Speaker's Office, while the House floor...while the House is in Session. Leave granted? Hearing no objections, leave granted. Immediately in the Speaker's Office. House Bill 1996. Representative Youngue."

Youngue: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I move we override the veto on House Bill 1996. I'm asking you to please override this veto because I feel that the issue is very clearly whether the State of Illinois and whether the people in Illinois will receive a \$2,300,000 federal grant to build an industrial park in



St. Clair County by the State of Illinois providing the matching loan of \$1,900,000 by making an investment in tax producing jobs in St. Clair County. I feel that this veto should be overridden because the reasons given for the veto are invalid. First of all, the veto message indicated that the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation was not the appropriate corporation for the state loan to go to. I call your attention to a manila folder..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the lady order."

Younge: "Okay. I call your attention to a manila folder that I have placed on everybody's desk. In that folder you will see that under the terms and conditions of the federal grant from the Department of Commerce, the grantee to be sure is a regional business economic development council but under the special terms and conditions of that branch the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation is the corporation that has come up with the money to purchase the land and also the nonfederal matching share. These two items are the subject matters of House Bill 1996 which I repeat and reiterate is a loan at 3% and so therefore under the terms and conditions of the federal grant it was appropriate to make the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation, the recipient of the loan from the Department of Business and Economic Development. The second reason given, too, in the veto message was that there was substantive language in the Bill itself. The, ah, Section 2 of the Bill indicated that the Director of the Business and Economic Development should set up a repayment schedule. I have read very carefully all the pages which go into the issue of whether or not this might be...Mr. Speaker, could I have some order? Whether or not this might be substantive language and I am convinced that it clearly is not. It is a condition of the loan but it's an inherent condition of any loan



that there be a repayment schedule. Thirdly, and so therefore I believe that the constitutional objection raised in 1996 in Section 2 is really not a serious one. Thirdly, the veto message indicated that we could not afford the \$1,900,000. My answer to that is clearly we can not afford not to make this loan. Since we have been here the unemployment rolls in this state have risen from 200,000 to half a million. Since we have been here the Aid to Dependent Children rate is...has gone all out of ...all out of proportion. These Bills are bills...this Bill is a Bill to provide employment in an area that is in desperate need of job creating activities. And for these reasons because it's in the right place that it will do a job of creating job opportunities thereby producing tax revenue. I ask you to vote to override this veto. I think we ought to take the stand right here and now in this Session of the General Assembly that we are a new generation of Illinoisans; we are new generations of Americans and that we're going to turn away from subsidized unemployment to providing tax producing jobs for people. I think that we have to take that step and we have to take that step right now in this...in this Session and for these reasons I ask you to vote to override the veto of this loan to build this industrial park. One of the objections to the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation was the fact that the Regional Business and Economic Development Council was not named as the recipient of the state loan. In your folder on your desk you will see the two, you will see a letter from the St. Louis Regional Growth Association; of course this is the regional association that has a responsibility for creating economic growth in the St. Louis area. It has some 3,000 clients that locate their businesses in that area and if the St. Louis Regional Growth Association is committed to the proposition of building this industrial park. You will notice in this letter that the chairman of the St. Louis



Business and Economic Growth Council indicated that four bankers and multiple businessmen will be put on the Board of the Directors of the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation. In the folder on your desk you will see that that fact has been accomplished. You see a...a annual report of the Assenting Citizen Development Corporation which shows that the four bankers have assumed their positions on the Board of Directors making the change... that was suggested in...in this letter. Also the letter suggested that the takedown period for this loan would be over two or three fiscal year period; therefore I'm not making all the demands on the state treasury occur in this fiscal year. That will certainly greatly help the situation. I think that we have effectively met all of the objections in reference to the veto message and because we have done this and because we have a proposition in which basically is whether or not we're going to provide the opportunity for all Americans and for all Illinoisans to work that we should vote to override this veto. I came here...wanting to inform you to turn away from public aid as a course of action in reference to our unemployed and dependent. The way that we can turn away from public aid is to do job creating type activities and that is precisely what this Bill is. It is a Bill for a loan, a loan, at 3% to create jobs in St. Clair County that needs it more than any and for those reasons I ask you please to vote with me and to override this veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller. Tom Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She indicates she will."

Miller: "Ah, Miss Younge, are these revenue bonds?"

Younge: "Ah, Representative Miller, it is a 3% loan, it has nothing to do with revenue bonds."

Miller: "A loan, ah, what kind of faith and credit is put behind the, ah, behind this money that would be given by the State of Illinois?"



Younge: "It is a, Representative Miller, it is a 3% from the General Revenue Fund."

Miller: "Well, what..."

Younge: "It has nothing to do with the full faith and credit clause that has to do with Revenue bonding or General Obligation Bond. This Bill has nothing to do with bonds. It is a 3% loan."

Miller: "A loan without any backing? Where...what...how will the money be used?"

Younge: "The money would be used as a nonfederal matching share to complete the site improvements to build an industrial park in St. Clair County. We have a \$2,300,000 federal grant and this is the nonfederal matching loan at 3%."

Miller: "Will the State of Illinois have any title to that property as long as we're making that a grant of \$1,900,000. Who will hold the property?"

Younge: "The...the loan would go to the Department of Business and Economic Development and then would be lent to the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation which would hold title to the land, I take it."

Miller: "The title would be held by the ACDC correct?"

Younge: "That's correct. I believe so."

Miller: "All right, I'd like to get a little information on this company or corporation. How was the corporation formed? Is it a private corporation?"

Younge: "It is a not-for-profit state chartered economic development corporation. The Department of Commerce has a local development corporation instrument which...which it sets up to pursue industrial growth and development of very poor communities. The corporation that has been set up for the City of E. St. Louis is the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation."

Miller: "When was ACDC incorporated?"

Younge: "ACDC was incorporated..."

Miller: "As a non-for-profit corporation."



Younge: "Ah, ten years ago."

Miller: "Well. I believe we have an annual report that would indicate that it was incorporated, in your handout, some-time..."

Younge: "No, that is simply a board change. One of the problems was to the membership on the board and so in order to straighten out that problem we asked four of the outstanding bankers of E. St. Louis to get on that board and that is proof that they're on that board and that is a bit of restructuring of that corporation."

Miller: "Thank you, I...I apologize for one question, I was misled with regard to when it was incorporated. Thank you for your response. What is the fiscal credibility of ACDC by its past performance. Have they ever...do they have an delinquent loans with any bank, have they been involved in any bad credit risk by their previous operation?"

Younge: "Ah, you'll understand that the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation is a service corporation. A corporation set up to help local businesses and help the growth and development of the very poor community. This corporation did in fact...was not refunded about three years ago and it has had some trouble but after...after it lost its funding it then did receive this federal grant which I believe testifies to the fact that it is a basically, although it is a poor corporation, it is a worthy and good corporation."

Miller: "Well, what kind of troubles have they had, Miss Younge, could you explain to us some of their credit problems that they've been through in the past?"

Younge: "There are no credit problems that I am aware of at this moment."

Miller: "You're unaware..."

Younge: "It doesn't have...it doesn't have any funding, it is an unfunded corporation but it has...tried to continue to be in business."



Miller: "Are you unaware of any previous bad credit problems that the principles of this corporation have had with regard to their industrial development in the East St. Louis area?"

Younge: "I believe..."

Miller: "And default on loans?"

Younge: "I believe it does owe money to some of the banks and ...those banks are represented on the Board of Directors so far as I know the whole restructuring of the board was in order to straighten out that problem. The...the fact that the Board of Directors and the President of the First National Bank is now on that Board. The fact that the President of the Edgemont Bank is now on that Board. The fact that the President of the Stockyard National Bank is now on that Board and the Union National Bank is now on that Board as you can see from that paper in front of you testifies to the credibility of the people involved in the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation."

Miller: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I briefly address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed briefly."

Miller: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if as the Sponsor of the Bill indicates that there are all these creditable people behind this ACDC, all bankers, why then don't they go out and sell revenue bonds to make this industrial park go. Why do they come to the State of Illinois and ask for \$1,900,000 to fund something that has by their previous demonstration been unworkable and a losing proposition. I would encourage a no vote on the motion to override."

Younge: "May I answer that question? You do not sell revenue bonds for site improvement. You sell revenue bonds when you're putting up buildings but you don't sell revenue bonds / ^{for} site improvements. That's why."

Miller: "Why...I believe that was your intent by veteran House Bill 396."



Younge: "No, we were..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we've gone into the question and answer period. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill was vetoed by the Governor for three reasons. Number 1 that the Ascending Citizens Development Corporation isn't the proper organization to receive the funds. The funds are to be loaned, in the wisdom of this body, because the federal funds will go to a federal organization. The Governor also pointed out, and I think very appropriately, that there is substantive language in this Bill. Finally, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're talking about a non-budgeted appropriation. It seems to me that on any one of these three counts the Governor was right, the Bill should have been vetoed. With three significant substantial objections it seems to me that it would be proper and right that we do vote no on this proposed override of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to begin by responding to Representative Miller's question as to why these people in the East St. Louis area see fit to come to the state, and I should say why shouldn't they come here when for three generations or more they've been supported by the State welfare rolls. They look upon the State as their surrogate father. They should come here, I don't see anything wrong with that. But I do see something wrong with the fact that you're going to equivocate over a few technicalities when people are trying to pull themselves up by the bootstrap and get off the doles. Now I watched here last June when the appropriation for welfare was considered, it stated that the ordinary contingency amount for welfare at \$1,600,000,000. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't find anything ordinary about a billion dollars. Especially when I know, or feel



and I'm sure many of you here do now, that next June when we have to consider that Bill, it's going to be two billion dollars. And I'm almost...I'm fearful that the way we will resolve the appropriation next summer is to arbitrarily cut people off and throw them on the streets. I see nothing wrong, I think that Representative Younge's Bill should be given serious consideration because it's a realistic alternative against that time when we'll be agonizing what to do with the unforunate poor. The people are, I think the state should act responsibly, instead of being a surrogate father and just handing out checks, they should be responsible and create situations where you hand out jobs and bring families back together again. In my opinion, public welfare has done nothing but destroy families. I think programs like the one, Representative Younge, is talking about will bring families back together and for that reason I'm going to support her Bill. And I think you should too."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

The East St. Louis area has approximately 70% of its people on welfare rolls. I think we'd better decide today whether we want to increase the welfare rolls which do tend to destroy the families instead of keeping them together or whether we want to apply and make some possibilities for payrolls. Now this situation is very real and acute. Representative Younge lives down there and show knows what it's like. As further proof of that one of our staff went down there and saw the situation for himself and reported the same thing as Representative Younge did. It would seem to me that the amount of \$1,900,000 is very small considering the \$25,000,000 per year approximately that we pay for consultant fees for certain executive departments. It seems to me that for \$1,900,000 as a loan, we could certainly take steps to



effect this because if it will help eliminate welfare rolls which are obviously not doing their job at all and institute some payrolls that will be doing some good. I urge your support of Representative Younge's Bill because I know how hard she's worked on it because she knows, she's lived in this situation and if you've been through the ordeal she's been through you don't know what it's all about and neither do I, so I therefore urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the time element involved I'd like to hold my comments for the explanation of my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise not only to commend Mrs. Younge on her fine idea but also of course to urge your support for this program. This is a Bill, I think, that would be of great value, not only to an area of our part of the State, but to a great number of people who are in great need of help. I think Mrs. Younge is a shining example of what can come out of an area like this. This is a loan and not an outright gift. This to me is an investment in human beings, not an investment in material things. And I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have no doubt but what the ladies intentions are very good but I think we'd better keep in mind that we're talking about, in effect, an outright gift of two million dollars for the East St. Louis area. Where we are told unemployment is at a very great rate. The people, if they pay it back, are only required to pay 3% simply interest. Now I suggest to you that the unemployment rate on the West side of Chicago is as great or greater than that in East St. Louis. On the near west side it is probably



greater. In Maywood, it's greater and if we had time we'd probably tick off a hundred places where it is as great. Does that mean that we have to come up with two hundred million dollars for an agency to build plants where there are plants already built now and people can go and go to work without the state making a single solitary contribution. I think, Mr. Speaker, we lose sight of the seriousness of the veto session. We're talking about two million dollars that we do not have. The constitution says that we cannot spend beyond anticipated revenues. We are doing that if we vote to sustain Mrs. Younge motion. We definitely should not do that, I urge that you vote no. This is very very serious. The only people who get a crack at this after us if we let it go, is the Senate and you know you can't depend on them so I urge that you vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise to support this Bill but I want to just preface my remarks by saying first, that I want to congratulate my colleague who a little while ago said that all of the women of this House should have roses. I really agree with him, as a preacher, I'm proud of the women of this House. Nowhere and nobody, I don't care where it is, whether it's in church, whether it's in social organization or any other place, do we have any finer women than we have here in this House. They dress like ladies, do you hear me when I tell you, they act like ladies, they conduct themselves like ladies and I was...I was pleased a little surprised when this distinguished lady came down here from the district from which she came but she's done her homework and she's done it beautifully. Have you looked at this last folder that was passed out here, she's answered those questions beautifully. Now you talk about pulling yourself up by the bootstrap, this is a



bootstrap Bill. If you want to give them the boots and the strap, here it is. A bootstrap Bill, this Bill will help a distressed area and let me tell you there might be some somewhere you are just as distressed as the East St. Louis area but there's no area in Illinois that is more distressed than this area. Finally let me say that it was just here about two and a half years ago that I was at Plymouth Rock. I'd never been there before. I'd heard about it, I'd read about it in history. But I was there and I saw it and I asked the guard to explain to me and tell me about the pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock, about their hardships and what they had to go through with and when I got through listening, when I got through viewing those spots, where these first pilgrims landed I felt like I was standing on holy ground, do you hear me? You can't imagine what they had to go through to survive. Oh, but as a preacher, they brought with them something that all of us need. They brought with them, their Bibles, thank God for it and you know what their password was, their password, I'm talking about your founding fathers now, their password was 'God is able', and of course they faced many problems. Can you imagine what they had to face when they came out this way? The problem was great, why am I saying that? I'm saying that to you because it seems to me that our cities are our battlefront now. Open battlefronts, that's what our cities are coming to and let me tell you this, we are facing mountainous problems, do you hear, in our cities. But here is an opportunity, not to put somebody on welfare and give them a check for nothing, but here is an opportunity to give them the boots and the straps and to let them to be able to pull themselves up. We're not asking, here in this Bill, that you just hand them 1,9 million. We are asking that you loan them 1.9 million and this will be the best investment we've ever made. Oh, I don't want to talk



about all these parties we throw down here, I've been to some and I've watched some and I've seen what goes on down here. I know what goes on down here. I know what goes on in some of these committees down here. I know about the entertainment and all this sort of thing. I don't want to talk about it because I watched it but let me tell you that this is a small amount to invest in human dignity. This is a small amount to give a lady like that stands back there on that floor and hold out her hand to you and say give me a chance, give me a chance. The Urban League testified down here a few days ago and this is what they said. They said primarily our goal is equality. Equality of opportunity. Equality of life. Equality is our goal and that's exactly what the founding fathers came to these shores for. Equality for the work of God as their conscience dictates. Equality of opportunity, that's what they came for. And this is what she's pleading for. We have voted here to override. I voted along with you. Not because I do not hold the Governor of this State in high esteem but because I think there's something more dear than dollars and cents. It's an investment in human life and an investment in human dignity. I plead with you on her behalf, send her back home with her vote so that she can hold her head up and so that she can walk with upright steps with the dignity of a normal woman who has been elected to this body and whom we honor here now. I plead with you to vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, and the Members of the House. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. Question is shall the main question be put? All in favor will indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it. Representative Younger to close."

Younger: "Please vote with me. I am fighting for the economic



life of my community. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 1996 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor signify by voting aye, opposed vote no. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, first of all, as one of those individuals who represents that west side area that Representative Walsh was talking about, I'm certainly going to support this Bill. Not because I feel that the west side of Chicago is not getting its fair share but because I feel that this represents a first step toward doing something for an area that badly needs it. Secondly, let me address myself to the three points that were raised by one of the previous speakers who alluded to the Governor's veto message. First of all, that speaker said that the Governor's message indicated that this Bill had a defect because the money was not being loaned to the same corporation that the grant was going to. Well let me suggest to that speaker, that first of all, that grant is going to that Regional Economic Development Council because that is the Council that has the relationship with the federal government. Secondly, the loan will be going to the Ascending Citizens Development Corporation because that is the Corporation that will hold title to the land. Mr. Speaker it would not make sense at all for this State to loan money to a corporation that didn't have title to the land so I think that argument is not valid. Secondly, the speaker, he referred to the Governor's veto message, as it had to do with whether or not the money was available. I don't want to debate that issue because it seems clear to me as Deacon Davis said that this is an investment in a part of the State that we need to make that investment in. Thirdly, let me simply say that I've watched Representative Younge as she's developed this legislation and think she's



done a job and that she merits our support. Not just because she did a job but because the area involved is badly in need of the funds and we have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to respond to that need. And I urge all of my colleagues to vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. I admire the diligence with which Representative Younger has gone about this. I've looked at her folder. I'm going to support it for a simple reason. I think we have an obligation to give them a chance. But I don't think that she...I don't think that she is being realistic. I think she's going up against a stone wall. I think we're going to see an increase in welfare down there, unfortunately, and I think that to overcome the difficulties there are beyond Representative Younger or anyone else. At least for the work she's done she deserves the chance. So I'm going to give her the chance by voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to explain my aye vote. This distinguished lady is doing nothing more than what everyone else of us do and that is fighting for the people who live in her legislative district. But I think that by offering this legislation and by supporting it we may actually be responsible for a laboratory, if you will, an experiment, if you will, an idea, if you will, in a state where in our inner cities unemployment is running rampant and where all the problems associated with it are running rampant. There becoming cancers and we have to do something. Now if you think that two million dollars is alot of money I can tell you what the alternatives to plans like this are, and they go way beyond two million dollars, they go into the billions of dollars. So I say that in supporting this legislation even though I do not come from the lady's



district I hope that her hard work and perseverance will be rewarded. But beyond that I hope that we can come up with a pilot program that we can use in every inner city community across the state and I'm very pleased and proud to cast an aye vote here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House and these very very lovely pretty ladies with all the flowers of all colors. You know, we sit here and vote to have limitations on limiting children and then we hesitate to vote the money out to see to it that we say should arrive have a chance. My personal relationship with East St. Louis and Mrs. Younge's family about six years ago when I was in the Attorney General's office and we went down to Cairo to stop a riot and her husband went with me when I was representing the Attorney General office and helped stop that riot. Her concern is for poor people everywhere not just in East St. Louis so I say to you who feel that East St. Louis is getting something the rest of the State should have East St. Louis deserves it. It is the most depressed area of any of the areas mentioned. Because it has the least industry there to compare it with. And therefore I feel that if we're going to give the young people an opportunity to feel that they are part of the government give the depressed people and opportunity to feel that we're concerned about them. The biggest problem we have is alienation of the public and unless we take every effort possible to reach into the most depressed areas of our state and bring them up to where we are we are denying the mandate of our people. So, therefore, I'm asking all of my friends on my side of the aisle as well as the other side of the aisle to join me in voting yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the aisle...er...the House. The remarks of the Minority Leader Mr. Walsh, I think were



valid to the extent that he pointed out that this is a statewide problem. That we have depressed areas throughout the state, as a matter of fact, my district is a depressed area and it equals East St. Louis. I had legislation which hopefully would have addressed itself to the State wide problem but unfortunately we couldn't perfect the legislation in time and it had to go back to committee and it languishes there. House Bill 1974 - 76. But notwithstanding that we haven't approached the matter statewide, I think what has happened in Ms. Younge's bill, she's come up with an extremely ingenious pilot program addressed if not to the most depressed area at least to one of the most depressed areas of this State. Now there is a legitimate question of money here. A million nine is a lot of money and we should weight it carefully before spending it but yesterday we voted for the children, that every speaker who spoke for that Bill got up and said let's vote for the children. Well there are several ways for voting for the children. I'm not an exponent for the trickle down theory, as a matter of fact, it's usually an to me but it seems to me that if you vote for the parents of those children to get jobs, that money will trickle down to those children in terms of education, housing, clothing, and so forth and that's all this Bill does. I don't think Mrs. Younge would say that this is a perfect bill but certainly she has addressed herself to the major objections raised by the Governor's veto even to the extent of recasting this community service organization to meet those objections. What is she saying to you? In very simple terms, the problem is statewide, we don't have the funds at this time perhaps to approach the problem state wide but let's not give up the ghost let's get a piece of this problem and work on it and where is the best place to work, East St. Louis. I've been in this General Assembly for 12 years



and have observed gradually that metropolis go from broke to super broke. There's simply nothing going there. I won't reiterate the problems of social-anti-social situation which has come about, Representative Gaines has dealt with that quite deftly. But it seems to me that we have to make a gesture in the direction of resurrecting metropolis's such as, towns such as East St. Louis. The problems in East St. Louis pre-date the recession. The problems in East St. Louis probably will continue far beyond the recession. It seems to me that what we need is stand by legislation on the state level to address ourselves quickly and promptly to situations like the East St. Louis problem. I think in light of the ingenuity of this problem, realizing that it's strictly a pilot program I think we should give this lady a vote of confidence, put this money down in East St. Louis, observe it carefully and hopefully it will do what we think it should do and that is bring some of these depressed areas up and at a later time perhaps we can expand it. I think we should tighten our belts other places and address ourselves to that serious problem and like others I commend her for making this gigantic effort and I'm going to vote aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. At this time, look at that board because almost all of those, except perhaps for Representative Borchers, is voting green up there has also voted for workmen comp and the unemployment comp bill last summer. Now we have talked about how those Bills...what they have done to the industrial and business climate of this state and that is the reason why we are having unemployment. You can vote these loans this gift of money down there but it's not going to do any good because the industrial and business climate of this State is getting bad so this is a complete waste and I urge a no vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I certainly disagree with my good friend, the previous speaker. If you looked at the recent business trend you will find that the automobile industry only as late as yesterday has had a 24 increase, 24% increase, in sales over a year ago and I certainly disagree with other speakers who have talked about pouring good money after bad money because let me tell you all one thing, this program is designed to take the probably the pocket of the most highly unemployed area of the State of Illinois and create jobs for people who today are on welfare. We're going to be confronted with a probably 200 million dollar deficiency as far as public aid is concerned if you want to take a job...take a step rather in creating a climate that will make it possible for these people to raise their heads and say yes I'm employed, I'm not on public aid you will vote for this Bill. And in the long run it's not going to cost the taxpayers of this State not one single solitary red penny because your going to offer gainful employment to people who want to work and we will then not be confronted with this horrendous millions and hundred of millions of dollars deficiency for public aid. If you want to help the people who only a few years ago live in an area that was nationally ranked as the seventh greatest unemployed and disaster area of the United States of America you will vote for Yvetta Younge's Legislation and take a step toward providing jobs for these people who can work and want to work and take them off of public aid."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When this Legislation came to the Executive Committee last spring I was in opposition to it. However, I think, perhaps, I was wrong at that time and I think perhaps this Bill



should have a vote in the effort to override. My reasoning for this is this, Mr. Speaker, is much better to invest money in development in an industrial area than it is to pay it out in welfare funds. It seems to me that those of you who are voting red up there that call yourselves financial conservatives should perhaps take a look at the idea that rather than taking an investment in public aid you'd better make an investment in industry in this State in the creation of jobs. We many times say that it won't work, it can't work, it never has worked, but Ladies and Gentlemen we waste more money in this State every day than the total cost of this Bill. And it seems to me that we ought to recognize that perhaps we won't solve the problems of St. Clair County Metropolitan Area in one Bill or in one development however a journey of a 1000 miles begins with a single step and it has been said that it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. Mrs. Younge is trying to light a candle for the St. Clair County Metropolitan Area and I think we should not, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we should not blow it out and we shouldn't allow the Governor to blow that candle out with his veto. I would urge an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think Representative should be applauded for the effort she has taken in this Bill. All the ideas and talks that I had is existing in this particular measure. She believes in the same theory that I do in trying to create and develop her community as I have tried so desperately to do for ours. I certainly think she should be given a vote in order to override so that more poor people will have a chance for a fair share of our State. Thank you Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.



For the record clears, I was one of those people who did not vote for Senate Bill 285 or 234 and 235 but I hope we look at ourselves and examine ourselves as the prior speaker said, which is better welfare rolls or payrolls. When an area needs the industry we don't want to give it there. We can afford a billion and a half dollars, ghost ridden payrolls, transportation budget, we can afford a four hundred million dollar deficit with the public aid and we have the greatest number of ineligible people, we have the greedy rather than the needy being taken care but we can't afford 2 million dollars to create jobs, help create jobs and help this destitute community. What are we anyway? Let's give this woman an aye vote, she knows the situation for heaven sakes let's show some compassion for the needy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are 50 people on that board who are not registered at all on this Bill and there are 14 who are voting present. Now I'm a little bit amazed at Governor Walker's action on this Bill. If I were the Governor of this State or I think if any of us were, and somebody came along with an idea that might even possibly help in East St. Louis I would jump at the chance to say that I was a part of it. I've gone through East St. Louis since I was, well young, when we go to St. Louis from my area we go through East St. Louis and I've seen that town come from a town that was one of the model cities program several years ago to what it is today. There are a lot of jokes about the real solution in East St. Louis but there not funny to the people that live there including Mrs. Younge. If you'll just remember a few short years ago when Governor Oglivie was the Governor of this State I sat on the appropriation committee with some of you and we voted an appropriation to fully fund the building



of a Junior College in East St. Louis. It cost alot more money than this and probably it won't do as much good as this. But this is a serious effort on the part of a very very imaginative Representative to do something, really something, for the people of her area. I don't think any of us have any conception of how to help East St. Louis. I know Governor Walker doesn't have any and I don't think Governor Oglivie really had much. But there was some ideas proposed by the local people and one of them was to build a Junior College there without a local referendum and without the local tax support and we did it for them. And Mrs. Younge thinks that if we pass this legislation and provide for this facility to receive this federal grant that it will provide some help for East St. Louis and I think we ought to give her the benefit of the doubt, we ought to not go along with Governor Walker's veto on it, I think she's answered the questions that he's raised by his veto and I think we ought to give 107 votes at least to any reasonably idea that would help East St. Louis. And I ask all of you to reconsider what your actions are there, if your not voting at all or if your voting present and give Mrs. Younge and this idea the benefit of the doubt and vote yes for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of this Bill and I rise because she's adopting a principle that they want to lend money not give money. Her problem is that she's too honest, too forthright to do the things that are necessary to do in order to get your Bills through. She could have told us that she wanted to build a road down there and we would have given her four million dollars or even a sidewalk, but she didn't. She took a direct approach, she used imagination, she worked with the people of her community, she made a sincere and striding effort to achieve and beat a problem which we here in this



General Assembly have refused to look at. Her problem, as we say, one of the bastard children of the State of Illinois. Now I ask, in all sincerity, those of you who cry for the rights of life simply look around and decide there's life in East St. Louis and don't you abort it any further by denying the slightest opportunity. I say that you would cry and I can hear people over there who have heard unborn children and their sympathy is great and deep but where is your sympathy for East St. Louis. Where's your sympathy for a person who is trying to bring an idea forth from the community and who among who, anywhere, has come forth with the first idea to help East St. Louis. If we have no ideas, no imagination, no compassion then gentlemen we are wasting our time here. There are those of us who said we are helping the children, it's always our approach to help the children but when the deals go down we neglect and we take care of our own selfish interest."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea. Oh..."

Ewell: "If she had but fought in another way and said I'll do it piecemeal and took the philosophy that some of us take and say it's not how much you get but how often you get it and put in a Bill and a little amendment on every Bill she would have had her money but she's simply too honest, too forthright and too noble and this, Ladies and Gentlemen is our disgrace. She deserves the help, this Assembly offering no other alternatives, I ask you and beg with you to help her or at least put forth your own suggestions. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Not so long ago when the Chief Executive officer of this State appeared before us, he said that one of the single biggest problems that face the people of the State of Illinois is the high rate of unemployment. And if you look at the



area from which the lady comes it probably has one of the highest rates of unemployment any place in this State. Here's a program that says let us help ourselves, let us get off the relief rolls, let us get jobs that are in an area where we need them. Now we're faced with a large deficit in public aid. Here's a way to insure that next year it won't be that large. Here's a chance to put two or three hundred jobs in an area in this State that cries out desperately for employment. Please help pass this Bill so they can get some employment in this area."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 97 ayes, 38 nay...Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, will you poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The lady has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Selcke: "Arnell, Boyle, Bradley, Carroll, Daniels, Ralph Dunn, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Greisheimer, Hirschfeld, Ron Hoffman, Jacobs, Katz, Klosak, Londrigan, McAvoy, Malloy, Randolph, Rayson, Richmond, Schisler, Sevcik, Stearney, Cissy Stiehl, Stone, Telscer, VanDuyne, Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 ayes, 38 no, the motion fails...Representative Younge."

Younge: "Could that be placed on postponed consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "Lady has requested that that be placed on postponed consideration. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen same objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed consideration. House Bill 2042. 2042, Representative Kozubowski has asked leave to withdraw the motion, any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Lechowicz is recognized with respect to the motion on House Bill 2868 and 2869."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On House Bill 2868 and 2869 I want to withdraw



my motion to override. Basically these Bills amended the Occupational Safety and Health Act by transferring the responsibility for administering the Act from the Industrial Commission to the Department of Labor. We also provided that the act applied to all employees engaged in any occupation, business or enterprise in this State and their employees. This has been taken over by the Federal government and the responsibility as provided in the Act presently just adheres to the various municipalities and governmental agencies within the State and for this reason I'm withdrawing the motion to override."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the motion with respect to 2868 and 2869 is withdrawn. A point of inquiry Mr. Clerk. House Bills 3028, I've been advised that that has been previously overridden. Am I correct on that? 2147. Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2147 will permit a home rule unit to adopt traffic warrant standards less restrictive for traffic control devices than those set forth in the State manual when the corporate authorities determine that such action is necessary for the public safety. Mr. Speaker, I think I'd better be realistic..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the gentleman order please."

McCourt: "I'll withdraw this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? The gentleman has withdrawn the motion with respect to House Bill 2147. Hearing no objection, withdrawn. 2560. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2560 is a Bill that I feel was vetoed through some misunderstanding on the part of the executive. The Bill deals with the salary range for the Chief Clerk of the State Board of Elections. The statute as it is now written establishes a minimum of salary of \$15,000 and a maximum salary of \$25,000. It's the only employee of the State Board who does have such a maximum



salary other than the members of the Board. Now the Bill does not attempt to raise the salary but it does strike that language that establishes the maximum and it replaces with language that says the Board shall determine the salary of the Chief Clerk of the State Board of Elections. This is in keeping with other positions within the State Board who are drawing salaries in excess of the Chief Clerk. These positions are all roughly equal in authority and yet the others have a range from 5 to 8000 dollars more than the Chief Clerk. I think this is even more unfair in light of the clear intent we had when we first passed the State Board of Elections Bills that the Chief Clerk would be the Chief Administrative Officer. Now the fact that this has been deluded I don't think changes the situation whereby one statutory position is limited in salary where there others who are drawing considerably more. The Governor in his messages stated that the salary range was commensurate with other positions of similar authority in State Government and this just isn't so and I think a mistake was made and I would ask you to redress that mistake today and give me the votes to override the veto on 2560."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "What's the salary range you are talking about?"

What's the present salary?"

Collins: "\$25,000."

Lechowicz: "\$25,000? And what's the title?"

Collins: "Chief Clerk."

Lechowicz: "Of what?"

Collins: "Of the State Board of Elections."

Lechowicz: "And what do you want to pay her?"

Collins: "I don't want to establish a pay at all, I want to give the Board the authority to establish her salary or



his salary whom ever it may be...uh...as they do for other employees such as the Director of Elections, Director of Personnel, Internal Auditor etc. who are drawing considerably more."

Lechowicz: "Who is the Clerk?"

Collins: "Presently the Clerk's name is Jane Price."

Lechowicz: "Good luck."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Collins do you want to close or have you? The question is shall House Bill 2560 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor indicate by voting aye, opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Record Representative Collins as aye. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 27 aye, 60 no, the motion fails and the Governor's veto is sustained. House Bill 3070. Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3070 authorizes the Comptroller to conduct such examinations that he considers to be necessary to determine whether expenditures pursuant to the law and authorized. This was a recommendation by the Legislative Audit Commission and the Auditor General and I will yield, it was a committee bill, and I will yield to Representative LaFleur to explain the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur you've been yielded to."

LaFleur: "House Bill 3070 is a Bill that came about through the constitution the creation of the State Comptroller. Some deficiencies have existed in the law and we found necessary to amend. 3070 is a very simple Bill that allows the Comptroller to examine beyond the four corners of a warrant. This Bill passed the House 126 votes to nothing. It came out of the Executive Committee unanimously endorsed by the Audit Commission and the Auditor General.



I would ask for a favorable vote on the override of the Governor on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative McPartlin do you want to close or have you consented to Representative LaFleur. The question is shall House Bill 3070 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor indicate by saying aye, all opposed voting no. Representative Byers."

Byer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that the Comptroller already has this power and we'll just be duplicating it if we give him something he already has and I see no need for this type of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3070 is very very important to this Legislature if we are to try and continue our integrity and creditability. This would give the State Comptroller the right to examine any transaction in which he's requested to draw a warrant, including examining any necessary field audits, investigations, and hearings. We've had alot of hidden payrollers. I think the public is entitled to know and I think the Comptroller should have the right to investigate these warrants fully before he issues them and the result of the reasons for them. Let's all give it an aye vote and clean house. It's about time when you know there's about 45 million dollars in consultant services in some of the departments per year and we talk about economy. Let's really be economic."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: This is a very important Bill, a very good Bill. It's not a partisan Bill at all. At the moment it happens to effect a Republican Comptroller whose not even running for election. It has Democrat sponsorship, bi-partisan



support, the full support of the Audit Commission. When we first passed, when the new constitution gave us the new Comptroller office it included some very serious and heavy responsibilities. This Bill implements the real full intentions of the people who pass the new constitution. The Auditor General can effect audits after the fact. But unless the Comptroller can go in to determine in advance accurately and well that monies are being used appropriately in on-going programs he has not got the kind the of information he needs in order to be able to make the kind of valid recommendations that he has recently made to all of us here on the fiscal situation in Illinois. The sponsor of this Bill is the Chairman of the Audit Committee. He has worked with and in a bi-partisan with the Comptroller's office, with the Auditor General who was selected by all of us with an extrodinary majority of the vote. When the Governor has vetoed this he has in effect thumbing his nose at the Legislator and I don't think you should let him do it. We've had a great deal of difficulty in trying to get the Auditor General and the Comptroller's office to be able to inquiry legitimately without harrassment into the everyday functioning problems of expenditures within the Executive Department. It won't take very many more votes to pass this override and I think that those of you who are aware of the integrity and skill in which the Comptroller has functioned within this office I think can recognize that we need to give him every bit of help that we can."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I never anticipated a slowness on the switches today on this Bill after it had the unanimous endorsement of the group and I think it would only be necessary to go back in the file and pull out all of the editorials that have been written across the State on this subject and the handicap that the Comptroller



works under in performing his function. I think that we should be prepared here, the advocate of this Bill, to stay here all night if necessary for the people to pay attention to this to understand what this Bill does and the importance of it. And I don't know how I can urge anyone anymore to look at this Bill, to understand this Bill and to give us a green vote on it so we can go on to the other business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm afraid we're resolving too many serious constitutional separation of powers and balance of powers between executive branches between executive agencies on the basis of personality. It seems to me that we've consistently done that throughout this Session and it's dangerous business. I think we've got to get away from the incumbents in office and look at this grant of power to the Comptroller in terms of one issue only. And that is, one, does the Comptroller have power at present to do the kind of job which we have mandated him to do and I must categorically say he does have that power but secondly, embodied in this Bill is there sufficient power given to the Comptroller that he mightif so inclined, politically motivated, hamstringing the executive wing of State government by consistently going into payrolls that are beyond reproach that's the issue and I think you ought to confront that issue not in terms of 1975 Comptroller, Governor but in terms of 1985, 95 and etc. Comptroller vis-a-vis Governor. Anything else is short range and lacking the understanding that I think we should put into this kind of legislation. I'm not presuming upon anything of the incumbents. I'm simply saying that the Bill is inherently dangerous because if you've got a unscrupulous comptroller you will have government at its knees and we've had government through the press blowing up issues that didn't exist, castigating



honest public servants and casting aspersions upon people who, perhaps, shouldn't have it. Don't go blindly willy nilly into this matter. The fact that the Legislative Auditing Commission recommends it only means they recommend it. Their recommendations are not cast in stone and they are not always right but I think we would be abominably incorrect if we voted on this Bill solely on the basis of personalities. Your dealing with serious problems and the question is do we have at our disposal the mechanism and the means to make certain that the Governor whoever he is does his job correctly and have we given to the Auditor General and the Comptroller sufficient powers to see that he does just that job. I think we have. I think if we vote this Bill is, we're going one step beyond reasonable operational government. I urge you to think twice, twice about this Bill. I'm going to have to vote no, notwithstanding the intentions are laudible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly if there had been any political implications in this Bill they would have been brought out under its original passage and let me point out in the original passage the vote count in the House was 126 to nothing and in the Senate it was 53 to 1, so if there were any political implications they would have been stressed and revealed at that time. To me this is just another...just another cross check balance procedure for the State of Illinois for good government. Certainly we've heard enough about questionable vouchers and questionable expenditures and questionable contracts and employees and this is one step that would reveal those questionable practices that are going on in State government today and I would request a couple more aye votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich do you seek recognition?"



Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.
On this question there 116 aye, 40 no, the motion...
Representative Byers."

Byers: "I'd like a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentlemen has requested a verification.
Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "A poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has requested a poll of the
absentees. Clerk will poll the absentees."

O'Brien: "Arnell, Capuzzi, Chapman, DiPrima, Ebbesen, Flinn,"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I just want to point out that this affects
everybody. All the constitutional officers and I want
to be recorded as present."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as present. Representative
Bradley do you seek recognition? Representative Flinn do
you seek recognition?"

Flinn: "Yes for the same reasons Representative Lechowicz gave
I'd like to be recorded as present also."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the call of the absentees."

O'Brien: "Laurino, Londrigan, McAuliffe, Malloy, Nardulli,"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell for what purpose do you
rise?"

Ewell: "I'd like to be recorded as present."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as present. Representative
Dunn."

Dunn: "I'd like to be recorded as present, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as present. Representative
Berman. Record the gentleman as present. Representative
Barnes. Record him as present. Representative Viteck.
Record him as present. Representative Kosinski. Record
him as present. Representative Maragos...the Clerk
surrenders. We'll dump the roll call and take a new one.
All in favor...the question is shall House Bill 3070 pass,
the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor



vote by voting aye, and opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 81 aye, and 40 no, the motion fails and the Governor's veto is sustained. House Bill 3122. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3122 created an Illinois Medical School Admissions Study Commission. It was actually Representative Roscoe Cunningham's Bill, initially and in time the purpose of the commission was to study the charges of medical doctors in the State. The study on admissions policies of two state medical schools with the reporting date sometime early next year. The Governor stated in his amendatory...in his total veto stated that the work of the proposed commission within the Higher Education Committee of the House and Senate was a duplication of effort. Many of the members that was interested in this commission were interested into the unfortunate procedures that are involved when a person makes an application at the medical schools and in turn there was quite some concern as far as the number of residents that come from out of state supposing at our two medical institutions. I checked with Southern Illinois University and the SIU presently enrolls residents at the rate of 100...Illinois residents at the rate of 100%. The University of Illinois, quote/unquote, is supposedly at 97%. I checked with the Department of Public Health and they have designated medical service shortage by county. In addition, the Board of Higher Education has nearly completed a total health man-power survey which would up-date that list as well as consider all health care personnel. Actually the first aim of the commission has been completed. But in turn I would still hope that this body would seriously consider the impact as far as there is a doctor shortage in this State. We'd like to know why. We'd like to know



why you have to be a son of a doctor in order to enroll. We'd like to know why certain specific recommendations as far as the admission policies are what they are. For this reason I'm asking for an override on the Governor's veto on House Bill 3122. And to aid my help I believe Representative Klosak would like to make a few comments on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Klosak."

Lechowicz: "Unfortunately I think he's off the floor, temporarily."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill...Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "How will this Commission be funded?"

Lechowicz: "The funds were contained in the omnibus appropriation bill of 3017. It asked for an expenditure of approximately \$9700; the Governor removed the fund from the ...from the Commission as far as by an item veto on that Bill. I think that as far as the total dollar amount that is necessary in order to fund this. We'll probably come in with a very slight and small supplemental appropriation like we'll do many other agencies after the March primary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "In...in other words, there are no funds available for the operation of this Commission?"

Lechowicz: "There were funds available, it's...some of the funds ...also response on 3017, and I'll have...I could have a motion on that Bill as well."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it seems to me rather presumptuous to create a commission for which there is no funding; suggesting that it's going to be a do nothing commission or a commission that is going to



come up with a report that is not well founded in terms of research and activity. Should also suggest that the creation of a commission runs in the face of the existence and operations of our standing committee structure here in the House and for those reasons I would encourage a no vote on this motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 3122 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a matter in which I have considerable interest and Representative Roscoe Cunningham was the principle Sponsor of a Bill in the regular Session and I was pleased to be a co-sponsor because I feel that something has to be done about the education of medical students. I don't think any of us are not aware of someone who has a dedication to being a doctor and who is a good bright student who has not been denied admission to a medical school. I have a good friend whose son is in this position and his son is required to go to Greece to go to medical school. Now this, this in a country like ours and a State like ours is deplorable. We need very much, so that we can have adequate medical services in this State, we need very much an increase in the number of doctors. Now I submit that there can be a lot wrong with the education of doctors. I submit that they make it too difficult to get into medical school and make it too expensive to run medical schools. There are many, many things that need inquiry and I think we are the body to do it because we are responsible to the people. And I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that this commission go into operation as has been pointed out before there is no funding so it can't hurt anybody and it might help."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I



would call your attention to the reason for the Governor's veto on this Bill. Ah, the matter under discussion is all ready within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Higher Education. And for the benefit for the rest of...of those of you who do not happen to serve on this Committee, a study of just this nature was done in the last Session by a sub-committee of the Higher Education Committee. Copies are available if you just ask the Legislative Council. It is an important issue, I agree with the last speaker and I agree with the intent of the Sponsor of...of this Bill. However it has been done and for you fiscal conservatives on the floor of the House, this is a place where you can save duplication in time, energy and money. It's there, it's been done. Vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the lovely lady from DuPage, and I mentioned it on my remarks in this Bill, I'm sorry Giddy but you're in error. In the 78th Session the Higher Education sub-committee on health services studied the programs designed to encourage doctors to remain in the State and that was all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to publicly express my appreciation to Representative Lechowicz for taking over this Bill. It's no longer mine, it's his, I thank him for an excellent presentation of the Bill but the need is statewide. There isn't one of us who hasn't been approached by a great many parents who have a talented son or a talented daughter that wants to be in medical school or in dental school. Maybe the commission accomplishes nothing but it's an effort and if all we can do is make an effort in that direction to try to create the opportunity for a life to be more useful to your community and your state. It would seem on that basis we ought to all give Ted a vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will



take the record. On this question there's 112 ayes, 25 no and the motion is adopted. Representative Choate."

Choate: "Yeah, before Representative Kane gets the microphone I just wanted everybody to enjoy these apples that Dick Hart brought up from the 59th Representative District."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question 112 aye and 25 no. The motion is adopted the Bill is passed over...is passed over the veto of the Governor. I understand that Representative Kane really is the donor of the apples and he has a fresh tube of denture cream for anybody who has any problems. Representative Kane."

Kane: "My colleague from the 59th District takes credit for a lot of things but these apples came from Jefferies Orchard here in Sangamon County and the people from Jefferies Orchard deserve a good round of applause. They're good apples. You can tell they're not from the 59th District because they taste a lot better than the last ones I had up here."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "You forgot to tell them how much they are per bushel."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of...we have...to quote of the total of veto motions, on the order of item and reduction veto motions, appears House Bill 1947...upon which a motion has been filed. The gentleman from Cook, Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a motion to restore the items in the budget appropriation for the Department of Transportation which were deleted in consequence of the Governor's veto of House Bill 1539, the Motor Fuel Tax Allocation Formula Bill. The Governor's veto of House Bill 1539 having been overridden by this House this week, this motion is necessitated in order to have the Department of Transportation's budget for this year properly reflect the allocation formula to local units of government of motor fuel tax revenues. Now the items in this motion are identified in your digest



as Amendment #4 to House Bill 1947. This was an Appropriations Committee Amendment which was agreed to by the Sponsor of the Department of Transportation Bill. I would emphasize that none of the funds involved herein are from General Revenue but all of these funds are from motor fuel tax revenues and are in accord with House Bill 1539 which was approved by this House this week. And I ask for your support of the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak in opposition to the motion that has been made to restore these items. Our road fund is in no better shape in this state than is the general revenue fund. And to deplete by some \$16,000,000 the road fund for what is proposed in House Bill 1539 which went out of this House the other day, would seriously curtail the availability of road funds for State owned projects. It's very simple for proponents of this measure to go around and say that our township, counties and municipalities would get additional money, but if you look at those amounts you'll find that ...very little can be done while the City of Chicago, a vast amount of money has again been given to them to repair the streets in the City of Chicago. In addition to restore this amount of money would hasten within the next fiscal year a time when we will have to increase the motor fuel tax in the State of Illinois in order to afford such proposals as this. And I would urge a no vote on the motion to restore these items."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall the items on page 13 line 2 through 12 be restored the reduction of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor signify by voting aye; all opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I'm sorry to be...ignorant but would you explain exactly what we're voting on because I've had so many people talking around..."



Speaker Redmond: "You're voting on the motion of Representative D. L. Houlihan to restore items that appear on page 13 lines 2 through 12 on House Bill 1947."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I will, that's Department of Transportation..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, apparently there's some confusion here. I didn't have the opportunity to close but I would ask the attention of the Membership to consider what we are doing here. This is the Bill that we have all ready passed this week with 112 votes. This is the Bill which changes the motor fuel tax allocation formula to increase the distributor shares under that formula to our local units of government. It has application in every one of our districts. The amount involved here is \$16.4,000,000 out of a Department of Transportation budget of \$2.4,000,000,000. Now we have debated this at great length; 112 Members of this House after a verified roll call supported the formula change. You can not now get the money back...all of the money back to your local units of government unless you support the appropriation change that will fully fund the new formula that all of us here have approved. Now I would like to point out the position of the Department of Transportation when the Department of Transportation budget was considered on this floor on June the 24th of this year. The Sponsor of this Department of Transportation budget agreed to this Amendment on the basis that they would agree to this for the needs of local units of government if they received their appropriation for \$200,000,000 in Series 'A' bonds. They have received the \$200,000,000 authorization for Series 'A' bonds. In consequence the stated position of the Department of Transportation was to support this Amendment. The overwhelming position of this House was to override the Governor's veto and to support House Bill 1539. Now logically we must now fund the appropriation and it was going to look ludicrous if we do not and I don't know how you



expect to go back and explain to your local units of government how you pulled a hat trick on them and told them that you were going to fund them more fully to meet their road needs and then not do it. Now this is the position that we are in; we have debated this at great length; it took a long time in this House on Tuesday and I ask your support now on the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak against this motion. I have heard Representative Houlihan state that there was some sort of an arrangement if downstate would receive, or the Transportation Department would receive \$200,000,000 in Series 'A' bonds that there was an agreement also for this amount. And that is not true. There was no agreement. I fought 1539, I'm fighting also this motion and it's ludicrous for us downstate to really believe that the motor fuel tax fund can really withstand the sixteen plus millions of dollars taken out of the motor fuel tax fund to go to residential streets. I would urge you to reconsider those, who are voting green, and to vote no or present. We can not afford this. I think downstaters and... suburbanites would be grossly, I don't know how you can explain it back home if you're voting green. I would urge you to vote no."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I certainly know what Representative McClain means because he ripped off \$59,000,000 from the last State Highway budget for road projects in his district. Now what about the rest of the State for Christ's sake? Now is...is the rider \$300,000 per district in the State worth more than waiting for the opportunity for you to sponsor the annual Department of Transportation budget? Now are you going to have a sure \$300,000 a year to use to fill ...potholes in your residential streets or you can wait like Mike McClain and be here two years and sponsor the Department of Transportation budget and have so many bulldozers in your District that even when you vote for the IEA position and get an army of workers on a veto override they're in so deep you can't pull them out."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Skinner: "If this is not passed, we...every township in this State is going to lose \$100 for every mile of road they have on their system. Now they're used to getting it because they got them for the first six months of this year. I would sincerely suggest that if your township road commissioner hasn't gotten in touch with you, that I hope he will find out if you didn't vote in favor of this Bill within the next year so he can ask you why you didn't. It takes a measly little 89 votes. It takes 89, it's a reduction veto, isn't it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Skinner: "An item veto...we've been had."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Just to clarify what I was saying here, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I referred to the position of the House Sponsor of the Department of Transportation budget. I'm quoting from the transcript of the proceedings on this floor on June 24th and the Sponsor of this Bill there said that in deference we believe that the \$200,000,000 appropriation from the Series "A" bonds will help us with our



road fund program. And if that appropriation is adopted, then we will support this Amendment #4 to House Bill 1947. Now..."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of order has been raised and I think it's in order. Please address your remarks to the issue here."

Skinner: "Well, I am addressing my...remarks; if I may..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Skinner: "...Mr. Speaker, I'm responding to the position of Mr. McClain because Mr. McClain was the one that made these remarks on the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, state your point."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman even though he's exercised about this issue is out of order. He's spoken on the issue, he's closed and he's voted and explained his vote. I think he's out of order now."

Speaker Redmond: "More than that he's got 94 votes. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield my time to Representative Houlihan for explanation of votes."

Speaker Redmond: "You yield on discussion but not explanation of votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little puzzled. You know just two days ago we had a roll call in this House that gained great deal of support for the simple concept that on a local basis you can spend monies close to the people in your district; Representative Houlihan brought a Bill before us that was made very clear that if you need a traffic light in your district on a state road and they don't want to do it because they want your municipality to do it, you need road fixed that's an unmarked state highway and they're trying to duck the responsibility, you can with these kinds of funds have a better opportunity to take care of those local projects in your district. Now simple fact is next Spring the...when the ice is melted and the cracks in the road are made again and there's potholes



in the streets in front of your neighbors, there's thousands and thousands of more miles of residential streets in this state than there are state highways. It was absolutely with the full support of this House that we overrode the veto the other day. What Representative Houlihan has said is absolutely consistent. Representative Skinner gave you numbers and dollar figures of how this will assist your local communities, your districts with the tax dollars that they pay in and they should get back. If you ever think there's been an inequity in the DOT budget that doesn't...taken care of your district, the way you can resolve it best is to maintain yourself through this effort a little bit more local control. And if you will remember from those dollar figures that were made available there is no specific advantage to any community in this state; the money doesn't go to the big cities or the small cities, it goes to your village, your town. It's no gobble up job on the part of Chicago. Every little area in your district will be...get back local money for your local people to decide what to do with."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? This takes 89 votes."

Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich state your point."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm led to believe that this is a motion to restore an item, isn't it? ...Then it takes 107, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Item reduction, I'm advised, parliamentarian has consulted the..."

Matijevich: "Well, the calendar says restore items page and that's what I was going by. That's what the motion on the calendar says."

Speaker Redmond: "Reduction veto."

Matijevich: "Well, it says restore items. An item veto..."

Speaker Redmond: "But the item was not vetoed, the item, as I understand it, part of it was reduced and it's the



restoration of the...to its original amount. It's restoration of the amount..."

Matijevich: "All I'm going by is what I see in the calendar..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, over the last 48 hours the term downstate has been rather loosely in this House. I'm from Rock Island, I originally thought that was western Illinois. Clyde Choate is from southern Illinois but now I'm classed as being downstate and I'm not particularly fond of it the way it's being used. I am from western Illinois, today I received a letter from my Rock Island County highway commissioners urging me to vote to override the veto of House Bill 1539 which I did yesterday and now urging me to override this veto. So I can say in good conscience that western Illinois supports Dan Houlihan on this motion. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 aye, Ralph Dunn, aye; 104 aye, 46 no. The ayes have it; the motion is adopted and the items are restored. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, is that electronic device up there working? I've been standing here with my speaker button on."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Waddell: "Well, it's too late now but I'll do it next time."

Speaker Redmond: "An item veto, it appears House Bill 1079 to which Representative D'Arco has filed a motion. Representative D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the item veto motion I am referring to emanates from House Bill 1079, page 2, line 13 and 14. The Governor saw...saw fit to veto some \$300,000 in the budget of the Dangerous Drug Commission that was supposed to be used...appropriated to a drug abuse clinic on the west side of Chicago, the West Side Organization Drug Abuse Clinic. It's the largest single drug of privately operated drug abuse clinic in the State of Illinois. This drug abuse clinic has some



500 patients...it services some 500 patients per day. It has the highest density of drug users in the State of Illinois. The appropriation was funded in the 75 DMH-DD Grant in Aid line item for treatment, education of research in narcotic addiction. It was then transferred to the Dangerous Drugs Commission budget and that's why 76 has a \$300,000 appropriation. The people on the west side of the City of Chicago are in dire need of this money to help these poor drug addicts become rehabilitated and serve society in a manner that we all see fit. I would ask you to please help me override the Governor on this line item veto. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would just like to point out to the member a couple items regarding this override motion. In appropriating the money to the West Side Organization there are two things which I think we ought to keep in mind. One, there is presently undergoing a federal grand jury investigation of the possible misuse of federal funds by the West Side Organization. But secondly there has been as was pointed out in the House Appropriations Committee two relatively recent arrest of two of the West Side Organization employees for selling narcotics. We are asked to restore the money, state money to this appropriation. I think there are some serious questions that the members will have to address themselves to on the operation of the West Side Organization. By not appropriating the money, there still is money, federal and state, that is going to the West Side Organization in the amount of \$282,500 so it would not put them out of business and we would have a chance to have the decision, or the federal grand jury investigation behind us when we come back in the Spring to take another look at this appropriation as to what's actually going on with the misuse of funds by the West Side Organization. And I really think that at this time probably our best



posture would be to hold off the override and then take a look at what the West Side Organization is actually doing using...how they're using funds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the distinguished colleague that just spoke only has part of the truth. He's been misinformed, the persons who were indicted were former employees and they were what you might call casual employees and not fulltime employees at that. And the persons who wrote the story have indicated to persons who later discussed it with them that they were wrong and that the hub of the thing were people that had been formerly been treated there and not employees. And because they had formerly been treated there they just lumped them all together and called them all employees. But anytime you have a massive program, treating as many people as they treat, you're gonna treat some bad guys as well as good guys. But when you consider the neighborhood that they're in to deny the large number of people a treatment because two people out of several thousand that go through there a year have been indicted is a real farce and I think that when you unleash these addicts on the community with no place to go for treatment you are putting the lives of all of us who live in Chicago in jeopardy. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was a member in the...who raised the question of the two arrests and subsequent indictments in the Appropriations Committee. At that time and subsequent to that I spoke to Representative D'Arco concerning that subsequent to that I requested a member of the staff, Republican Appropriations Committee staff, to look into the matter and at Mr. D'Arco's request, Mr. Kirkpatrick, the director of the program came back here in fact this afternoon and we went into detail and in light the state and federal participation in the program he told me that he felt that this program that was going in the



midwest. And that if anything should appear to be irregular that the state had the authority to terminate the funds immediately without notice. That there had been a subsequent...subsequent to the...the arrest and the conviction of the two members that there had been a strenuous reorganization of the administration program. Several people in the supervisory capacity had been fired and that this program was going as well and is well administered as any in the country. I felt that he was sincere in this program. I know that Representative D'Arco is sincere in this program and I received the personal assurance of Mr. 'Kilpatrick' that if things did go wrong and he did not expect it, the state had the authority to terminate their funds immediately. For those reasons I feel compelled to rise and speak in support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative D'Arco to close."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Representative Meyer I want to thank you for those comments. I appreciate them. Representative Totten, I would like to answer your remark and in doing so I would point out that the federal grant you are referring to is a federal social rehabilitation services grant that since...since expired. The state did an audit of the West Side Organization. The state according to its present executive director, Mr. Kirkpatrick said that the audit did not show any irregularities in the way the money was administered. The federal government, HEW, did an audit of the West Side Organization and their auditors showed that there were no irregularities in the way the monies were being administered. The West Side Organization does presently have grant and aid from HEW. So both the state and federal government can examine the books of the West Side Organization and they have both come to the conclusion that there are no irregularities in the way the monies were administered. The West Side Organization is the only privately operated drug



abuse program in the west side of the City of Chicago. They need this money. This...this money serves about 500 clients per day and it also serves as a rehabilitation source for vocational education. I implore your support. I think you are supporting one of the best drug abuse programs in the City of Chicago and please vote aye. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the item be restored over the veto of the Governor. Requires 107 votes. All in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. ...All voted who wish? Representative Ryan, do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ryan: "I'd just like to point out to the members of the General Assembly that there are approximately 500 addicts under the program of the West Side Organization. We're talking about \$300,000 that's badly needed. And this Bill should certainly be...be passed the veto should be overridden. One of the big problems we've got is the drug problem and thank you for your votes."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 117 'ayes', 21 'no', 7 voted 'present'; and the motion carries, and the item has been restored over the veto of the Governor. Item and Reduction Veto Motions on Consideration Postponed . . . no, pardon me, on House Bill 2989, on Motion 1, Representative Hanahan. That's an error in the Calendar, Motion 1 is not Consideration Postponed."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the first motion of the two motions concerning the veto message of the Governor concerning the Office of Education funding and grant Bill. Motion #1 is the total motion on override of the vetoes, the item vetoes, by the Governor and I believe it will take 107 votes for this total amount of money to be restored for the various projects that the Governor has seen fit to item veto. I do not, and I have said this today to many Members, I do not object to taking each item on a separate Roll Call. There are 2, 4, 6, 8 items in this Roll Call, and I do not mind each Member of the General Assembly to decide which of these 8 items they would like to see restored totally to the budget of the Office of Education. But before entertaining that motion of division of the question, I would like to point out that on Special Education building I, the Sponsor, would like to re . . . withdraw that portion, that \$10,000,000, from my motion to the General Assembly because that . . . it would be best handled by either Representative Ryan and Hoffman's . . . ah . . . Bill, or Representatives Ryan and . . . ah . . . Boyle's Bill or Representative Schneider or Hoffman's Bill that would best take care of the \$10,000,000 funding out of Capital Development Bonds. So I'd like to re . . . take out that portion from the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Could you identify that item, Representative . . ."

Hanahan: "Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that I don't have the line numbers, I've got all the language. It's a \$10,000,000 item."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . if you know, Representative Mudd."

Hanahan: "Which item is that?"

Mudd: "Ah . . . I think . . . I don't know what item it is, but it's . . . it's listed as line item on building construction."



Hanahan: "No, this is reduced item."

Speaker Redmond: "Page 16, lines 2 through 6, is that it?"

Hanahan: "I'll tell you that in a second. It's page 16, lines 2 to 6, yes, Mr. . . . I'd like that portion taken out which will reduce the total amount of items restored that I'd like to see restored to the Bill of . . . from \$13,000,000 . . . \$13,792,720 to \$3,792,720, and I'd like the Members of the General Assembly . . . well, after that, is that motion acceptable that leave to . . . ah . . . do I have leave to withdraw that Section from my motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, it's a little puzzling. Ah . . . It sounds like the Representative is moving to divide his own motion."

Hanahan: "Right."

Duff: "Well, then is dividing the motion, isn't he? Can he make his motion so unspecific as it regards the remainder?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw . . ."

Duff: "Well, why not . . ."

Hanahan: ". . . on the motion specifically the \$10,000,000 item on page 16, lines 2 and 6 from my motion #1 to House Bill 2989 so that we do not have to consider that \$10,000,000, and then we'll discuss the rest of the \$3,000,000 worth of items."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave, Representative McClain."

McClain: "May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, so that it's perfectly clear in my mind?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McClain: "Representative Hanahan, are you saying, therefore, that of the items in this matter before us you are saying to the body that you are not going to consider them in your motion to override?"

Hanahan: "Just that one item because there are two Bills presently pending that would do the job a lot better than for us to address ourselves to that one item."

McClain: "Okay, so of the \$35,000,000, so to speak, . . ."

Hanahan: "No, no, this is \$13,000,000 something, this is item . . . motion #1."

McClain: "So you're . . . you're taking away from that . . . ah . . ."



Hanahan: "Ah . . . \$10,00,000, right."

McClain: "\$13,000,000 . . . \$10,000,000 that you don't even want to consider?"

Hanahan: "Right."

McClain: "Okay, then may I ask a parliamentary question please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McClain: "A motion to divide then . . . ah . . . at present is being presented by Representative Hanahan. Now, if he strikes from the consideration before us \$10,000,000 of the \$13,000,000 a subsequent motion to divide the . . . ah . . . \$3,000,000 . . . ah . . . is that out of order then?"

Hanahan: "No, no, that won't be . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "No, that would be in order. It would seem to me that another . . ."

McClain: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . way would be to give Representative Hanahan leave to amend his motion to delete there from . . ."

Hanahan: ". . . that's what I'm asking, right . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . those items on page 16, lines 2 to 6 and then when . . ."

Hanahan: "That's what I'm asking, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Did he have leave to amend the motion to delete . . ."

McClain: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . the item appearing on page 16, lines 2 to 6, any objection? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, now, do I understand that he is doing something other than restoring the amounts that the Governor reduced and . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "As I . . ."

Walsh: ". . . that the Bill would be returned if he is successful to the Governor with an amount that could not appear in the regular . . . in the original Bill?"

Hanahan: "No, . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "My understanding is that what he is doing is that he is deleting that particular item that appears on page 16, lines 2 to



. . . through 6 from . . . from the original motion then, which would leave the Governor's action with respect to that item intact and the Governor's reduction would . . . ah . . . would become law."

Hanahan: "So that nobody is confused, Mr. Speaker, if I may on that, you know, point of le . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . leave."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't finished yet. Now it is necessary, it's going to be necessary then for him to . . . ah . . . divide the question, is that correct? Before this can be done there's going to have to be a division."

Speaker Redmond: "I would interpret it if he's granted leave to file . . . to amend the motion on its face, then we would be in the posture of considering the motion with respect to all of the other items in total . . ."

Walsh: "Well, there is in effect seems to be leave that we will be granting him will be in effect leave to divide . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Walsh: ". . . everything but this one item to divide this item out . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . or eliminate it from his motion had he found the motion in the original instance and then not included it then it would be the same posture as he would be if he was granted leave to . . . to amend it out."

Walsh: "Now, is this the motion on which there was a . . . ah . . . a motion to divide yesterday that was defeated?"

Speaker Redmond: "No . . ."

Hanahan: "No."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . no, that was with respect to motion #2, this is motion #1. There's been no vote on motion #1."

Walsh: "I see, so a motion to divide on . . . on motion #1 . . . ah . . . could be considered . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Which is certainly in order."

Walsh: ". . . but a motion to divide on motion #2 could not be considered because we have already treated of that question, is that correct?"

Hanahan: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "There has been a . . . a . . . ah . . . a motion to



divide on item # . . . on motion #2 . . ."

Walsh: "So you would not . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . and that failed."

Walsh: "Right, and you would not accept a motion to divide on . . . on motion #2 again for that reason."

Hanahan: "That's not the point here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, yeah, I think you're correct. I think we're on motion #1, rather than . . ."

Walsh: "Okay, but I . . . I think we can establish that since we've gone this far, Mr. Speaker, correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're correct . . ."

Hanahan: "I think it's a point of order."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . there's more than one way to skin a cat. Is . . . Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, then for my clarification would you please explain to me the distinction between motion 1 and motion 2?"

Speaker Redmond: "They refer . . . refer to . . . ah . . . different items in the . . . in the Governor's message. Those that are addressed in motion #1, which are restoring items which have been deleted, require 107 votes; those that the Governor reduced, which are contained in motion 2, require 89 votes to restore the amount that had been previously reduced."

Madison: "And motion #2, Mr. Speaker, is the one that was dealt with yesterday . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "That is on Postponed Consideration."

Madison: ". . . having to do with reductions?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Madison: "So there is no way we can now make a motion to divide the question on reductions because that's already been dealt with?"

Hanahan: ". . . that's not the point."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, in the posture that we're in now, that is correct. But we're on motion #1."

Madison: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Chair and to the Body



that the motion that was in writing last night that was . . . ah . . . that did not prevail was in writing as respects to both motions #1 and #2, and if Mr. Hanahan wants to do what he wants to do since he voted on the prevailing side of that motion which was defeated, I would suggest that he move to reconsider the vote by which my motion to divide and which clearly was written and is in writing on both of these motions should . . . he should make a motion to . . . ah . . . reconsider the vote. Otherwise he can't divide 1 or 2."

Speaker Redmond: "I think . . . I think if you will bear with the Chair, we're trying to handle the question of motion #1, . . ."

Duff: "Well, if my . . . my motion referred to motion #1 and it was defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan . . . well, that is not before the House at the present time."

Duff: "Yes, it is, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . the matter . . ."

Duff: "My motion refers to motion # . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . the Chair has ruled with respect to that if . . . if you will bear with me, we'll get at the . . . in the form in which you want it."

Duff: "Let . . . let me . . . make myself more clear, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . ."

Duff: "If you will look at or have the Parliamentary look at the motion which was defeated last night, that motion which was defeated include Representative Hanahan's motions #1 and 2 and now if he wants to divide now, he should make a motion to reconsider. The motion didn't carry, Mr. Speaker, and it was in writing and it is on your desk and you can see that it . . . it referred to Hanahan's motions 1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct, but the House only addressed itself to motion #2."

Duff: "The House addressed itself from that Roll Call to my motion, and my motion included Hanahan's motion 1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "It could not because motion #1 was not under consideration."



Duff: "It was . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "The Sponsor of the Bill had requested that motion #2 be considered and that was the only thing that was under consideration. Now, . . ."

Duff: "All right, Mr. Speaker, the Roll Call was on my motion not on his motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman . . . the Gentleman . . ."

Hanahan: "Point of order . . . point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The Gentleman is a office . . . a Leader of his party and he knows full well . . . in the rules of this House, and un . . . under those rules, if he does not like the ruling of the Chair, he has his opportunity to make a motion. Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of dialogue in debate between the Speaker and the Member and I think he should have more respect for the Chair's ruling, and if he doesn't agree with him, let him move to override him."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention my motion in writing which was voted on last night."

Speaker Redmond: "When the motion #2 is to . . . is called before us . . ."

Duff: "No, Sir, not Representative Hanahan's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I have ruled on that Representative Duff. The only thing that Representative Hanahan is trying to do here is to put a motion in the form in which he wants it considered, and the form in which he wants it considered is to have leave to withdraw from or amend the motion to delete those items which appear on page 16, lines 2 through 6, and then if that leave is granted, then we'll take care of motion #2."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear of what you're saying. My motion was the motion that was voted on. Now, isn't that correct? But my motion . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "We had no vote on motion #1. I made the ruling on that now Representative . . ."

Duff: "My motion not his. Mine was voted on, mine was in hiding . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "No, no, no. The Chair has ruled that the point of the



....the question that is going to be before the House is whether Representative Hanahan has leave to amend on its face his motion by deleting therefrom the...the items which appeared on page 16, lines 2 through 6. Now, does he have leave to do that? Any objections? Hearing none...ah...to remove from his original motion those items which appeared on line 16...16 through 2...2 through 6, and the effect of that would be to leave the...the...ah Governor's veto intact with respect to the item which appears on page 16, lines 2 through 6. The balance of the motion remains. Now, there is...and there is...ah...there is a motion filed by Representative Duff that we divide...ah...all those items which now appear on motion #1 as amended. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I have no such motion. If you will read my motion, you will see...what it's clearly says...."

Speaker Redmond: "Re...read the motion. Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your inquiry."

Stone: "What part what is the business of the House at this moment?"

Speaker Redmond: "The business of the House is item and reduction vote motions and as far as it pretains to the motion of Hana..Representative Hanahan for House Bill 2989 which has been a means amended by leave of this House to delete that one item and everything that is not deleted remains."

Stone: "Then Mr. Speaker may we proceed with that order of business?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding, this is a point of parliamentary inquiry, it was my understanding last night when...ah Representative Duff made the motion to divide the questions of motion 1 and 2 that the chair ruled that the motion his motion could not be considered because motion 1 was not before us and that on its face the his motion in effect was amended to only to apply to the item that of business that was before us. Is that not correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "As I recall the ruling of the chair was that that...ah a motion to divide those items which appeared on motion #2 because after all motion #2 was the only thing that was before us, and that question was put and it was the decision of the chair that in order



to divide it required 89 votes, the simple majority, pardon me."

Madison: "The only that I'm trying to say Mr. Speaker is that Mr...ah...

Representative Duff's motion to divide the question on on on motion 1 was improper because motion 1 was not before us at the time."

Speaker Redmond: "It wasn't put, the only that was put was as it pretains to motion #2."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I would just like to have the journal record this. I hear all this but I really just do not believe it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, the other 7 items in motion #1 I move to restore the full vetoed item to the budget of House Bill 2989, and I'll go point by point and leave it up to the wishes of the House how they'd like to handle those items."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan the written motion which I have here contains substantially more than the number of items to which you refer. I think they have 13 remaining."

Hanahan: "Yes, but they pre...pretain to 7 different programs...ah...ah... reason why yes...ah...let me explain that. There's some on page 14 line 14, I've got all the lines if you want to go through the technical aspects, they really pretain to 7 distinct programs. One of which there were 8 and one of which have we would leave have removed the \$10,000,000 item. The total motion cost to the people of Illinois if we if we vote on this in one Roll Call right now would be \$3,792,720. I would need 107 votes for that for those amounts of money to be restored to the budget. In explanation of exactly where those monies are going, there is \$89,520 totally being restored for the for the...ah...deaf and blind service center that was approved in Senate Bill 379, voted by the House of Representatives overwhelmingly and approved by the Governor to provide a deaf and blind service center in the State of Illinois. That's one item.



That's one item. The next item is a learning and disability screening program by Representative Steele, a Republican leader of the House for a project of screening in the Belleville school district for \$112,000. There's a learning disability project screening program of which we have already expended nearly \$1,000,000 for completion and that in order for them to continue the Illinois Office of Education is main maintained at the reliability and validity of the American Psychology Association must approve the continuation of that program for \$500,000. There is a \$900,000 item asked to be restored of the school library media services. As many of you know Representative Clabaugh former Representative Clabaugh is personally very interested in that kind of set forward in the area of library media services. There's \$191,200 for health education training, that's Representative Brinkmeier's specific request in the Bill and a very worthwhile project. In the model truancy program there's \$1,750,000 in that's Representative Arthur Burns program. Truancy drop-out task force \$250,000 and I believe is Representative Marovitz's program, and that is the total items left for consideration by the House. If you'd like to divide each of those up into separate votes I have no objection at this time. I think that there're explained well enough to...ah... take a Roll Call when we're together and I have no objection whichever the wishes the.... House would like to see placed on this restoration of these item vetoes in House Bill 2989."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "What about the motion to divide, the motion to...ah...then he's going to consider the whole thing."

Speaker Redmond: "He was willing to consider the whole thing."

Walsh: "Fine, ok, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Mr. Chairman...ah...I'd like a clear understanding I I thought that...ah...that...ah...Representative Hanahan...ah...entertained a motion on the division of these...ah...different categories, is that right?"

Speaker Redmond: "No his motion was to permit him to amend his motion on the face to delete the items that appeared on page 16, lines 2 through 6."



Mudd: "Okay, the \$10,000,000 . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct and everything else remains . . . on his motion. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, that wasn't what you told me, you said he was dealing with the whole thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, as . . . this one is out though because we've allowed him to amend it on its face."

Walsh: "Oh, no."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, yes, we took a vote on it."

Walsh: "Gee, I must have been back . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "You'd better consult your lawyer."

Walsh: "Well, now what . . . he said he's willing to keep intact or to divide. I . . . I don't understand, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Walsh, let us assume that Representative Hanahan had prepared a completely different motion which would be identical only if it would have eliminated the items on page 16, lines 2 through 6. We would have given him leave to have withdrawn or tabled his original motion and then he would have been in position had he done it yesterday to or I presume even today to file a new motion leaving that item out. So then . . ."

Walsh: "And it would not under the rules have been at leave to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Well . . ."

Walsh: "The motion must be on the Calendar, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Well, I think the Amendment . . ."

Walsh: "Now, this is . . . I . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . wait a minute, what we have done . . . what we have done, we have permitted him to amend it on its face by deleting those matters. Now, what we haven't . . ."

Walsh: "Without a Roll Call or without consultation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we voted on it."

Walsh: "Well, I don't remember voting on it and I've been here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, it was very clear when he made his motion and there was no objections and he had leave to delete that item."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct and that is the posture of where we are



at the present time and the . . . the question will be put on the . . . whether or not these . . . ah . . . remaining 13 items be restored. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'd like the Journal to show that I . . . ah . . . am in opposition to the Gentleman . . . to the leave given him to divide that out of there, that \$10,000,000."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the Journal so know. Representative Schlickman, do you desire recognition?"

Schlickman: "Only to speak on the motion when timely."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. the question is . . . no, he wants to explain . . . do you want to close, Representative Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I thought . . . I thought Representative Schlickman wanted to ask a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to explain your vote or do you want to enter into discussion? Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "I would like to speak to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Procced."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it's vital that we all are aware of what is covered by this motion. There is an appropriation of \$250,000 for a truancy task force, page 22, line items 11 to 14 and \$1,750,000 truancy program, page 22, lines 7 and 10. This is for implementation of the program set forth in House Bill 2892 which was vetoed by the Governor and for which there is no motion to override. In other words, these two line items would be useless and an appropriation because there's no existing program to be implemented by the appropriation. With respect to the library media services on page 21, lines 27 through 30 in the amount of \$9,000, that was for the implementation of Senate Bill 87, which was vetoed by the Governor and no motion to override. We have, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, \$2,650,000 covered by this motion which would be to no end, to no purpose, to no avail; and I think it's also interesting, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to note that on page 17, lines 15 through 23, \$500,000 for a program that was initiated by the Board of Education but is an annual pet project of the Sponsor of this Bill. For a total of \$3,400,000



of the motion which is remaining \$3,792,720; and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with the motion as is now constituted, it should be defeated with a 'no' vote because of its useless nature."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, there is a motion by Representative Duff that I said I was not opposing . . . it's up to the Members of this House if they want to vote exactly what Representative Schlickman pointed out on each of the remaining 7 items that were left in my motion . . . ah . . . I presented to this House, and I concur that there is two other items that really do not need to be left in here and if Representative Duff wants to move to divide the rest of these motions, I have no objections."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, that comes as an untimely suggestion."

Hanahan: ". . . Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're correct."

Hanahan: ". . . made the suggestion to begin with."

Schlickman: "And was not voted upon."

Hanahan: "We are at the voting stage."

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Madison: "Is that portion of Representative Duff's motion to divide that dealt with motion #1, is that still alive?"

Speaker Redmond: "The . . . the Gentleman who . . . who filed the motion didn't persist and didn't call for it, so now we're just about ready to put the question on the . . . on the Bill."

Madison: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. . . . Mr. Chairman, I . . . ah . . . I think that, Mr. Speaker, that there is an argument here because of some of the . . . the . . . ah . . . areas in the motion #1 of Mr. Hanahan's Bill. I think that if there is a strong . . . ah . . . insistency that . . . that the motion is divided at this time someone who voted on the prevailing side could . . . could . . . ah . . ."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "A point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Matijevich: "We're on the . . . we're on the discussion of the question and that comes too late."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're correct. Your point is well taken. Representative Byers."

Byers: "I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question and the question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in speaking with staff here . . . ah . . . it has come to our attention very late that there were some motion . . . there were motions not made, not made at the time since I made my motion concerning the matter of truancy, concerning the truancy dropout and the other points that Representative Schlickman, you know, pointed out. I suggest that if we vote the 107 votes today on these 7 items that are left, which would send out of the House a . . . an approval of \$3,792,720, that I, personally, would assure Representative Schlickman that the other \$2,000,000 or \$2,6 whatever he's pointing out that will not be used that the Senate would not concur with those specific line items. I'd recommend to the Senate Sponsor that they would not concur and, therefore, those would be dropped from this motion. Now, I can't do any more than that and we'd be then talking about a total override of \$1,792,000. So . . . for . . . I am not a mind reader and when I presented my motion to the floor of this House in writing I did not know nor could I out guess any other Member on whether or not they were going to move or not move on their specific projects on . . . on override motions of how the Governor voted on their specific Bills. Now, in connection with that, we're talking about a very few dollars in a total budget to continue a deaf and blind service center project, a learning disability screening project, a project screening learning disability, and . . . and I've a lot of interests



like the Representative might have pointed out, I've a lot of personal interest that learning disabilities, they're very serious problem in Illinois. There's many people afflicted with this and many of our children that sometimes you don't know about have learning disabilities, and a lot of interest in this area has been gone into, we've invested \$1,000,000 so far in a very worthwhile program that most people consider worthwhile continuing to try and uncover those children with learning disabilities with both audio and visual; and I think it's a good thing for the state to continue the school library media services and the health education training program should continue. I would suggest an 'aye' vote of 107 votes and the other two programs that are not needed would be deleted by the Senate in their . . . in . . . by my recommendation, I'm sure, with Senator Hynes who would handle this motion in the Senate. So I urge in behalf of a lot of people that aren't here a continuation of these programs and restore these items that were vetoed by the Governor."

Unknown: "Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the items appearing on page 14, lines 1 through 4, 14, line 5, 14, line 6, 14, line 7, line 8, line 9, line 10; page 17, lines 11 through 14, 15 through 23; page 21, line lines 27 through 30, 21 and 22, lines 35 and 1 and 6; page 22, lines 7 and 10; page 22, line 11 through 14 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', oppose 'no'; it takes 107 votes. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, yesterday this House . . . ah . . . sent to the Senate a Bill with \$81,000,000 in it . . . ah . . . an amount that many of us felt we did not have. However, that particular program benefits all of the children if it, in fact, does become law; and they all qualify under that program. If we don't believe we have \$81,000,000, we certainly can't believe we have money that's included in this program and, therefore, I would encourage a negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison."



Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'm voting 'aye' on the question, but I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that I and perhaps a lot of other Members of this Body have been misled in terms of the parliamentary procedure here. I was under the impression that . . . ah . . . that Representative Duff's motion as it related to motion #1 was still alive, and for that reason, I did not file a . . . a motion to divide the question on . . . on this, Mr. Speaker. I now understand that it is not alive and a motion on my part to divide the question is not timely, and so we're caught in the situation, Mr. Speaker, where I'm awfully afraid that this Bill is going to go down to defeat because of the fact that some of us were . . . were misled in terms of what the parliamentary procedure was. I hope that doesn't happen, Mr. Speaker, but I'm afraid it will."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 74 'aye', 77 'no'; and the motion is lost, the item . . . Represen . . . Representative Choate 'aye' . . . the item veto is sustained. Representative Ewell 'aye'. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, for the Record I think we ought to show that the items have failed to be restored. I think we'd better use that just to be safe."

Speaker Redmond: "It's an override I'm led to believe by my Parliamentarian . . . these are not reductions, these are, I think, deletions of . . ."

Matijevich: "No, no . . . oh, I thought they were items of restoration."

Speaker Redmond: "No, item veto."

Matijevich: "No?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's why we have 107 instead of 89."

Matijevich: "Oh, item of restoration needs 107 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Consideration . . . Item and Reduction Veto Motions Consideration Postponed. Motion #2 with respect to House Bill 2989. Rep . . . Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding by advice given by you on Monday of this week that before we went to Consideration Postponed we would take care of the other motions which had been acted upon. Now, there is a number of amendatory motions or motions with respect to amendatory veto and it seems to me that if for only operation and in fairness of Sponsors who have an interest in those Bills that they ought to be given their first chance instead of going back to a Bill that already has had its first chance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, there isn't . . . there isn't a motion on the Calendar that hasn't already been called at least twice, and most of them three times, . . ."

Schlickman: "Now, wait a minute . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . in many cases they were taken out of the Record, but the ruling was not acted upon because, as I explained yesterday in my opinion, that you could be dilatory tactics, and I don't mean you except in the generic term, are dilatory tactics . . ."

Schlickman: "My name is . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . ah . . . the orderly process . . . the orderly process of the . . . of the House could be completely frustrated. So . . . I . . . ah . . . would like to caution the Gentleman from Cook . . . ah . . . had something . . . ah . . . the Gentleman that . . . that observes the courtroom decorum in the floor of the House and is always properly garbed . . ."

Walsh: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, the . . . see the question of going to Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker, it is pitifully unfair. There I'm clothed now, am I all right, am I fit to talk to you?"

Unknown: "Almost."

Walsh: "Anyway and seriously, we have no business considering this. You said that thing that are on Consideration Postponed would be considered after everything else has been considered. Now, you are going down the Calendar and have done a reasonably good job today up to this point . . . up to this point . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll be better after this."



Walsh: ". . . now, well, now, seriously, you have no business considering this. We've spent a lot of time on this yesterday, there are a lot of motions on this Calendar that have not had . . . consumed the time of any of this House. Now, we . . . really should keep going as you have been going and consider this if there's time later."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Well, I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. How in the World can you keep going with people . . . ah . . . getting up, objecting without using the one avenue they have and that is appeal the ruling of the Chair?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's very difficult. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't want to get into lengthy debates of the items that I'm asking to restore in the reduction veto of the Governor to House Bill 2989. They're all listed, last night I appealed to Members that had a lot of . . . ah . . . exhilaration one way or the other, after a very tiresome day, there were a lot of people missing and I appeal to the Membership tonight to give to the State of Illinois the amounts of money return to your local school districts the amounts of money that we by law mandated the programs for and we by law should pay our share that we by law said we would . . . were going to pay for these various Special Education, gifted reimbursements, gifted area for the Special Education for orphans, for the bilingual programs, for the pupil transportation, the Special Education transportation, the lunch-breakfast programs and Vocational Education. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are a lot of people that may not be effected by your vote. Those are the lucky people, those are the people that didn't need Special Education, maybe those are the people that haven't got emotional or other types of mental handicaps. I think that of all the votes that you'll vote on in education, we have a special obligation to those young people who we have mandated programs for to at least keep our commitment that we will pay our share of the cost. Now, I don't know how many of you have witnessed physically handicapped people, young people trying to get an education, but I have spent some time doing that. I think that your



conscience on this vote should be the issue and I know you could hear all the bugaboos about where's the money going to come from. But you be a father or a mother anywhere in Illinois with a kid that's either gifted, emotionally disturbed or physically handicapped and you say to that mother and father that you don't feel an obligation to them, you tell that to them, I can't. That's the reason why I've spent the amount of hours I have on this project. I think that for those that can't be here, for those young American Illinois citizens that need your help now, I'm appealing to for your vote. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, hopefully we can put some perspective into . . . ah . . . the appeal for support for House Bill 2989. Yesterday in the wisdom of this House decided that we would appropriate an additional \$81,000,000 . . . ah . . . for the General Distributive Formula. Every child in this state and school is counted for in that formula, whether he's gifted, whether he's like most of us sitting here, just a normal human being or whether he has the misfortune of having some affliction. He is counted, he is treated the same, we sent \$81,000,000 over to the Senate for that program yesterday. Let me also say that in the area of Special Ed' we are appropriating 4 . . . or 4.92 million dollars more in fiscal '76 with the vetoes than we were in fiscal '75, from \$112,000,000 to \$117,000,000. Per capita in terms of the number of people that money reaches, it is very high compared to our General Distributive Program. In Americanism, in basic Adult Education, which I've heard referred to, that has been increased by . . . ah . . . 15 . . . percent. The breakfast and the lunch program has gone down, that certain that is true and that is based upon the estimated needs of . . . for that program because there is some reduction in the numbers. The gifted program has been . . . ah . . . to 2.6 million dollars, which is \$600,000 above the level that I can remember agreeing to some short five or six year ago. The gifted program was to be a program funded with seed money and the wisdom of the program and the validity of the program would be



accepted by the people in the local community and they would be happy to support it. We have watched this request from this area grow and grow. Bilingual Education has been increased by 12½ percent, from \$8,000,000 to \$9,000,000. Voc' Ed' up from 14 to 16 and these are all with the vetoes, a 14 percent increase. Now, I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, in the light of the fiscal situation this state finds itself in, are these not reasonable decisions? Do these not in fact in the times that we find ourselves make sense? I believe they do and, therefore, I will be voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't rise on this motion last night, but I don't want to let the opportunity go by today because this is our last chance to address ourselves to what I think is a very, very important issue. I want to single out two areas here for particular attention. Number 1, Special Education reimbursement. Let me give you a little background on what that means. Two years ago in response to some of the urgings of the people involved in Special Education, the School Problems Commission appointed a Subcommittee chaired by Senator Tom Hynes, and the Special Education people came in and asked for some substantial increases in state funding. The Committee after extensive hearings recommended a compromise and part of that compromise included passing a Bill that increased the amount that the state would reimburse the local school districts and the method by which we fund the Special Education programs was through the payment of teacher salaries. We had a Bill and before 1974 where we used to reimburse the local school districts \$5,000 per Sepcial Education certified teacher and \$2,000 per non-certified teacher, and the Subcommittee came out with the recommendation and a Bill was passed, signed, passed by the General Assembly, signed into law by the Governor increasing that reimbursement 25 percent, instead of \$2,000, we're gonna' reimburse the school districts \$2,500, instead of \$5,000, we're gonna' reimburse them \$6,250. That Bill was passed by the General Assembly, signed into law in 1974. Last year, in the Spring, We . . . I'm sorry, after the passage of that Bill, every school district from the



in the state that had Special Education Programs relied upon that level of reimbursement twenty five hundred dollars and sixty two fifty in the planning for their Special Education Programs, and those programs went forward, the teachers were paid from local funds, and this Bill 2989 is the reimbursement to those school districts. Those school districts have already paid those teachers. They've already undertaken those programs based upon the statutory authorization that we passed, that the Governor signed at sixty two fifty and twenty five hundred dollars respectively. Now those who are urging us not to override this reduction are saying that we've gone out, we've told them what to spend, we've told them what we're going to reimburse and now we're going to change our mind after they have already spent the money. Well Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't do business that way, you don't do business that way, those in a business manner of state that does business that way where you go out in fact charge something, and then don't pay your bills. Thirt...eighteen million dollars of this override is involved in that principal, and I think that it is an important principal and I don't think and I think it's a disservice to keep talking about 2971 and eight one million dollars in...ah...talking about 2989 in this override. They're two different subjects. I think the issues are different. I think here it's the principal of whether we're going to live up to what we previously told school districts they must spend. These are mandated programs, and we are being ask today through this motion to live up to that commitment. Let me talk about one other item, a small item. Eight hundred thousand dollars eight hundred and twenty thousand dollars in the gifted program. First of all that's a terrible name, it seems to make the...ah... children involved in these type of programs seem to be sort of special. They're not special. These programs are the type of programs that people in Chicago for example, that live in the outer edges of the City this is what makes the middle class people that live in those areas want to stay in those areas because it brings a certain enrichment program a certain expansion of the regular programs in those schools which are in competition with the suburbs. This... these kind of programs allows the eight hundred thousand dollars



has been cut from the Gifted program. It means so much to the schools in the outer area of the City of Chicago and other areas throughout the State of Illinois. There important to bringing a low enrichment, a low fulfillment to the type of child that can take advantage of it and I think that all of these programs deserve our green light."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's the first time today that anyone has admitted that most of this stuff was supposed to be for Chicago. I'd like to point out that there was a motion made to divide this question. I have a Roll Call here in my hand and anyone here that's wants to look at it can. The gentleman Sponsoring this Bill voted against it. As long with as almost all of the Chicago Legislators...ah...from the other side of the aisle, and then they talk to us in pleading terms about the children but if they look at the grant we're talking about they will see that the Governor didn't make any reductions in Adult Education. Then he made very minimal adult...in Adult Education Public Assistance. The smallest of all the reductions under Adult Education Section 3-1, but what happened to the Gifted Education, and the Gifted Area Services? Average reduction of thirty three percent over Fiscal Year 75, reduction of thirty percent...ah...over what we appropriated. More money reduction there than was in the whole Adult Education System. Then let's look down at Special Ed that we've heard so much about today. Special Education for the handicapped, a 36.4 percent reduction. Remember there was no reduction at all on a couple of the Adult Education Programs but on the children with a special education problems 36.4 percent. Under the Special Ed Traineeships a fifty percent reduction over Fiscal Year 55...75. Under the Special Ed Building Projects a one hundred percent reduction, he knock it out threw it out completely. Now for goodness sakes we tried hard to get a division of this question so some people could vote for the more meritorious portions of it, but you have thrown in a whole grab bag with all kinds of money expenditures in it that the state cannot afford, and you have walked away. Gentlemen you have walked away from the real needs in order



to make what I consider to be a gross political gesture. We don't care about the fight between the Governor and the Mayor. We're trying to be responsible in doing what's available within the dollars available, and the ones that hurt the very...very most you have thrown in the bag with everybody else to let them sink or swim, and I hope that you who say you'll carry the Roll Calls around the state will be willing enough to stand up and say that you refused the division of the question that could have helped some of those children."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I...I remove the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think you have to. Are you ready for the question? Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Some people put priorities of concrete ahead of children. Some people put priorities of deer ahead of food. Some people make priorities of games instead of churches. There are some priorities that are pretty sacred to me, and I think sacred to most of the Members of this General Assembly. Those priorities are for Special Education, and so...why do people talk about a big grab bag when in this Bill of the thirty five million dollars there is twenty four million dollars just for the reimbursement of Special Education. We talk about the needs in Special Education, and the desires of doing something about it. We mandated programs. We told the School Boards we're going to repay you for the amounts of money that you have spent, and then some Legislators and I hope very few want to renege. In the neighborhood that I grew up in we had very fancy names for those kinds of people that reneged, and they weren't very pleasant names and many handicapped people may not be able to use those names, but I hope they fit according to how your conscious dictates how you should vote. For those of you downstaters that think that this is a Chicago program I want to point something out. Lincoln one time said that because some fools says a dog has five legs don't make it a fact. Because some Representatives stands in the floor and says that this program, this motion is for Chicago don't make it a fact. He hasn't taken the time to read what this program is all about. Less than



thirty percent of the total amount of money, less than thirty percent would go towards the reimbursement in the City of Chicago. Of the pupil transportation and five million eight hundred thousand dollars alone of that amount none of which goes back to the City of Chicago, and those of you who have no other reason to vote for it if you're not concerned about Special Education needs of this state. Let me tell you downstaters something. That the cost that we already know of last years pupil transportation obligation is already in excess of forty two million dollars. We are even by restoring by restoring this 5.8 million dollars only going to restore up to thirty five million five hundred and eighty thousand dollars. So even with this restoration we're going to need a supplemental appropriation next Spring to pay back school districts for pupil transportation. Don't kid yourself the money won't be any easier then it's just going to be a lot more if we don't override the reduction veto now. I think that each Member has been lobbied, I think that each Member has been at least consciously approached on this issue. I could just urge all of you to give back to all local school districts the amount of money that by law we owe them. The amount of money that we said we would give them. Let us not be hypocritical when it comes to Special Education. I urge and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the appropriations for the items on page 2 line 12, 13, 14, 21, page 3 line 19, 20, 21, page 4 line 35...lines...page 5 line 1, 2, page 9 line 26, page 14 line 29 thru. 33, page 15 line 3 thru. 5, 6 thru. 10, 11 thru. 14, 18 thru. 22, 23 thru. 28, 15...page 15 and 16 lines 29 thru. 35 and one, page 16 lines 7 thru. 12, 13 thru. 18, 24 thru. 28, 29 thru. 31, page 16 and 17 lines 32 and 35, and line 1 thru. 5, page 17 lines 6 thru. 10, page 21 line 31 thru. 34, of House Bill 2989 be restored over the reduction of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. This requires 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker we read in the paper that New York City may go bankrupt maybe insolvent next week. Let me tell you that if the State of Illinois reneges on it's legal obligations to reimburse monies



that our school districts have paid out for tuition, for transportation, for teachers salaries, for the last school year and reneges on that obligation to reimburse, we're insolvent. The definition of insolvency is the failure to meet your obligations when they come do. These are legal obligations of the State of Illinois and we're failing to meet them. We do not have bankruptcy yet, but we're insolvent, morally certainly and financially as well because the school districts were lying on our mandates passed by this General Assembly and our authority passed in other statutes have actually expended the funds and are expecting us to reimburse them this November hence the day expended during the 1974, 1975 school year. Well, obviously unless something dramatic happens and nothing that dramatic has ever happened after a speech by myself, but unless something dramatic happens..... unless something dramatic happens we are obviously reneging on that legal and moral obligation. And believe me, we're insolvent, we beat New York City to the punch. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'd like to suggest that any insolvency here is intellectual and that it probably was caused by the putting of the \$81,000,000 bond issue for kids that don't have learning disabilities on the agenda before this one."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Schraeder. Representative Schra.... Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again, I just want to go on record as being for a number of the items that are in this Bill, but since they were not divided and ah.. since 2971 passed, I can't vote for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on all of these Education Bills and those that contained a great deal of expenditure, I continuously voted red, but I think that Representative Berman put it very well and also Representative Pierce. If we cannot live up to the obligations that we made and these were expenditures that we allowed school districts all over the state to incur... to hire



personnel and to do other things that ah... cause them to put their budgets in deep jeopardy, I think that this particular portion is more realistic and more ah... can be supported with ah... with a better conscience than any other portion of these Education Bills. My district, ah... or the area that I'm from is the third largest Metropolitan area in the State of Illinois. However, 80% of the land is agriculture and small school districts which is like ah... I would imagine like most of the school districts in southern Illinois. And the transportation cuts alone ah... in portion of this Bill is going to place them in a very serious position in meeting their obligations and I would only hope that the other Representatives from downstate who have not supported these overrides would think very seriously and give us the support to keep these small school districts ah... even if it's only in transportation, be in a good position as far as meeting their obligations and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, as a person who has a physical disability, I have to keep a personal interest in seeing to it that persons with like disabilities have an opportunity to have the education that I had. I went through the ah... schools for crippl children in the City of Chicago and I got a good education... better than many in my community. And I don't feel that the others who are coming up like me today should be denied that opportunity to have advantages that I've had. And I also want to say that I think from the political standpoint, that we sent the other Bill over to the Senate and I think we should send this one over there too because many of you are saying that if the other one hadn't passed, you would have voted for this one. Well, let's give the Senate the same opportunity that we've had to make a choice. And I think that the solution would be to make this available because are the people who cannot help themselves. Many of the others, have an opportunity to help themselves, but without education, a person who has a disability is a cinch to get on the dole. And you all claim that you don't want people on the dole. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, again I'm voting for this motion, but I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker. I've listened to all the pious speeches about commitment and the one thing that we fail to do in terms of a commitment was to allow on yesterday this question to be divided. Now, I talked to a hell of a lot of Legislators here who said if the question were divided we'd be able to vote to make sure that some of these items passed. Now, maybe they were making an excuse which . . . ah . . . never gave me the opportunity to prove that they were making the excuse. Now if this Bill goes down to defeat, it is going to be on the shoulders of those of you who refused yesterday, absolutely refused to divide this question so we could at least pass some of these items. I hope it pass . . . passes. I'm afraid it won't, but you are gonna' have to answer to that commitment that you didn't make yesterday when we asked you to divide the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote, I would like to point out that I feel that we are . . . ah . . . meeting our legal commitment. I get a little concerned about people who ought to know better . . . ah . . . saying that we're not meeting our legal commitments, because they know as well as I do that in the section, the payment sections of all of these . . . ah . . . statutes we have an apportionment section which provides that the funds aren't available, they will be apportioned accordingly; and that's where we are. We're there. We don't have the funds available and . . . ah . . . therefore, . . . ah . . . I would like to use that as a basis for explaining my 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, do you seek recognition. Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, back in 1960 to '66 I was privileged to be called by Bill Paulick, Lord be good to him, who was a leader on the opposite side to the Appropriation Committee for the appropriation of a mil . . . an additional \$1,000,000 for the veterans of World War II to continue under the



Rehabilitation Program. Being a Member that is also handicapped, I had spinal meningitis when I was a boy, and when I appeared before the Committee, I got up on the table and I lifted my pant's leg up so they could see my deformity, Bill Paulick says, 'You Bohemian, you've won me over'; and with the help of that and the help of God I was able to continue on 'til 1966 and thank God that he sent me back here so that I can fight for the handicapped and the Pre Ed' and the children that need this support; and I hope that those that are voting red and those that are not voting will change their vote to an 'aye' vote to support Hanahan's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Spe . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to sus . . . solicit some more green votes up there and would like to emphasize again to you the fact that this is reimbursement for programs that were finished last Spring. We have given our school districts to believe that they were going to be reimbursed for these funds. Many of them had to go into debt themselves in order to pay for these services. The local school districts have carried the burden of these expenditures for a year now waiting for their reimbursement and indeed they are well into their second of programing on the basis of the same expectation for reimbursement this year. It's too late now to tell them to cut the fat out of a budget that is already spent. It's too late for them to dismiss teachers who are on contract for this year. We aren't saving money if we do not make these appropriations. We are simply transferring the debt from the state level to the local level, and the taxpayers are going to have to pay the same number of dollars one way or another. I happen to believe that we should keep our commitment to these contracts with the school districts, we should keep our word so that they have some idea how they can plan in the future; and I hope that a few more votes will get up there to carry this vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just



like to say that . . . ah . . . I don't know if . . . ah . . . the actions that we've taken on the last few days are leading up to this point and time will result in . . . ah . . . the need for an increase in taxes. I . . . all . . . all I know is that . . . ah . . . when the Governor came down here in June and called the . . . ah . . . Joint Assembly and stated that . . . ah . . . we had to make these cuts, six percent across the board, we requested that he send his . . . ah . . . Bureau of the Budget . . . ah . . . the Director of the Budget here to delineate where we could possibly make these cuts selectively; and I remember at that time he sent a young man here who had only been on the job about a month and a half and he's supposed to be heading up a \$10,000,000,000 budget. I mean it certainly did nothing to edify me. I don't know whether the status is really towering on the insolvency or not, and I don't know if . . . ah . . . the kids who are gifted or not so gifted or the handicapped kids postulate those lines, I doubt it. I think the . . . they postulate on one thing, our word and their faith in our commitment; and I can only say that as to the question of insolvency, I don't know. But about one thing I am sure of, we have bankrupted our word to those kids because that's all they have to . . . to go on, and I think we are breaking that word with them in that trust."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "It's with reluctance that I rise, Sir, to explain my vote, Mr.

Speaker. You know, in the number of years that I've been here I've seen people stand up and almost come to blows when we talk about really the only thing that those of us in politics . . . ah . . . have to sell. Ah . . . That's the wrong phrase, let me take that back. Ah . . . The only thing that we have to give and that is . . . I'd better start all over . . . ah . . . let's go back a little bit, when we're talking, I've seen fellows get up and friendships almost come to departing and blows almost struck when somebody will stand up and challenge the word of another Member of this Body and today I'm rather surprised that we don't rise and almost as a single Body unanimously with the indignation that I feel when



we're letting somebody else make liars out of us. Unlike the Bill of yesterday, 2971, where we're talking about the funding of a formula and the expenditure of money for the General School Aid Formula, the major part, I want to stress that, and I understand some of the people that are complaining about not dividing the question, but let me point out the major part of this budget of this override involves money that we have mandated . . . mandated the school districts to institute and that we have pledged a certain degree of money along with that mandate; and now we're sitting back and arguing at 85 votes, 87 votes, something short than what I really think ought to be up there and that's 177 votes because we're sitting back and letting somebody make a liar out of us and that's what bothers me; and I know that if I walked over to some of those red lights on some other issue and said you're a liar, I'd get my teeth knocked out, but you're sitting back and letting somebody else do that to you and you're taking it; and I'm very disappointed by that kind of approach."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as . . . I voted 'no' on the big Bill yesterday, but it was the will of this House that this Bill be sent to the Senate and it's strange for me to sit here and look at that board and hear three and a half or four hours arguments yesterday . . . ah . . . for the big appropriation Bill. These same arguments that we heard yesterday apply doubly or triply to this Bill and it's strange for me to sit here and look at that board and see some of the people who supported the Bill yesterday not support the Bill today. I say to this House if we have to find the money in education for full funding, if this be the will of the General Assembly, then certainly somewhere in the budget or somewhere in our tax program or somewhere in the State of Illinois we can find the money to help the mentally disabled, the physically disabled and the developmentally disabled; and I think it's a disgrace and a sham if we're here and if we're sincere and if we were sincere yesterday to pass the big appropriation Bill and deny these unfortunate children this money, and I'd urge a 'yes'



vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question . . . Representative Davis . . . Representative Davis."

Davis: "You haven't announced the vote, may I just say, Mr. Speaker, if we don't pass this, it seems to me everyone's word is going to be broken, everyone in the General Assembly's word is going to be broken."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow, for what purpose do you arise?"

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Fredric Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Darrow: "I don't know if I'll get my picture in the paper like McClain . . . my family has a tradition of humanitarianism and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye', Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "I'd like to request a verification and Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Record has been taken. On this question there's 89 'aye', 72 'nay'; the Gentleman has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. The Clerk will . . . Representative Berman."

Berman: "Would you please poll the absentees before you get to the verification?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Fredric Selcke: "Arnell. Carroll. Ewing. Fleck. Flinn. Hirschfeld. Klosak. LaFluer. McAvoy. Randolph. Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "The poll of the . . ."

Fredric Selcke: ". . . 89 'ayes', 72 'nays'."

Speaker Redmond: "Verification of the affirmative Roll Call has been requested. The Clerk will . . ."

Fredric Selcke: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . call the affirmative Roll Call."

Fredric Selcke: "Gene Barnes. Okay, I got this. Jane Barnes. Beatty."



Berman. Birchler. Boyle. Brandt. Brummet. Byers. Caldwell.
 Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Choate. D'Arco. Darrow.
 Davis. DiPrima. Downs. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Friedland.
 Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Giglio. Greiman.
 Hanahan. Hart. Hill."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, not so fast."

Fredric Selcke: "Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe.
 Emil Jones. Katz. Keller. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski.
 Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz.
 Lucco. Lundy. Madigan. Madison. Mann. Maragos. Marovitz.
 McAuliffe. McLendon. McPartlin. Merlo. Meyer. Malloy. Mudd.
 Nardulli. Patrick. Peters. Pierce. Pouncey. Rayson. Reed.
 Richmond. Rose. Satterthwaite. Sharp. Shea. Stearney. Taylor.
 Telcser. Terzich. Vitek. Washington. White. Willer. Williams.
 Wolf. Younge. Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative Roll Call?"

Beaupre: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Beaupre: "Representative Catania?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Chapman?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Dyer?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Friedland?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Garmisa?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's down in front."

Beaupre: "Representative Houlihan, Dan?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan? He's in the back there."

Beaupre: "Representative Katz?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Kornowicz?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz is here."

Beaupre: "Representative Kosinski?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski is here."

Beaupre: "Representative Kucharski?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski is here."

Beaupre: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Beaupre: "McAuliffe?"

Speaker Redmond: "McAuliffe."

Beaupre: "McAuliffe, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the Persian accent. McAuliffe."

Beaupre: "Representative McPartlin? He just came in, Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Meyer?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Patrick?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Patrick? He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Sharp?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp is in the center aisle."

Beaupre: "Representative White?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative White? Which one?"

Beaupre: "Jesse White."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative White here? How is Representative White recorded?"

Fredric Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Beaupre: "Representative Wolf?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf? He's in his chair. I was looking for B. B."

Beaupre: "Representative Gene Barnes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Barnes? In the center aisle. Representative White is back, put him back on the Roll Call."

Beaupre: "Representative Brummet?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet is here."

Unknown: "Capparelli?"



Beaupre: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli is here."

Unknown: "Shea's here, Downs?"

Beaupre: "Representative Downs?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs is here."

Beaupre: "Representative Ewell?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell is here."

Beaupre: "Representative Mugalian?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian? He's recored as voting 'no'."

Beaupre: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk was going rather fast and
we were having trouble keeping track. Representative Younge?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge is here."

Beaupre: "Representative Emil Jones?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones is here."

Beaupre: "Representative Holiwinski?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Peters?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters is here down in front."

Beaupre: "Representative D'Arco?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Malloy?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Beaupre: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 89 'ayes', 72 'nays'; the
motion is adopted, the appropriation for the items reduced have been
restored to the original amount over the reduction of the Governor.
We have . . . ah . . . two emergency matters appearing on House
Bills, Third Reading, we'll take the subject matter of transporta-
tion, appears House Bill 3164. Representative Garmisa."

Unknown: "What page is that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Page 2 in the . . . page 2 in the Calendar."

Fredric Selcke: "Bring me the Bill."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, . . . ah



House Bills 3614..."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the Clerk...let the Clerk read the Bill will you...ah, you want to consider these two together or not?"

Garmisa: "Yes, they are companion Bills, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Do they have leave to consider them together? Hearing no objections, the Clerk will read House Bill 3164 and 3165."

Selcke: "House Bill...House Bill 3164. An Act to amend Section 49 of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3165. An Act making appropriation Department of Transportation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, over this past summer the House Transportation Subcommittee on Railroad Abandonment held extensive hearings throughout the State. Testimony was heard from many federal, state and local officials as well we shippers and citizens affected by abandonment of the Penn Central Lines in our State. The Subcommittee's extensive hearings has led the House Transportation Committee to believe that special emergency legislation is necessary this fall to avoid a cutdown in early February of several key rail freight lines in Illinois. The emergency is the result of Congressional action and Illinois Department of Transportation inaction concerning the bankrupt Penn Central Company. Congress has approved creation of a new railway corporation, 'Conrail' to operate segments of the Penn Central. There are over 280 miles of Illinois freight routes that were not recommended for inclusion in 'Conrail'. And unless we approve emergency legislation in this Session these lines may be abandoned on February 7th of 1976. Under federal legislation routes that are not included in 'Conrail' can be continued for a two year period by utilizing a 70% federal, 30% state or local share of operating deficit. Illinois does not have legislation to provide



the state or local funding shares. Further federal legislation is pending to fund 100% of operating subsidies on the lines not presently scheduled to be included in the 'Conrail'. However, it seems doubtful that the Congress will approve a hundred percent subsidy necessitating a state or local share of approximately 10 to 30 percent of the deficit on the subsidized line. Unfortunately, the Governor has steadfastly opposed using any state funds to match federal dollars. The Administration has concentrated its efforts on persuading other railroads to purchase the Penn Central lines. However, complications have arisen and it appears very likely that some lines will certainly need a subsidy. The Administration has failed to propose necessary legislation providing the state matching funds for the program. The Committee recommends passage of legislation which it believes must be approved to provide a backup in case efforts to obtain an all federal subsidy failed. The Congressional decision on a 100% federal subsidy will not be forthcoming until mid-December. Both the Secretary of the Department of Transportation and myself have testified in Washington before the Congress stressing the need for a 100% federal subsidy to allow continued study and development of a coordinated transportation plan. However, subsidies must be offered to 'Conrail' in order to continue operating the state lines scheduled for abandonment on this February the 7th. Thus, since the General Assembly will not return to consider legislation until March or April the train could stop running in February if efforts to obtain a 100% federal funding fails and if no state subsidy is available. The abandonment of the involved line will not just affect small communities, the major power plant's serving 780,000 Illinois residents would be left without a train route for coal shipments in February. Currently the 3,000 carloads the plant receives annually comes from southern Illinois. However, if the rail line is abandoned the coal will have



to be brought in from Indiana by truck resulting in higher coal prices and miner layoffs in southern part of Illinois. The Committee believes the vital state interest is involved in subsidizing the routes at least for a two year period. The cost estimates of the state share of a subsidy program are extremely low. We believe they will run less than \$200,000 for the subsidation. The Transportation Committee strongly urges you to support House Bills 3164 and 3165."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bills 3164 and 3165 pass. On the question the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, I'd like to have...ask the Sponsor, Mr. Garmisa, a question. Do the labor amendment on this one, Sparky, is it placed into the Bill now?"

Garmisa: "The labor amendment has been placed into the Bill and it has been agreed upon by both railroads, the railroad association, labor, management, and all the way... and Illinois Department of Transportation. It has been an agreeable amendment."

Kelly: "Fine. Well, then I...I will support the Bill. And you're right, at the Committee hearing all sides agreed to the legislation and I'm favor of it. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is shall these two House Bills pass. Those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. It takes a 107 votes to make these Bills effective immediately. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are 126 ayes, 111 nays, 3 members voting present, 11 nays, 3 members voting present. House Bills 3164 and 3165 having received the constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, appearing on the calendar in the order of second reading is House Bill 3100 and I would like leave to have that placed on the spring calendar."

Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to place House Bill 3100 on



the spring calendar. Hearing no...are there objections? Hearing none it will be so ordered. On those two last Bills they received a constitutional three-fifths majority. House Bill 3036. Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "That's not my Bill, Mr..."

Shea: "House Bill 3036, Mr. Maragos, do you know whose Bill that is?"

Maragos: "Just a minute, Mr..."

Shea: "Dan, you don't want to call that now do you? That's out of the record."

Maragos: "What...what...where is that on the calendar?"

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, moves that House Bills 3036 and 311 be placed on the spring calendar. Is there objection? Hearing none that will be the order."

Maragos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Under amendatory vetoes, House Bill 574, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we took a dry run on this Bill the other day and I had a certain degree of unreadiness and so I pulled it out of the record but the original Bill was actually a Bill to increase...to amend the State Employment...Employees Retirement System to increase the pension amount for spouses only from 250 to 350 and to increase the stipend for spouse and dependent children from 350 to 500. The Governor reduced the amount for increase for spouse only from 350 back to \$300. The second phase of the amendatory veto provided that the Governor who had been placed in the General Assembly Retirement System Fund to be taken out of that and be placed back into the Employees Retirement System. That in essence is the substance of the amendatory veto. It is strictly a widows and orphans Bill. They have had no significant increase in their stipend over several years and I move the adoption of the Governor's Amendatory veto to House Bill 574."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, moves shall the Governor's specific recommendations for change with



respect to House Bill 574 be accepted by adoption of this amendment. On the question, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you recall the other day when this Bill was brought up I have no objection on the par...one part of this particular Bill which reduced the amount for survivors under the Illinois Employees Retirement System. However, this Bill was further amended since the Governor did sign a Bill to include all the members of the Executive Branch of government to be covered under the General Assembly Fund. I find it a little bit objectionable that the Chief Executive has decided not to participate with the rest of the Executive Branch and..uh..under this particular Bill he wants to be excluded from the General Assembly program and I think it would set a bad precedent if the Chief Executive had enough guts to sign the Bill to include all the members of the Executive Branch I think he should have also been included in the General Assembly retirement Fund and hope that's there some way this Bill could be passed to include the survivors benefits but to leave the Governor in the General Assembly Retirement Program. I would urge a no vote."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Would the sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Shea: "Indicates he will."

Beatty: "Representative Washington, with the Governor presently under the Legislative System, isn't it true that an addition to any benefit that he may derive from this if he's not removed if something were to happen to him that sometime his wife would have a right to a pension same as any legislator?" In other words, isn't the legislative pension also cover a widow of a legislator or whoever is under that pension?"



Washington: "That's correct. I don't know the significant differences between the two pension funds but it seems to me that this is in the area of permissible discretion on the part of the Governor. He seemed to deem it unadvisable that he be incorporated into the General Assembly Pension Fund. I don't know whether its a concept of separation of powers or what but he doesn't spell it out in his veto message. I think it's relatively insignificant amendment to this Bill and I don't really see that it merits a lengthy discussion, suffice to say that in this area perhaps he should be entitled to some minor discretion and I think that's the extent of this amendment."

Beatty: "But in any event he's also giving away any, trying to get out of the Legislative Pension or by wishing to remove himself he's removing also his wife in any future benefits under this, isn't that true?"

Washington: "The benefits are spelled out under the Legislative Retirement System but there are additional benefits or similar benefits under the Employee System that the spouses are included there. I don't know the ratio of pay out under that as against the General Assembly system."

Beatty: "Would this effect future Governors of the State of Illinois were this provision to be passed?"

Washington: "Well, certainly if we blanket it into law, it will effect any Governors who succeeds the present Governor or whoever occupies the chair but we can always, if we deem it unwise, after a trial period, restore it."

Beatty: "But do you think it would do good to have this inconsistency in two senses, in the sense that you have the other State officers now participating and your just going to put the Governor in that position and now ignore it?"

Washington: "I sluffed over it but I think the inconsistency is relatively minor...uh..."

Shea: "Mr. Washington, can I make a suggestion, sir? There are



two amendments."

Washington: "I want to go with this amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "There are two amendments."

Washington: "I know that, but I want to go with this one."

Shea: "The first one your going with is the widows, is that it?"

Washington: "I'm going with a motion to accept the amendatory veto Governor as he amended the Bill."

Shea: "Alright, there are two amendments filed up here."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, is it possible that there could be a division of these two issues?"

Shea: "Wait, I'd like to find out from Mr. Washington. I did not know there were two motions filed, the Clerk handed me two motions. Could you tell me the difference between them sir?"

Washington: "The difference is insignificant at this point because I am going to proceed with motion #1. Motion #2 is not before this Body now, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Alright, motion #1...motion #1 covers both phases, is that correct, sir?"

Washington: "That's correct."

Shea: "Alright. Is there any further discussion? The gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Just a point of information Mr. Speaker. Does the motion before us incorporate both amendments?"

Shea: "From my reading of them it does."

Collins: "Thank you."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I look upon the amendment as indivisible, they're not two amendments, an amendatory veto is amendment to the Bill in toto, it's one amendment."

Shea: "Can I ask you, sir, there are two motions filed on this."

Washington: "Now we've gone through that Mr. Speaker, I'm proceeding on motion #1."

Shea: "Alright, but the gentleman's question was does motion #1 incorporate both changes. The answer was yes."



Washington: "He didn't say that, he said both amendments.

There is only one amendment."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to close."

Washington: "I would defer to Mr. Terzich since he was instrumental in passing this Bill out."

Shea: "Turn Mr. Terzich's on."

Terzich: "May I inquire as to what motion #2 may be?"

Shea: "What is motion #2 Mr. Washington?"

Washington: "I repeat Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's relevant. I'm proceeding on a motion..."

Shea: "The gentleman asked..."

Washington: "It's on his desk he can read it."

Terzich: "I would still like to know what motion #2 is, I don't know...would the Clerk read motion #2 please?"

Selcke: "Motion #2, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change to House Bill 574 by adoption of the following amendment. The amendment #2 amends engrossed House Bill 574 page 1, line 17, page 3, line 14 by deleting 250...by deleting 350 and inserting in lieu thereof 300 on page 3 by inserting after line 23 the following: 'Section 2 on this amendatory Act takes affect upon its becoming law'."

Shea: "Mr. Terzich are you..."

Terzich: "Yes, well if that's the case then I would like to see this Bill come out as it was originally presented to the General Assembly which dealt with survivors benefits and therefore I would like to suggest that we vote no on motion #1 and accept motion #2 which was in compliance with Pension Laws Commission."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, now I am more confused what the Clerk read, I believe, was the suggested amendatory veto of the Governor which would change \$350 benefit to \$300. And that is what Representative Terzich is recommending that we approve, I believe."



Shea: "That is motion #2."

Collins: "Oh, that's motion #2. Then motion #1 is the one that removes the Governor from a Bill he already signed."

Shea: "No, motion #1 incorporates, how do I want to put it Mr Washington?"

Collins: "Both recommendations?"

Shea: "No, the motion #1 incorporates the total recommended change by the Governor."

Collins: "Alright, then what Representative Terzich recommended is then that we defeated Amendment #1 and adopt amendment #2. Yea, I think I go along with that, too."

Shea: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the General Assembly. I think I have a glimpse of an idea of why the Governor asked that he be taken out of this retirement fund. I think it may be because he has taken \$20,000 in salary or intends to take \$20,000 in salary over his term that he pledged to the people of Illinois that he would forego. The General Assembly before 19...that was sitting in 1972 saw fit to raise the Governor's salary by \$5,000 a year and prior to taking office, this present Governor said that he would not take that \$5,000 a year. Now I'm sure that he's stashed away in a keyhole plan or some type of retirement benefit plan that will yield benefits as least as high as the General Assembly Retirement benefits so I think we ought to let him have his way..."

Shea: "Excuse me, Mr. Skinner, the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, on a point of order."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe he's speaking to the Bill. I don't believe his remarks are germane to the Bill."

Skinner: "I think they're very germane."

Shea: "Well, I think his point is well taken, if you want..."

Skinner: "I'm arguing in favor of agreeing with the first motion that has been filed which is what I think we are talking about and I'm giving the reasons why I think a



yes vote would be totally in the best interest of the State."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understood you to say Mr. Washington to close and he then deferred to Mr. Terzich, it seems to me we're on the question as to whether to vote this up or down."

Shea: "You're right sir. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington to close again."

Washington: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't avoiding a direct response to Mr. Terzich but in my humble opinion an amendatory veto is indivisible and I was mistaken in filing motion #2 and I think it's null and void and consequently I have no intention of proceeding with it. However, the second phase of this amendment arrived here I don't know the rationale for it. Suffice to say that the main thrust of this Bill and the amendment is to raise the stipend for widows and orphans of State employees. That's the main thrust of the Bill. I don't even choose to speculate on why the Governor recruited a second phase. But I do think an amendatory veto is indivisible, consequently I prefer to proceed with motion #1, vote it up or down, if it's down then the Bill is dead as far as I am concerned. But I think it would be a nullity to try and divide the amendment. I ask for your support in the adoption of the amendatory veto to House Bill 574."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, moves that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 574 and that it be accepted by the adoption of this amendment. All those in favor will vote aye, those opposed vote nay. This takes 107 votes to become effective immediately. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the essential issue here is whether or no we are prepared to raise the stipend



for widows and orphans. That's the issue. The ques....
It takes 105 does it not, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "Pardon me."

Washington: "It takes 107 doesn't it?"

Shea: "Yes sir."

Washington: "Thank you."

Shea: "It takes 107 to become effective immediately."

Washington: "That's correct."

Shea: "It takes 89 and that's then effective July 1st."

Washington: "Addendum on this Bill I think is relatively insignificant. As I said before I think it's within the discretion of the Governor to decide whether or not he cares to be placed on one pension system or the other. It's just that simple but the core of this Bill deals with a needed increase in this type for widows and orphans and that's what we're voting on. I'd appreciate one or two more votes on that board."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins to explain his vote."

Collins: "Well Mr. Speaker if we if we defeat this Amendatory veto, we're not taking anything away from widows as a matter of fact as I read it we're giving them more than the Pension Laws Commission recommended which may not be all that bad. But if we adopt so we're not penalizing the widows under any circumstances but what we are doing is we're allowing if we adopt this thing we are allowing the Governor to misuse his Amendatory veto powers where he signed one Bill which put him and all the other constitutional officers into the General Assembly Retirement Plan and now because he got some heat after signing the Bill he decided to take himself out by exercising an Amendatory veto improperly on another Bill. I don't think he can do it. I think he jeopardizes the whole legality of this Bill. It certainly would I would think would be tested so let's take care of the widows and orphans in one way or another. I think better that we take care of



them by rejecting this Amendatory veto and not let him cop out of some action that he took and didn't realize he was going to get some heat on later. So I certainly would recommend that we defeat this Amendatory veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker I would..ah..point of a parliamentary inquiry. Is it proper to ask you now as the Speaker to rule on whether or not...ah...an Amendatory veto that has two distinct issues involved is divisible." If it's not proper this time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise it at the proper time."

Shea: "Mr. Matijevich on a point of order." Point of order we're in the Roll Call. If I had not been asked that question prior to the Roll Call that is where we are. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Geo-Karis 'aye'. Take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 29 'nays', 10 'present' and House Bill the specific recommendation for changes of House Bill 574 are adopted. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker I renewed my parliamentary inquiry. For future reference."

Shea: "Mr. Madison, Mr. Matijevich is about to save the chair. Mr. Matijevich raises a point if I can rule with nothing before me. Is that your point of order, Mr. Matijevich?" You're absolutely correct sir. I need a specific piece to have a piece of legislation before I can rule. George I'll let you get there. On the order of Amendatory vetoes appears motions appears...ah...Mr. Grotberg did you want yours called now?"

Grotberg: "Anytime is as good a time as any, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "All right. 600."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker with leave of the House can we hear these two Bills together? They are on the same subject matter."

Shea: "The question is does the Gentleman have leave to hear



House Bill 600 and 601 with regards to the Amendatory vetoes as a package? Hearing no objections leave is granted."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The motion is then that I do move to accept the Governor's Amendatory vetoes to House Bill 600 and 601. To refresh your memory very briefly these were the two Bills that amend the laws relating to the publication of notice of proposed zoning changes. One in the county zoning Act and the other in the municipal zoning Act. The Governor and Bill Goldberg have done some interesting things amendatorily in veto writing and this happens to be one that I subscribe to. He deletes the home rule Amendment from these Acts to bring it into conformity with the State law Chapter 100 which absolutely forbids home rule and I'll take a Roll Call of at least 89 votes. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentlemen from Kane, Mr. Grotberg moves that with regards to the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bills 600 and 601 that they be accepted by the adoption of this Amendment. Is there any debate. Hearing none the question is shall the motion prevail? All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Shall the motions prevail? All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On these questions there are 157 'ayes', no 'nays' and no 'present' and the House adopts the Gentleman's motions. House Bill 658, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's a motion on this Bill to accept the Governor's Amendatory veto. This was the Child Labor Bill which expanded various forms of labor that children could involve themselves in under federally funded programs. All it did was change the hours. I concur on this. There are no other changes. Everybody's agreed with it."



Shea: "The motion is that the Governor's specific recommendation for change be accepted by adoption of this Amendment. Is there any questions? Roll Call. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 142 'ayes', 1 'nay', and 1 'present' and the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 658 is adopted by this Amendment and that motion passes. House Bill 898, Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 898 creates the agricultural areas, conservation, and protection districts. The Governor made numerous minor changes in the language, the Bill that does not change the Bill in anyway but he did also make two major changes. One he struck the section that changed the assessing, the new assessing method under the Bill in it's original form. As originally written 50% of the assessment would have been made from the productivity of the land and 50% from the cash value. He struck that section and under his Amendatory veto. The land will be assessed to this as it presently is and has been for a number of years just on a cash value. He also struck the home rule exemption. So in interest to preserving agriculture in the State of Illinois now moves that the House accept the Governor's Amendatory veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for a change with respect to House Bill 898 and it be accepted by the adoption of this Amendment. On the question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer. Not quite yet."

Lauer: You're looking? Now turn Mr. Lauer on."

"Ah...Representative Fennessey is this, if the Gentleman will yield for a question? Ah...Representative Fennessey is this the one that sets up local control boards on the use of agricultural land?"



NOV 6 1975

226

Fennessey: "Yes."

Lauer: "OK. Thank you very much. It's a very good Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman moves for the adoption of his motion. All those in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. This takes 107 votes to become effective immediately. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there 145 ayes, 2 nays, 8 members voting present and the gentleman's motion is adopted. 11...House Bill 1127, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This motion, basically, involves a housekeeping measure. It, apparently, we passed two Bills which amended the Community College Act and inadvertently one of the Bills repealed a section in the other, they were both signed on the same day...uh...this Bill would conform with the original intent of the General Assembly by installing what was passed in Senate Bill 179 which would allow a back door referendum for new Community College Districts, I will give you a more detailed explanation if you'd like to have it but if not I would ask for your favorable support."

Shea: "The gentleman moves that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to House Bill 1127 with this amendment. All those in favor will vote ayes, those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this there are 131 ayes, no nays, no members voting present and the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regards to House Bill 1127 is adopted. 1133, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a motion to override the amendatory vetos of the Governor on House Bill 1133. Briefly, this Bill, when it left the House, was an increase flat grant Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Rayson, excuse me for a minute. Mr. Collins."



Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that you clear the floor of all unauthorized people who might be in the position to influence votes on this Bill."

Shea: "Will all those people on the floor of the House that are not entitled to the floor by the rules of the House please removes themselves. Mr. Rayson will you please continue?"

Rayson: "Yes, as I said, this was a flat grant increase bill when it left the House. It was pegged at \$21.70, an increase from the prior law which said that 'student per semester hour would have a floor of \$17.61.' But because of Bob Cronson, our Auditor and...uh...George Lindberg, the Comptroller, we added a provision that would take care of a situation down in East St. Louis with regard to paying certain items of income into a special fund to be known as the Community College Boards State Community College of East St. Louis Income Fund. Then we also authorized the Junior Colleges, if they had grants elsewhere or other kinds of gifts received that they could account for these and keep them. Then it went over to the Senate and the Senate changed the flat grant formula to a three category, category which was consistent with the appropriation which was Senate Bill 491. The flat grant rates were as follows: \$21.70 for baccalaureate and occupational credit hours, \$10.20 for developmental or remedial or review of vocational skill credit hours, and \$17.61 for all other general student studies credit hours, now that, when appropriated yielded something 107 million dollars under Senate Bill 491. Now the Governor comes along and does some strange things. Number 1 he says you can't authorize Junior Colleges to get special grants and gift. We feel that that is wrong and they should have this right. But the most important thing that the Governor did which I think totally erodes this whole concept that we put in the



statute when we created the Junior Colleges Act and that was the statutory floor that there should be a flat rate for students per credit hour. He removed that by deleting these three categories and then he put in... then there's language in the statute that says...uh... that the rate of a flat rate grant for each instructional category shall be specified for each year in the Act making the appropriation for this purpose. He struck that, so the effect of what he did removes the floor.

"Totally removes the floor we have for funding students in Junior Colleges. This is the way it was set up in the master plan, this is the only workable way that we can work for for future funding and to destroy that it really totally emasculates the whole Bill that we tried to put together. And I hope that that's sufficient explanation because I respectfully move to override the amendatory veto of the Governor on House Bill 1133."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, has moved that the House Bill 1133 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that question, the gentlman from Cook, er Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for Representative Rayson, please."

Rayson: "Yea."

Leinenweber: "Representative Rayson, as I understand, one of the changes that the Governor did is that he struck out a specified amount as a flat grant and in effect make it a floating grant depending on the amount of money appropriated in the annual appropriation, is that correct?"

Rayson: "That's right."

Leinenweber: "Let me ask this. How would it work any differently in actual practice if we restore the flat grant, if we do not appropriate a sum equal to \$21,70 times all the students that attend college."

Rayson: "Well, you see, when they...when they set up the manner



in which appropriations ensue...uh...the community college board recommends to the...uh...master board who makes recommendations based on enrollment figures now, for example, they just made enrollment guesses of 190,000, when this went into effect there was an enrollment of 145,000 guess, now, or the past year, the Junior Colleges has grown to 169,000, so if we had the flat grant of \$17.61, if this law went into effect, it would have been deluded by that increase. Now, if we take the floor out entirely, you said something about a floating grant, it would be something like a floating crap game, we wouldn't know we'd get, it would be..."

Leinenweber: "My question is, as a practical matter, don't we have a floating flat rate because of the fact that the state can only pay to our local community colleges the portion of the money that we appropriate for the implementation of the flat grant, if it's not sufficient to equal \$21.70 times the number of students then there has to be some adjustment downward, does there not?"

Rayson: "Yes, and that's what always occurs because the enrollments keep going up."

Leinenweber: "Isn't the effect of the Governor's amendatory change here then just to legitimatize what actually takes place in fact."

Rayson: "Not quite, because as we start out with a statutory floor that they must have at least this amount. But maybe in practice it doesn't quite work out that way. But if you remove that guaranteed floor, if you remove that, you don't know what your going to end up with."

Leinenweber: "My point is we've already appropriated money to implement the flat grant program. We also passed a Bill raising the flat grant from \$17.60 to \$21.70, now if we restore, in accordance to your motion, the flat grant of \$21.70, won't the practical effect be that our



Community Colleges will not get this amount or would it require us to pass a supplemental appropriation to fulfill that statutory obligation?"

Rayson: "Yes, we will and there will be a supplemental appropriation coming through next spring due to the fact that the estimates were based on enrollment of 145,000 when in fact, in reality, it's 169,000."

Leinenweber: "Alright, what is the amount that will be required to be appropriated next spring?"

Rayson: "Well, the question is, is it the amount of actual loss to the College or the flat grant guarantee and I guess it would be a flat grant guarantee at \$17.61."

Leinenweber: "Well, if we restore the \$21.70 what amount of money will we be required to appropriate next spring to fulfill the obligations imposed by House Bill 1133?"

Rayson: "As I understand it, what the supplemental will be the deficiency in the light of increased enrollment. Whatever that figure is and if we don't meet or we meet it in part that's what happens to the Junior Colleges."

Leinenweber: "Well, the question is, what is your closest estimate that that amount will be."

Rayson: "About 15 or 20 million dollars."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Rayson: "But that has nothing to do with the Bill or the reality of the situation now because we're dealing about a future and we don't want to knock out the floor."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on the Bill very briefly. If we adopt the motion to override the amendment of the Governor we will be committing ourselves to a supplemental emergency appropriation of 15 to 20 million dollars next spring. Now we have today appropriated, as I understand it, approximately 39 million dollars... uh...by overriding the Governor. Yesterday, it was 81 million dollars overriding the Governor and in the Spring the Junior Colleges will be reminding us that we



made a commitment to spend this extra money. Now I thought it was interesting that the group..."

Shea: "Will the gentleman bring his remarks to a close please."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was interesting that the group that appeared this morning in the balcony hung a banner which stated, and I think I can quote it, 'More school aid, no increase in taxes, no increase in tuition.' This kind of thinking is, of course, exactly what happened in New York and is exactly what is happening on the floor of this House for the past two days. I think we've got to call an end to it and I would have to ask that we do not vote for this motion to override."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would rather talk about what will happen if this veto is sustained. What will happen is that next year or earlier the community colleges of the State of Illinois will have to turn away thousands and thousands of students because what the amendatory veto of the Governor really means is that as the enrollment in community colleges goes up the amount, the rate per student hour, will decrease and therefore the community colleges which have always had an open door policy for students in the State of Illinois will no longer be able to do the job and you may not take that seriously now but wait till you encounter the students and the parents that are coming to you in your districts asking you to explain why it is their children cannot get into the community colleges within your district. When the whole concept of community colleges was sort of to be a half way house between high school and college for those students who wanted to pursue higher educational opportunity. I think you're making big mistake if you sustain the Governor's veto here because your going to destroy the entire principle



of financing the junior colleges which has obtained in Illinois since the master plan was enacted in 1964. So I would urge you to support this motion."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson to close. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, that's all right. I was going to move the previous question."

Shea: "Mr. Rayson, to close. George, I'm sorry, I didn't see your light. Do you want to talk? Go ahead. Turn Mr. Rayson on, please, to close."

Rayson: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, I can't add much more to what my colleague, Mr. Mann, did say. He pointed out the problem. The problem is the Illinois master plan did provide for the promise of 50% of the cost per student per credit hour. We've fallen far short of that and unless we have some...form of statutory floor, either we're going to turn away these students that come into these junior colleges in droves or we're going to have tremendous tax hikes back home and tuition increases back home, it's going to create an impossible condition. I'm asking that we live up to this commitment of the General Assembly, which the Governor did commit himself to and all of the other parties involved did agree on this formula. And we're saying henceforth he must operate from this formula. It means no money now and has nothing to do, we have an appropriation and it just means that in the future we aren't going to play this floating crap game that we alluded to before. So I ask for a favorable vote."

Shea: "The question...the question is shall House Bill 1133 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? The Representative from Union, Representative Choate, to explain his vote. Well, your light's on that I'm curious."

Choate: "Tell Chuck to leave my light alone."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, or



Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, thank heaven he corrected himself on Cook. I wanted to say notwithstanding the unruly, rude, idiotic behavior this morning of those young people out in that balcony who ought to have known better and exemplified to a certain degree the in...undisciplined that is...prevalent today, I feel that there is a bigger issue involved. My instinct was to vote no because of their stupid action and the insult to this House, I think, that our Speaker at that time should have had them thrown out instantly with the state police. That's what they deserved. But I feel there's a higher duty in regard to this so I'm going to vote aye."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Anderson, the gentleman from LaSalle, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yeah, I'm voting yes on this Bill. We have a community college in my hometown. And not only has the amount per credit hour gone down, you know 1761 is supposed to be the floor, but by missing the enrollment by 35,000 students the floor is going down to 1483 per credit hour. Now this is more of a drastic cut than any of the elementary and secondary schools have taken with the enrollment going up. This is a necessity. We've raised the cost per student hour from \$6.00 to \$8.00 starting next semester and the semester after that it's going to \$10.00. So I urge you to vote for this, let's get this floor in here."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, to explain his vote."

Rayson: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I believe it takes 107 votes to affect this motion, is that right, sir?"

Shea: "Yes, sir."

Rayson: "Ah, I...I'd like to explain my vote this way. I feel there's some apprehensions about what's going on here. First, this is no money situation here whatsoever. This is strictly do we have a floor on what we, the State, should contribute to the cost of education in junior colleges.



Bear in mind the total cost is around \$580 per student as compared to those in our state universities that's close to \$600 per student. But...but forgetting that, the thing is when they estimated the needs last year, they guessed at 145,000 enrollment of students. In the junior colleges now in the State we have 170. The, ah, Board of Higher Education just went in...with a new recent recommendation for fiscal year 1977 and there's a 190,000 students enrolled. All right. Are we going to continue to say that we have a floor which is really minimum, really minimum, and try to live up to it knowing that we're not going to because we know enrollment exceeds so that the floor amount is going to be diluted or are we going to do what the Governor says and that has completely removed the floor and not know where we are henceforth as to a state to share. I suggest that the Governor's action historically as to us, it's removed something important, that is a guarantee of a floor which again is a diluted floor. We're not paying our own way in this..."

Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Rayson: "Yes, I'm just saying there's no money involved here.

I need 107 votes otherwise we're going to have to gut the Bill because 17.61 as the floor is better than nothing.

Thank you."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor. The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, there is a third alternative and that is to do nothing; not to change the law. At the present time there is a floor in the formula of \$17.61 and I would suggest that it is better to have the junior college people coming to us saying we're breaking a promise to give them \$17.60 per credit hour than whatever this is \$21.50 per credit hour. We'll be in the same situation, we'll have someone just like Representative Hanahan, someone just like Representative Berman, standing on the floor saying here's a law that you gentlemen have passed but refused to obey."

Shea: "Take the record. On this question there are 90 ayes,



58 nays, 5 Member voting present and the gentleman's motion fails. On the order of amendatory veto 1287, Mr. Kelly moves that the House, or that House Bill 1287, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding become law."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on House Bill 1287, the Governor had stated in his veto message that the railroad would be excluded under the definition as a mass transportation carrier who can participate in the students and senior citizens reduced fares program. NOW this is the only question that was at hand. I'd like to mention that if we permit this Bill to go through the way it is, none of the railroads in the, particularly in the RTA regions, will be able to participate and give reduced fares to senior citizens or to students. And I certainly feel that this would be in the benefit of the citizens and...in our area up in the RTA area. And I'd ask for your favorable support to override the Governor on this particular Bill."

Shea: "The question is, shall the House Bill 1287 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Takes 107 votes. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs, to explain his vote."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I heard you correctly as to what the question is. Is it a motion to accept..."

Shea: "No, this is a motion to override. You'll find it down a little further. Mr. Kelly said he did not want to go with the motion to accept, he wanted to go with the override."

Downs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah, on the calendar I have here, the motion to override is on postponed consideration."

Shea: "When I called the Bill that's what he wanted to go with, that's what I called, sir."

Washburn: "We change the order of business, then, you mean."

Shea: "Perhaps I was in error."

Washburn: "Perhaps you were. I expect to go back to the regular



order now."

Shea: "We'll go right after 1287. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 68 yeas, 34 nays, 6 Members voting present and the gentleman's motion to override the Governor fails. On the calendar appears House Bill 1691. Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the interest of time and not to run into the confusion that Representative Washington ran into and some others I would now move, Mr...Speaker, to table Motions #2 and 3 regarding House Bill 1691...and..."

Shea: "Why don't you just call Motion #1?"

Grotberg: "All right, I'll be delighted to call Motion #1 and I will then table Motion 2 and 3."

Shea: "The gentleman has leave...ask leave to table...withdraw Motions 2 and 3. Is there objection? Hearing none, then he goes with Motion #1. The question is shall House Bill 1691 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that question is there any debate? The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the gentleman yield to a couple questions?"

Grotberg: "Be delighted."

Shea: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we all deserve an explanation of the Bill before we go into questions."

Shea: "Mr. Grotberg to explain the override."

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that, I was going with you when you called for questions. I did intend to explain it. This override, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, involves the long and tedious task of House Bill 61 that has several various forms and numbers in the previous Session of last Spring. This Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the one that the Department of Children and Family Services and the private child care agencies in the State of Illinois finally agreed upon and the...substance of the



Bill at that time was and still is today that the Department shall pay 100% of reasonable cost which leaves it all negotiable and doesn't change any of the fiscal...atmosphere of this Bill at all. Now, I would like to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the amendatory veto in which if you all, and I'm sure you all have many copies of many pieces of paper from me, the Department, and other people, on your desk which indicates that the Governor in his amendatory veto and with no input from the field at all and from the private agency structure, includes in the amendatory veto the mandating of contracts for the purchase of these care...with private agencies. And it is that veto message which I would like to override. The Department now works under contract to all these agencies. It is not too functional at this point in time and we will deal with it in the Spring Session. We will deal with it in depth and I promised the Department this, the Administration, Bill Goldberg, who helped draft all of this, that the proper platform for addressing for addressing the contractual arrangements with Children and Family Service is in full hearings with the House Joint Senate Child Care Committee which will be going into Session right after this Fall Session is over with and with the Human Resources Committee of the House. So that is my explanation of that. And I'll be pleased to respond to questions."

Shea: "Is there any discussion? The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I continue? I'd still like to ask the gentleman a couple of questions."

Shea: "Proceed, sir. He indicates he'll yield."

McClain: "Thank you. Ah, Representative Grotberg, as you're obviously aware of, Title 20 requires a written contract. And by moving to override this amendatory veto, we no longer codify that we have a written contract and could be subject to losing Title 20 monies. Ah, could you respond to that, please?"



Grotberg: "Yes, it's an excellent question, Representative McClain, and upon close investigation I find that the Federal Department HEW has placed a moratorium on that particular section of Title 20 until March 31st 1976 which gives us that time in your committee and my committee, to work at this with full hearing and try to resolve the contractual phrases that have the whole system paranoid at this point."

McClain: "Well, I'll respond to that in a minute. Secondly, are you, you're then, not against, philosophically to written contracts?"

Grotberg: "Heavens, no, but it is untimely, Representative."

McClain: "Ah, let me ask one last question. In the amendatory veto, it does state that we will have a limitation of up to 20% of administrative cost, ah, for total actual cost. Do you not find typically in the...in any sector of the...of our state government that the minimum usually becomes the maximum?"

Grotberg: "Ah, I cannot speak...in strict percentages on that Representative McClain, but I do know this, that in the negotiating process on the line items that we've articulated in the Bill that you and I worked on so hard that there is room to negotiate all of those costs. And...and the Department has the complete discretion not to sign contracts."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill, please?"

Shea: "You may, sir."

McClain: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in Section 228.70A, contract provision requirements, the Title 20 program of the Federal Government requires that we have written contracts. Even if Representative Grotberg is correct saying that there is a moratorium 'til March 31st 1976, there is no way that we are going to codify by March 31, 1976 written contracts. Let me explain what Title 20 does. For a majority of programs in the State of Illinois the Federal Government is offering the State Government sponsored agencies a \$2.00 to \$1.00 matching. By removing or voting for this motion to override we are putting on the



line the possibility of not codifying a written contract and losing literally thousands of dollars for a private care sector and our system. I would urge you in order to help our private care sector, in order to codify and comply with Title 20 to accept the Governor's amendatory veto and vote now on Representative Grotberg's motion."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Downs: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Representative Grotberg this is going by me rather quickly and I...I want this made very clear. I understand you to be objecting to the requirement of a written contract between the Department and the private agencies which I infer from what you said there is to be negotiation and here we have the State being required to pay a 100% of cost. And you're saying that the State is not to have the assurance that this will be pursuant to a written contract. I find that astounding."

Grotberg: "The only astounding thing about it Representative is that you're wrong on both counts. First of all, it's a 100% of reasonable cost which was met with and we who are in on those meetings, you know for weeks, reasonable being the key word, nobody has to sign anything. The second point is that we all ready have contracts. They are agreed upon. It took three years to devise the contract form, 80% of these agencies now have contracts, the other 20% of the contracts are out in the field. They are mailed out by the Department with the rate filled in and say please sign this and send it back. And they're working at that. The credibility level of the..."

Shea: "Mr. Grotberg, Mr. Grotberg..."

Grotberg: "...Contract this year. Yes, am I shouting?"

Shea: "...To close."

Grotberg: "Am I shouting too loud?"

Shea: "Yeah, you'll get to close, if you'll just answer the question."

Grotberg: "Thank you. I just thought I would answer his question. Thank you."



Downs: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not finished. You said I was wrong but you haven't pointed out where. I asked you if you are objecting to requirement of a written contract and as I understand your answer you proceeded to tell me that such contracts indeed exist. And what is your objection?"

Grotberg: "The objection is we want to find out...for...for instance, had the Governor written in there that all contracts ...or Mr. Goldberg, all contracts had to be signed by 30 days, a time limitation. Some of these contracts have been out a year now, Representative, I think you're aware of that. Six months is not unusual for those larger agencies that have much at stake."

Downs: "I'd like to address myself briefly to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Downs: "Nothing that I have heard satisfies me that there is any reason in the world to prevent the State the opportunity to protect its coffers by insisting on some kind of written understanding as to what these costs are going to be, the State here is obligated to 100% of a long list of enumerated items and I think that to require the written understanding is certainly a very reasonable requirement. That I oppose this motion to override."

Shea: "The gentleman from...or the lady from Cook, Miss Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor please."

Shea: "Proceed."

Chapman: "Ah, Mr...ah, Mr. Grotberg, we, I...I don't know when so many people have worked as...as hard as...as we did together to achieve what really appears to be so little and that is to put into the code what is presently the practice of the Department and that is to reimburse at 100%. Now when one places this kind of statement in the code sometimes questions can arise and as I look at the Governor's amendatory veto and at the Bill, the question that occurs to me is how do we determine, reading the Bill, who



determines the reasonable cost?"

Grotberg: "Well, Representative Chapman, I would presume that we could make this assumption. That the Department maintain sole responsibility for the placement of the wards. It does not mandate that the Department purchase anything. Under the Bill, the Department still retains the right to decide what wards need what service; where it can be purchased and they still have all of these powers, ah, Representative. They have the power of licensing, inspecting, controlling, every facet of these children's laws and it does spill over into the various institutions so I do not predict under these conditions the Department will ever sign a contract that they don't find the terms equitable on."

Chapman: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, if I may talk briefly then..."

Shea: "Briefly."

Chapman: "...The point, it...it appears to me that we are in agreement, that it should be the Department who determines what the reasonable cost is and...and therefore it appears to me that we should accept the Governor's...amendatory veto which clarifies this point in which states that it is the Department who determines this matter. Therefore, I would opposed to overriding the Governor's veto on this matter."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison. Mr. Grotberg, to close."

Grotberg: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not go into long detail in closing only that the subject of contracts will be dealt with and dealt with intelligently in hearings and agreed upon by all parties concerned before we codify that. The experience to date with contracts has been a constant frustration putting it into statute will not clarify it and I told the Governor's shop that I would take that out to the field and fly it. It did not fly and here we are with anxiety level on contracts that has to be resolved in public hearings and that is the thrust of the veto amendment that I am asking to override. I would



appreciate your support."

Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg, moves that House Bill 1691 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote aye; all those opposed will vote nay. Takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll make this very brief. The question about a contract has come up and the Sponsor of this Bill said this is really not a timely matter. I want to explain why it is not a timely matter. We've had some experience with this Administration and their contracts. You call your hospitals in your District tomorrow and find out what this Administration is doing with contracts in the Department of Public Aid and what it's requiring of the hospitals. Hospitals will be providing services for the next year and a half before they know how much they are going to be reimbursed for providing those services. Representative Grotberg introduced this Bill to clarify a very bad situation with people who are providing services for the State who have a moral obligation to do so and they are getting nothing from the State but bad...a bad public relations effort where the State is not paying for the services that are being provided. If it's a question of a contract, all right, there's no problem with the Agency and the State sitting down and agreeing. But the State, under this Administration, has been unethical, they've sent the contract and say sign this or provide the service and get paid what we feel like paying you. That's a bad way for anybody to do business and I would urge that you vote to override this veto."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would you to vote your own switches, I would hate for this to get a 107 votes. I know there are several people now voting green that are not here and I'd hate to take the



time of the House and ask for a verification, so please vote your own switches."

Shea: "The lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a member of the Human Resources Committee. I can honestly tell you that the Department of Children and Family Services doubt...really know what it means to enter into a contract. We have to pay our bills. I've had constituents who have had contracts with some of these agencies and let me tell you the last one last week had to go borrow \$29,000 from the local bank and mortgage his hide because the Public...Department of Public Aid, for example, said sorry we don't have any money attitude. I would like to suggest that everybody put on the green switch because this is the only way we're going to clear up some of these matter that should be cleared and have been unfair to the people of the State of Illinois."

Shea: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his no vote."

Byers: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I want to verify the roll call at the proper time."

Shea: "Well, that...the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "I wish I could laugh with you Representative Shea. Mr. Speaker, the confusion of this item I would hope in the first place has nothing to do with money. The confusion in this item is the credibility of every private child care institution in the State of Illinois vis-a-vis the Department of Children and Family Services and their operating procedures. There are been...have been many advances in the Children and Family Services Department, Ladies and Gentlemen and I've been instrumental in trying to encourage them to continued improvement and I will pledge myself to continue to work at that problem to resolve this issue. But as you go back to your district, to your boards of directors, to each and everyone of your Catholic, Lutheran, Methodist, ...and other not for profit agencies and discover that this



is what they have been asking for for so long, just this much. I think the contractual thing is next. I pledge, Mr. McClain, I pledge, Mrs. Chapman, that we'll look at that issue by March of next year in time for the moratorium. In the meantime the contracts that we have are...are still incredible, there's need to put them in,...more of them back into the statute if we can't even keep the contracts we have and with that I would still appreciate a few more green votes. Thank you."

Shea: "...All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 108 ayes, 29 nays, 14 Members voting present, the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, requests a verification. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg, wishes a poll of the absentees. Proceed, Mr. Clerk, with a poll of the absentees. Mr. Byers, do you wish something, your light is on there."

Byers: "No, no."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, Boyle, Brummet, Carroll, DiPrima, Fleck, Greiman, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Katz, Klosak, LaFleur, McAvoy, McGrew, Peters, Randolph, Rose, Sangmeister, Schisler, Sharp, Stearney, Van Duyne, Van Duyne votes no. Waddell, Wall, and Wolf."

Shea: "Proceed with the verification of the affirmative vote."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson, J. M. Barnes, Beatty, Berman, Bluthardt, Borchers, Brandt, Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, Deuster, Duff, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geokaris, Getty, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Hart, Dan Houlihan,..."

Shea: "Excuse me, sir. Emil Jones, do you seek recognition? Emil Jones wishes to go aye."

Jack O'Brien: "Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Jacobs, Emil Jones, J. D. Jones, Kane, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Luft,



Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Maragos, Marovitz, Mautino, McAuliffe, McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Meyer, Miller, Nardulli, Neff, Patrick, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Shea, Simms, Skinner, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Walsh, Washburn, White, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Yourell."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Shea: "You are recorded as voting present, sir."

Giglio: "Vote me aye."

Shea: "Change Mr. Giglio to aye. Mr. Waddell. Mr. Waddell, please."

Waddell: "How am I recorded?"

Shea: "You're recorded as not voting, sir."

Waddell: "Change mine to aye."

Shea: "Change Mr. Waddell to aye. The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Byers: "Yes, sir. Representative Epton."

Shea: "Representative Epton. Representative Epton, how is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call."

Byers: "Representative Ebbesen."

Shea: "Representative Ebbesen?"

Byers: "Yes, sir."

Shea: "Representative Ebbesen, is he in the Chamber? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call."

Byers: "Representative Jacobs."

Shea: "Representative Jacobs? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call." Mr...Mr. Clerk, would you



give us the starting count, please, sir?"

Jack O'Brien: "We started at 111, 3 have been taken off."

Byers: "Representative Getty."

Shea: "Representative Getty, how is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call."

Byers: "Representative Meyer."

Shea: "Representative Meyer. Representative Ted Meyer."

He is present, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Thank you. Representative McMaster."

Shea: "Representative McMaster is in the Chamber, sir."

Byers: "Thank you. Representative Davis."

Shea: "Representative Davis is laying down. Do you want me to get him out?"

Byers: "No, sir. Representative Giorgi."

Shea: "Representative Giorgi, ...kay, how is he voted?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "I think he's in his office, do you want me to get him out?"

Byers: "Yes, sir."

Shea: "All right. Take him off the roll call for now."

Byers: "Representative Stubblefield."

Shea: "Representative Stubblefield? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call. Representative Epton is back, put him back on the roll call."

Byers: "Representative Hanahan."

Shea: "Representative Hanahan, is in the Chamber."

Byers: "Representative Coffey."

Shea: "Representative Coffey...he's in the back of the Chamber, sir. He voted present."

Byers: "Representative Peters."

Shea: "Representative Peters, is Representative Peters in the Chambers? How is he recorded, sir?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Byers: "Representative...Representative Mautino."



Shea: "Representative Mautino is in his...right by his seat."

Byers: "Thank you. Representative Deuster."

Shea: "Representative Deuster. Is Representative Deuster on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call."

Byers: "Representative Hart."

Shea: "Representative Hart? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Take him off the roll call."

Byers: "May I ask the count?"

Shea: "Are you through with the verification, sir? Well, you know I don't want to stop playing hop scotch."

Byers: "Okay. Ah, Representative Stearney."

Shea: "Representative Stearney."

Byers: "He's not recorded as voting...okay. Representative McCourt."

Shea: "Representative McCourt is in his seat, sir."

Byers: "Okay. That's all, sir."

Shea: "Mr. Madison, for what purposes do you arise, sir?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Shea: "How is Mr. Madison recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting, ah, present."

Madison: "Would you vote me aye?"

Shea: "Change Mr. Madison from present to aye. Give me the count, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are a 105...Mr. Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise, sir?"

Lechowicz: "How am I recorded?"

Shea: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Lechowicz: "That's right."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Mr. Byers."

Byers: "I think...aren't you ready to announce the roll call. We have a lot of business before the House. We don't want to play hop scotch, your own words."



Shea: "Yes, sir, I know that. Mr. DiPrima, how are...what do you rise for, sir?"

DiPrima: "How am I recorded?"

Shea: "How is Mr. DiPrima recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

DiPrima: "Vote me aye, please."

Shea: "Record Mr. DiPrima as aye. Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, was I taken off the roll?"

Shea: "Was Mr. Lauer..."

Lauer: "How...how am I recorded?"

Shea: "You're recorded as aye and I don't think you've been taken off the roll."

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Lauer: "That's fine."

Shea: "On...on this question there...there are a 100 and... the gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "How are you reported, Mr...how is Mr. Campbell recorded..."

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Shea: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I really think you know that this is dilatory and I'd ask you to go to the vote. I mean we can play with this all night if we want and you know it's dilatory, we...we...we've gone through a lot of roll calls and allowed people a lot of time to get on but now it's so obviously dilatory I thought...I think you ought to so rule."

Shea: "On this question there are 106...there are 106 ayes, how...Mr. Keller, for what purpose do you arise?"

Keller: "Well, I was off the floor temporarily and I'd like to know how I'm recorded."

Shea: "You're recorded as voting aye, sir."

Keller: "How do you know, the Clerk hasn't looked yet."

Shea: "You're recorded as voting aye, sir. 106 ayes, 30 nays and the gentleman's motion fails. The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."



Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that vote but I have spent 50 years working for kids and I'm here to tell you I'm going to spend the 50 working against that damn bureaucracy that can't even give anybody a break. Thank you."

Shea: "House Bill 1730, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations with respect to House Bill 1730 with...after considerable soul searching. The Governor with his recommendation changed the Bill entirely and what the Bill does now is simply make the alternative, alternative B comply with the rules of the Democrat National Committee and that is that the last two presidential elections shall be used instead of the last one in determining the proportional share of the delegates elected. And I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, moves to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change on House Bill 1730 by the adoption of this Amendment. Is there discussion? Is there any discussion? The gentleman moves for the adoption of his motion, all in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Shea, no. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Walsh, do you want to explain your vote?"

Walsh: "Ah, yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a little explaining to do. This...this amendatory veto by the Governor simply makes it possible for the Democrats to have a convention this year and possibly have this alternative used by the Republican Convention. Now, I suggest to you that if we don't do something in the area of delegate election in this Session of the General Assembly then we're going to find that according to the rules, at least, of the Democrat National Convention it won't be possible to have a delegation there from Illinois, they will be unseated. Now I think the responsible thing to do is to vote yes on this so that we can have a Democrat Convention."



Shea: "The lady from Cook, Miss Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor during the presentation and I did want to ask if the amendatory veto changes it so that now it will be possible no matter what option is used for the First Congressional District to have Republican delegates to the Republican Convention?"

Shea: "I think you're out of order with that question, but Mr. Walsh, wants a..."

Catania: "I certainly hope everybody is going to vote no if it hasn't been changed."

Shea: "Well, Mr...Mr. Walsh...turn Mr. Walsh, on."

Walsh: "Well, the answer to that question is yes, but the Bill before the amendatory veto had been applied provided for the First Congressional District to have an elected delegate for the Republican Convention and so in that..."

Catania: "Well not necessarily with some of the options..."

Walsh: "Yes, it did, there was an amendment in the Senate not, perhaps not according to that but the...it had been amended so that that would be provided and you can very faithfully, ah, ah, Representative Catania, vote yes on this amendatory veto."

Catania: "There is no way that they could be prevented from..."

Walsh: "No way under this."

Catania: "...Coming to the Convention. Thank you, Representative Walsh."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 97 ayes, 37 nays, 13 Members voting present and the...Caldwell, aye. And the Governor's specific recommendation for change is adopted. House Bill 1758, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr...Mr..."

Shea: "Mr...go ahead, I'm sorry."

Craig: "I want to take the second motion, the override."

Shea: "The gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig, moves that House Bill 1758 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. The gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig,



to explain."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what this Bill did was provided for a five year semi-trailer plate for semi-trailer trucks. Now the fee is \$20 per year, this provided for five year plates for \$50. The Governor vetoed the amendatory veto out saying it would be all right for a five year plate but keep it at \$20 the present rate because of loss of revenue. I maintain that no one could determine, I don't think at the present time the amount of loss of revenue. Yes, for the trucks that are registered here, they would be a \$10 loss. But I would like to remind you people that the...most of the semi-trailers have been registered in Maine where they allow them to be registered in Maine for \$5 per year and the State of Missouri is allowing them to be registered for three years for \$7.50 or \$2.50 per year. So what is going to take place, the trailers will be registered in Maine or Missouri and not here in Illinois and I would like to move to override the Governor's amendatory veto."

Shea: "The gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig, moves that House Bill 1758 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Is there any debate? All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. This takes a 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 58 ayes, 20 nays, 11 Members voting present and the gentleman's motion fails. 1849, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had originally filed a motion to override the Governor's veto but I...I don't think that's the proper motion so I'm...filed a motion to accept the amendatory veto of...of...of the Governor. What this Bill does is similar to one Bill I had all ready had accepted with 727 and it's a pension laws bill and it allows individuals to get into the pension fund and the amendment that was put on by some



individual in the Department of Insurance was not a product of my thinking and...uh...I wasn't even consulted with the amendment but what the Bill does now it provides for a payment of a interest charge for those who want to get into the Pension Fund and it has the approval of the Municipal League, the Taxpayers Federation and the Pension Laws Commission, and I move to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, moves to accept the amendatory language of the Governor regarding House Bill 1849 by the adoption of this motion. Is there discussion? All in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. Takes 89 votes to become effective, immediately it takes 107. Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. The gentleman's motion with regards to House Bill 1849 receives 140 aye votes, 1 nay vote, 1 present vote, this Bill having received constitutional majority is here...or the amendme...the motion is hereby declared accepted. House Bill 1999, are you ready for that one, Mr. Walsh? 1999? Turn Mr. Walsh on, I'm sorry."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation with respect to House Bill 1999. This... the Governor made a technical change in this Bill and deleted some language that was obsolete and was not relevant to the Bill at all but was changed for the purpose of up-dating and...uh...that's the only change that was made. The Bill deals with the notification of candidates and their requirement to file statements of economic interest and I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations."

Shea: "The gentleman moves for the adoption of the Governor's specific recommendation for change to House Bill 1999 by this amendment. Is there any debate? All those in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 141 ayes, 36 nays,.....



141 ayes, no nays, no present, the gentleman's motion is adopted. 2249, Mr. Farley. Turn Mr. Farley on, will you please sir?"

Farley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With leave of the House I would like to consider motion #2, amendment #2 to House Bill 2249. The difference between the first amendment and the second amendment was... er...is that there was no effective date in the first amendment which the second amendment does have so I would ask leave to hear amendment #2, motion #2."

Shea: "The gentleman moves that the Governor's specific recommendation for change be accepted by amendment #2 which has an earlier effective date clause. Requires 107 votes to become effective immediately. All those in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there 139 ayes, no nays, and 3 members voting present and 2249, the recommendations for change are accepted. On total vetoes, total vetoes appears House Bill 138, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, and fellow members of the House. I ask leave to consider 138 and 139 at the same time."

Shea: "Gentleman asks leave to hear House Bills 138 and 139 together, does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."

Borchers: "It's very simple. There are 52 counties in the State of Illinois, including Cook County where the Circuit Judges have for many many years made decisions and used the financial aide from the Department of Children and Family Services to the tune of \$500...\$500,000. Now this \$500,000 is in the budget now, as usual, and has been for many years. But the trouble is that these counties are only receiving per child, these 52 counties, are only receiving per child \$35 a month. Now this...uh...\$35 a month has been existence since 1959 at least and possibly before that."



There isn't anyone here that doesn't know of the increased cost of living and other costs of operating and all that. Now all this does is...uh...the one Bill adds a \$600,000 which will allow a \$90 a month contribution to the Department of Children and Family Services to these 52 counties that are handling children in foster homes or foster institutions. I would certainly solicit your support. No change since 1959 is a long time with the change in the valuation of money and cost of living etc."

Shea: "The gentleman from...the gentleman's motion is that the House Bills 138 and 139 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that question, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I couldn't follow the number, I said 2249 and I didn't realize 138."

Shea: "Is there any question? Questions regarding...takes 107 votes on these two Bills. All in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay."

O'Brien: "Fred Selcke comes to the Clerk's desk please."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Borchers to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think you should think of the interest of the children here. This effects, again, 52 counties in the State of Illinois. The amount involved is only \$600...\$600,000. With what we've done I think this is a small amount to help these 52 counties and I want to point out to you that what I've seen of the Department of Children and Family Services the children are far safer in the hands of the Circuit Judges of these counties and their future interest and welfare is far safer there than in the hands of the Department of Children and Family Services. All you have to do is remember what you read in the paper these last 3, 4, 5 years to realize that we haven't seen or read of one such case where a circuit judge has handled the fate of a child. So please help the children on this Bill. Thank you."



Shea: "Is there any further discussion? On these questions there are 68 ayes,...take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 68 ayes, 45 nays and 8 Members voting present. And these Bills, or the gentleman's motion is lost and the ...or the motion is lost. On consideration postponed, total vetoes, is House Bill 437. Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "I'm sure you're all aware what the issue is involved here. The...this particular Bill commits the State to pay the entire judicial salary rather than the present arrangement wherein the State pays the basic salary and the add-ons are paid by the various counties that are involved. It's been pointed out to me by someone that the present time the judges have sent all over the State, at the direction of the court administrator, which would seem to be an argument in favor of this common sense arrangement. I hope that you'll find it possible to vote a green vote on this issue."

Shea: "The gentleman moves that House Bill 437 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 46 ayes, 40 nays, 8 Members voting present and the gentleman's motion fails. All right, now back on the order of total veto motions. Mr. Walsh, yes."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion filed..."

Shea: "I know but...you know according to Walsh's rules on where..."

Walsh: "Ah, those...those...Speaker, we..."

Shea: "Now, we are leaving this order..."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Pardon me."

Walsh: "We are...we seem to be leaving this order of business and before you leave this order of business..."

Shea: "I'm on total veto motions."

Walsh: "...Appropriate for you to consider that motion before I leave...before everyone goes home."



Shea: "You'll get a chance Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, isn't now a good time, Mr. Speaker? You're changing the order of business..."

Shea: "No, because...there's a lot of people that haven't had their Bills called, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "No. No. They've been called two or three times, we were...."

Shea: "Well, but...according to Walsh's rules, you had your shot now I think if you want to come back to it..."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we haven't followed Walsh's rules at all. I don't know why we should begin now on poor old Walsh. Why don't, why don't we consider my motion."

Shea: "We'll get to your motion, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I'll tell you what it is."

Shea: "I know what it is Mr. Walsh, it's to reconsider the vote by which the Bill, 1730, was adopted by this Chamber."

Walsh: "That's absolutely correct. And I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that everyone...is that before us now?"

Shea: "No. On the order of...er, total vetoes appears House Bill 1510 and on that Mr...or 1588, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the...the Governor has totally vetoed 1588 was the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Lake DePue dredging with the funds not to come out of the General Revenue Fund but to come out of the Boat Safety Act and from the Illinois Boat Safety Boating Act is the funds that are paid by the boaters of the State of Illinois for the registration of their boats and that fund is to be used for facilities owned by the State of Illinois which the Lake DePue is owned. I move that...my motion is on the Clerk's desk. Will you read it, please?"

Shea: "The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, moves that House Bill 1588 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that question, the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."



NOV 6 1975

256

Byers: "Representative Mautino, what's the name of this lake?"

Mautino: "Lake DePue, sir."

Byers: "Is this the one where they have motor boat races?"

Mautino: "Yes, sir, up until last year when they were moved to Winona, Minnesota, from DePue, Illinois."

Byers: "And how deep is your lake?"

Mautino: "It used to be 30 feet now it's about 18 inches."

Byers: "That makes it difficult to have motor boat races."

Mautino: "Not if you dredge it, sir."

Byers: "Mr. Mautino, I want to remind you about the suggestion I gave you this spring. I think we should fill your lake up and make it into a park. And I would urge a no vote."

Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Could I ask...the Sponsor a question?"

Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Skinner: "How much money in these...this special fund?"

Mautino: "Ah, approximately \$12,000,000."

Skinner: "Could this be used to build a ramp that Waukegan, to launch boats maybe?"

Mautino: "You have to ask the Department that, sir, I imagine it could be."

Skinner: "How about you'd clean up the Chicago River?"

Mautino: "On that case you'd have to present your own bill, Mr. Skinner..."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the... the issue. The Sponsor of this Bill..."

Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Skinner: "Ah, in voting for the education veto override said that he had chosen kids rather than highways and indeed he did vote against the \$200,000,000 bond issue that this Administration may now issue now that we've overridden the motor vehicle...or, the Motor Fuel Tax diversion veto. But I have a similar project in my area, for the Chain of Lakes that the Governor just vetoed outright; didn't suggest that the money for dredging ought to come out of the...the boat, Boat Fund, is it? And I just don't think it's fair."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Shea: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, when we considered Representative Mautino's Bill early this year there was quite a bit of discussion on trying to hold on to some of our natural resources which created a lot of activity. What we're talking about is a national event that was carried on here in the State of Illinois and we talked about the funding and where it was going to come from and the people that supported this national event that Illinois very popular throughout the nation. And I think it's a very good Bill. I think the cost warrants the dredging of this lake. I think that not only just be...for the motor boat races but to preserve this natural resource of ours which has become a national landmark throughout the country and I...I would hope that everyone would see the advantage of supporting this override and give Representative Mautino the votes he needs to carry this project out."

Shea: "The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to close."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is not a privately owned lake. It is a lake owned by the State of Illinois that has not been maintained or repaired. I am not asking for dollars to purchase property to build a facility. I'm saying that we must repair, maintain and support what we have. In that respect I would like to say that this money, once again, does not come out of the General Revenue Fund but the Boat Safety Act by...that was originally set up for these types of projects. And I respectfully solicit your support. Thank you."

Shea: "The gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, moves that House Bill 1588 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Takes 107 votes. Shea, aye. Mr. Mudd to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote I think we got to take into consideration here that if we'd all take the actions today to preserve this lake that we're going to spend many more dollars in the future to do the



same work or to reclaim the property. I would urge that everyone spend that money that's available now in these funds earmarked for these kinds of improvements to reclaim this lake and use it for it was used for in the past that gave the State of Illinois the kind of notoriety that it deserved among motor boat sportsmen throughout the nation. And I would hope that we could override this and save ourselves some money that we'll surely have to spend in the future and that's why I'm supporting this. It's a money saving measure and I would hope that everyone would support it."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mautino, do you want to explain your vote?"

Mautino: "Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I think it's extremely important to make mention of the fact that six short years ago the General Assembly of the State of Illinois found \$738,000 to purchase this lake. Since that time they've let it deteriorate. It's a very simple situation, like buying a car and setting it outside to seven winters and expecting it to remain in the original condition. That is literally impossible. What I'm saying to you is that when they found \$738,000 to buy this lake with no program to retain it at that point it was utterly ridiculous. I don't want to see our problem compounded because what will happen in the next one or two years is the EPA will come in here and to their body, this General Assembly, and say we're going to have to spend 40 to \$40,000,000 to clean up the antipolluants that the industries and the farmland are dropping into Lake DePue. It's a matter of taking care of the situation now or putting it off to where you're going to be talking about multimillion dollars to repair what can be taken care of right now."

Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, to explain his vote."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this particular lake in the past has been noted certainly for boat racing. Not only in the State of Illinois but throughout the United



States and even though we sit here and we're a little gunshy when we find out that there's a large package of money in a piece of legislation, this money does not come out of the General Revenue Fund. It is a special fund set up for this and it seems to me in order to help the situation up in that particular area, not only for the area citizens, but for all of us in the State of Illinois, for a beautiful area, for something that will bring money into the State of Illinois and certainly we're all wanting that, this is one time you can pass a yes vote and accomplish something for the people. Thank you."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 89 ayes, 28 nays, 5 Members voting present and the gentleman's motion is lost. On the calendar is House Bill 396, the Lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge. Miss Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that we override the veto of the Governor on House Bill 396. Ah, House Bill 396 would create the Illinois Depressed Areas Land Use and Development Authority which would have the power to act as a public developer in carrying out community development in depressed areas. And to do so in a manner which would comply to the maximum extent and would rely on private enterprise while strengthening the capacity of the State and Federal Government to make their resources available to the people of depressed areas by providing any assistance needed by such State and Federal Governmental and local entities to produce quality environment. The Board would have 9 members, 5 of whom would be appointed by the Governor and 4 by the General Assembly. The authority would be responsible for a long range comprehensive redevelopment plan for the growth and development of depressed areas. This plan would be the result of the cooperative efforts of an advisory committee working in conjunction with State and Federal agencies and the authority...and authorities in various depressed areas and...and...the...the redevelopment plan



would be presented to the General Assembly for approval. And if approval, then it would proceed. In the Governor's veto message he raised several issues which I would like to speak to; number one, he said that the authority would have broad powers to develop in depressed areas. However, that some of the powers include functions which properly belong to municipal...municipalities. This is certainly true, the plan under the Bill is that if the municipality is having problems implementing its power or its authority it would ask the assistance of the Federal, of the State, new State authority. The plan basically is based on the premise that many municipal officers and many municipalities in Illinois are having great difficulty carrying out their development plan and they need the assistance and the cooperation of a state agency in implementing their plan; therefore, this new state authority would sit down with these municipal offices and help them to complete the buildings and development plans they have. The underlying premise of the new authority under this act is that this new state agency would act only if invited by the municipalities to help it. I do believe as a result of working on a local level that many municipal officers are in, seriously in need of the state planning redevelopment assistance. The veto message raised the question as to what would be the relationship between the established state agencies and this new agency. That relationship would be voluntary. It would be one of cooperation. This new authority would have as its responsibility the focusing in on the planning and redevelopment of depressed areas. The other state agencies are working all over the state. One agency is needed to bring to the table all of these other state agencies and federal agencies and come up with a coordinated combined redevelopment plan. I believe that does not now exist in the State of Illinois and I think this new agency is needed to do that. Many local officials are just besieged by a large numbers of state and federal offices and they have great difficulty cooperating



and coordinating...the multiplicity of effort. I believe that the point that is basic in the breakdown as to why our small cities and municipalities are not fully developed is that they are having difficulty with the fragmentation of decision making that exists on a state and federal level and for these reasons I believe that this new State entity is needed to help these local officials implement their local goals and desires. The veto message mentioned the fact that there is a home rule amendment that seems to be contradictory to the whole Act. I do not believe so. The basic premise of the act is that this new authority would only work on a local level if invited. I don't believe anyone can be of assistance to the municipalities all over this State that need unless there is a...an agreement and a...and a...desire to have the state or federal government work with them. And finally, the question was raised as to how this new...State authority would be financed. You'll remember that there was House Bill 2956 which is still in the Appropriations Committee for the passing of this...Bill that we have under consideration at the earlier Session I agreed to seek federal funding. I have talked with Mr. Werner who is the Regional Director of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and he has indicated that he would favorably recommend to Carla Hills that planning...the first year's planning fund be made available from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. And I am in the process now of developing a proposal to Carla Hills so that very appropriately the planning fund which would be the first year's activity would come from the federal government. I move the passage of this motion."

Shea: "The Lady moves that House Bill 396 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill would create a State facility referred to many as a super agency. The responsibility of this authority would



transcend that of all units of local government in the State as well as most State agencies. The authority would have the responsibilities encompassing certain functions of the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Illinois Capitol Development Board, the Illinois Department of Local Government Affairs, the State Planning Clearing House as well as municipalities, the counties, townships, park districts, other special purpose districts, the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Department of Interior and any planning agency authorized to operate in an area chosen for consideration by the authority. Because of the many agencies and units of government the definition of relationship is very vague and uncertain leading the potential of duplication, overlapping and delays in the provision of services is greatly increased. Also very importantly, the Bill supposedly relieves the State of any obligation for the bonds of the authority; however, it's questionable whether or not the State really would be free from such obligation. I think it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this Bill which would be of tremendous impact statewide should come up at this late date, late hour, within this Session considering vetoes. I do respectfully and sincerely suggest, Mr. Speaker, it's one of such awesome authority resulting probably in...in overlapping, duplication, and further commitment of state funds that a reasonable and a prudent vote on this motion to override would be a no vote and I so encourage that."

Shea: "Miss Catania, please."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very briefly, I was happy to be a cosponsor of House Bill 396 because it can help the communities that are found by this board to be economically depressed in the State of Illinois to redevelop themselves. It is not an outside force imposing redevelopment on communities, it is a resource for communities to use in redeveloping their own economic capabilities



and I think that it certainly could be a very significant step during...helping of the redevelopment of the south and west sides of Chicago as well as the economically depressed areas of E. St. Louis and I urge you to put on your green lights in support of this override motion."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Cook who spoke before the last speaker and I think all he said if you will condense his language is that this would be an agency with regional power and authority and it seems to me that Representative Younge knows more about the needs of her area and her community than we do and I see nothing wrong with involving government in coming to the aid of areas that have been hit by the recession and are depressed in nature. I can appreciate her feelings because I have some areas like that in my own legislative district. And I think we ought to just forget all of the language and just go to the heart of the Bill. It's an imaginative, creative effort to help restore a semblance of prosperity and viability to an area that is badly depressed. And I think Mrs. Younge is to be congratulated for her efforts and I hope you will support this motion."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 396. I listened very attentively as one of the prior... speakers rattled off a list of names of state agencies and federal agencies and suggested that perhaps this authority would...would overlap and would take away some of the authority and powers of these agencies. Well, I suggest that maybe the speaker...the speaker may very well be true in his assumption but I can tell you this thing. There is not one thing that any of those agencies that he has listed off has ever done in terms of comprehensive land use and...and planning of an area like E. St. Louis or an area like the west side of Chicago that I represent. And so maybe it's



a good idea to take away this...if that...those agencies have that kind of authority and I doubt it, seriously. And take it away and give it to an agency that is in a position to do something because those planning agencies have not done one damn thing for the west side of Chicago and I doubt seriously if they've done it for any areas of...that are depressed and I would suggest that all the Members of the House at least give consideration to House Bill 396."

Shea: "Lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge, to close."

Younge: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Bill says time and time again that the relationship between the new State agency and the other State authorities and municipalities would be a cooperative one based on the premise that there...there has to be a voluntary cooperative relationship for this kind of thing to work. Secondly, the Bill clearly says that the new authority would not have the power to obligate the full faith and credit or...or to obligate the State in any way so any fear of that is certainly unfounded. I think that we have gone through a period of time in which we have seen repeatedly the efforts of the Federal Government to work directly with municipalities. This relationship has been a strained one because the State of Illinois has never really defined its role in helping to develop those depressed areas of Illinois. There is no question that the State of Illinois does not in any way know how or what it's going to do about the Pope-Pulaski-Alexander County area. One-third of the people down there are poverty stricken. There is no question but there is absolutely not the slightest idea as to what is going to happen to the very depressed areas in St. Clair County. Can anyone believe that there is any plan or coordinated State effort at all to do anything about the inner city of Chicago or the depressed areas of Peoria or ...or...or Danville or Kankakee or Champaign. No one is kidding themselves about that. There is no planning. The State of Illinois is simply sitting back watching a pingpong game between municipal authorities who are struggling to stay



alive and struggling to do something to solve their local problem while they attempt to deal with the federal government. And there is no question but that 396 would be a valuable authority to get rid of the...fragmentation in the effort in the physical development field. And I urge you to vote yes on this matter."

Shea: "The Lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge, moves that House Bill 396 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. This requires a 107 votes. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hill, aye. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to say in answer to some of the things that were raised by one of the speakers from the other side that this authority has of itself no power except that which in municipalities that it is working in give to it. It is simply a planning mechanism to identify areas that are depressed and the means by which through the municipalities and...and the state and federal government where resources can be brought to bear to develop the area. That's...that's all the authority do. If you read the synopsis it says the same thing...."

Shea: "On this question..."

Huff: "I think it's a good Bill and it's worthy of our serious consideration. Thank you."

Shea: "On this question there are 84 ayes, 31 nays, 86 ayes, and the Lady's motion is lost. Mr. Borchers, do you... On consideration postponed under total vetoes...Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Isn't there, under the rules, more for the Speaker to say than just that the motion was lost? What do the rules say? How about the Governor's veto being sustained? The...to be perfectly clear about the matter?"

Shea: "To be crystal clear?"

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, your words, right. You're Speaker."



Is the veto sustained, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "No, the motion is lost."

Schlickman: "And the veto is sustained?"

Shea: "The motion is lost."

Schlickman: "And the veto is sustained. I'm looking at the rules, Jerry."

Shea: "I know."

Schlickman: "Well, I'm sure Mr. Matijevich joins with me..."

Shea: "And you..."

Schlickman: "Joins with me..."

Shea: "You're lodging an objection."

Schlickman: "Yes, sir. Thank you very much."

Shea: "On total veto motions appears 1809, Mr. Kane, that's under postponed."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, can I have leave to consider 1808 on consideration postponed; amendatory veto on 1809, together?"

Shea: "Now, they're both on postponed consideration. The gentleman had leave to consider them together the other night. Yes, sir."

Schlickman: "Leave as far as I'm personally concerned."

Shea: "Is there objection? Hearing no objection leave is granted, 1808 and 1809. The mood of the House changes, right, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Well, when they're on the same order of business, we've got no problems."

Shea: "Oh. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Mr. Schlickman. Ah, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these two Bills remove from the Personnel Code two positions, two investment officers for the...from the Board of Investments, one...that handles bonds, one that handles the investments of equities. The feeling of the Board is that these two positions need to come under the direct control of the Board. They're very sensitive positions. They are positions that are difficult to find persons in at the salary level that is commanded in the private sector. They were...they passed both the



House and the Senate almost unanimously. The first time around they were on the consent calendar and I think we've all ready debated this once and I would ask for a favorable roll call to override the veto of the Governor. Or, again, this applies to only two positions with the State Board of Investments."

Shea: "The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, moves that House Bills 1808 and 1809 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. That...those motions require a 107 votes. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are 83 ayes, 30 nays, 1 Member voting present. And the gentleman's motion is lost with regards these two Bills. On the order of total veto motions on postponed consideration, Mr. Terzich, do you want to have that Bill called or they holding that? On total veto motions appears 1147, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1147 was a Bill that we had passed during the spring session. It dealt with the provisions to allow insurance companies to indemnify directors, officers, employees or agents against expensive fines and judgments actually incurred in connection with civil administrative and certain specified criminal proceedings resulting from their association in their official or corporate capacities. There had been requirements in this Bill for extraordinary action by board of directors in order to provide for this indemnification. The Governor vetoed the Bill. I think that his action was not justified based upon the reasoning of the Bill and I would move to override the veto of the Governor."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, moves that House Bill 1147 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Is there any debate or question? Hearing none, require 107 votes. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all



voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 76 ayes, 26 nays, 9 Members voting present. And the gentleman's motion is lost. On the order of total vetoes appears House Bill 1996. The lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Governor's veto of House Bill 1996 be overridden; after the vote was taken, of course, everyone will remember that this is a Bill to provide the matching share to build an industrial park in St. Clair County. After the vote was taken, the new fact came to my attention that the Monsanto Chemical Company which is a company immediately adjacent to E. St. Louis is actively meeting the various industries in the area in order to be an active participant in seeing that this park is developed and populated with factories. And I think this is further immediate evidence. I talked with Dr. Washington of Monsanto Chemical Company and I think this is further evidence that the industrial establishment in the St. Louis Metropolitan area is enthusiastically backing backing this park and will see that it is carried through expeditiously. During the course of the voting I...came to my attention that there was a rumor that my husband who is an attorney would be involved as the attorney on this project. My husband has done legal work for the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation. If the State of Illinois, of course, is involved in the development of this industrial park he a...certainly would not serve as an attorney any further so there could possibly be any conflict of interest question. I think that I want to indicate to the Members of the General Assembly that if I am not successful in the override of this veto the federal grant will be placed in great jeopardy if we can not override the veto or if we can not get some type of alternative funding. Also, it came to my attention after the voting and argument that one of the bankers has not agreed to serve and would not serve but certainly the other banking people who...who are the largest bankers in



in the City of E. St. Louis, Mr. Rogers of First National Bank, Mr. Charles Daley of Edgemont Bank and Mr. Ron Wallace of the Union Bank will serve on that board. I think that in earlier in history the old sage said that the moving fingers writes and having writ moved on. Now all that piety of wit are lured back to cancel out one half line of it. Under modern constitutional theory it is possible for the General Assembly to be the supreme sovereign of the State of Illinois and to make the decision as to how the resources of this State will be utilized. We can do that by a three-fifths vote. I implore you to exercise that sovereign will and be the body of the State Government that is closest to the people that understands what the problems of the various communities are and to act forthrightly and to act now to get to the very serious problem of unemployment and dependency in this State. And I ask you to please vote with me to override this veto."

Shea: "The Lady moves for...that House Bill 1996 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. And on that question, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have before us in House Bill 1996 which from my recollection being in this House for eleven years is very unprecedented in terms of the borrowing of money from the General Revenue Fund for an industrial park. And I think it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if you'll look at your synopsis and digest to see how this Bill has progressed and has been revised starting off interest free loan and finally up to the grand amount of 3% interest on the loan. And I think it's interesting, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when we're being asked to appropriate from the General Revenue Fund close to \$2,000,000 when the State is in dire need for funds, that there's no security that's provided with respect to the repayment of this amount. And I think it's also interesting, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as we're being asked on November 5, 1975 to



appropriate \$2,000,000 for this project, we're given a packet today showing that this not-for-profit corporation finally, finally got around to filing an annual report yesterday when the legal requirement in this State for the filing of an annual report was six, seven months ago. And I think it's also interesting, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that we're given a copy of the sales contract; a sale contract dated October 31, 1975 but the acknowledgment is November 1, 1975. And I think it's also interesting, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we look at an estimated budget, \$50,000 for one year for legal services; an unnamed amount for a director; \$45,000 for a technical manager; \$13,000 for an office manager; \$16,000 for two secretaries; \$20,000 for somebody in real estate; and that's only for six months; \$23,000 for an analyst; \$20,000 for an accountant; \$6,000 for a receptionist. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is extremely unprecedented, there will be no accountability, no assurance that the State will ever get back its \$2,000,000 and God knows what's going to happen in later years. And I solicit a-sincerely solicit-a no vote on a very ill conceived project being presented to the Illinois House of Representatives."

Shea: "The Lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge, to close." Miss, I'm sorry, I didn't see your light. Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, with relationship to the comments of the last speaker I'd just like to make one comment. It seems to me that that speaker and the rest of us in this Body ought to be aware of the fact that at one time in the history of this State of Illinois everything that's been done was unprecedented at one time or another. Everything has had to have a beginning and I think it's about time we started a new beginning as relates to this project."

Shea: "The Lady from St. Clair, Miss Younge, to close."

Younge: "I simply want to point out that the document from which Representative Schlickman is reading is a proposed twelve month budget which shows that the...this project has a



detail...program analysis chart in which it shows every month exactly what will be done and it is very carefully planned. You have in your packet that I have given you a month to month analysis. You have a chart as to what actions will be taken each month and you have a...a chart and analysis drawn up by an engineering construction management firm which would be responsible for the very day to day construction management of this project making certain that it is done expeditiously and very carefully. I, of course, the answer to the fact that the report was filed this morning I, only when I found out that there was some objections to the Assenting Citizens Development Corporation was, it was possible for me to begin work in reorganizing and getting that local conflict straightened. That report in your packet shows that I have gotten that situation straightened out and have met the objections in reference to this matter. And I urge your support."

Shea: "The Lady moves that House Bill 1996 become law the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 90 ayes, 33 nays, 1 Member voting present and the Lady's motion fails. Now in checking over the calendar on total veto motions, we have called according to the Clerk's record and mine, all total veto motions. Is there any Member that has a total veto motion that has not been called or he wishes to be called? I'm not talking about your motion to reconsider. Hearing no question, oh, Webber, go ahead. I'm sorry, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "All right. Well, 1494."

Shea: "Is that on total veto..."

Borchers: "That's on total veto."

Shea: "Have you filed a motion on that, sir?"

Borchers: "Jerry, you got me."

Shea: "It is difficult to call a motion not filed. On, going



through, the next is on page 10, reduction veto motions, Mr. Tuerk, do you wish that called? The total veto motion on page 10, House Bill 2972."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as I recall that was not my motion. I have a motion on a supplemental calendar. It seems to me Mr. Hanahan filed a motion on 2972. I have no, no desire to call 2972, have a new Bill filed to take care of this problem."

Shea: "I see, they're Representative Hanahan's motion. Is he on the floor?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Illinois Education Association, I filed that motion hoping that it would prod on the movement of the Bill that Representative Tuerk is alluding to, so at this time I'll just let the motion, withdraw the motion with leave of the House."

Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to withdraw the motion. Hearing no objections, will be so ordered. Now, on amendatory veto motion, the only one that I still have open is 3071 and that is Mr. McPartlin. Is he on the floor? I know, but that's under motions. That's under motions, Mr. Walsh. All right, under supplemental calendar #1 appears motions. Motion on House Bill 182, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this is a motion having voted on the prevailing side of House Bill 182, I now move to reconsider the vote by which it failed. Ah, this is Representative Friedrich's Bill which dealt with the inheritance tax exemption increasing it for surviving spouses only from I believe 20 to \$40,000 and I would move that we have a roll call on my motion."

Shea: "The gentleman moves that the House reconsider the vote by which this motion lost. Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry."

Shea: "Takes a roll call vote. Yes, sir."

Madison: "I understood that the Representative that he voted on the prevailing side as it related to House Bill...182. Am I to understand that on the motion he voted against it?"



Shea: "Yes, sir."

Madison: "Thank you."

Shea: "It will take 89 votes. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, excuse me, I'll yield to the Sponsor."

Shea: "Swell.....Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who was, I'm sorry, we've got it, I...I...won't pass, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "On this question there are... Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Request a verification."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "...Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Seriously, Jerry."

Shea: "I know. I'm listening."

Schlickman: "Can I speak?"

Shea: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Thank you. Under our rules there can be a motion to reconsider on a matter only when it's within the control of the House."

Shea: "Yes, sir."

Schlickman: "Previously the motion to override the veto on this matter was defeated. There's no longer a matter before the House. It's out of our control."

Shea: "The motion, in the opinion of the Chair, is still before the House."

Schlickman: "No, it's dissipated. It's gone. It's away. It's not like a Bill where you've got to send a message over to the Senate. It would be a good decision if you'd rule me in order and proper. Save the State some money; finance public education and keep those kids going."

Shea: "On the point of order, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "...The gentleman knows that arguing between the Chair and a Member is against the rules. If he does not like the ruling let him appeal the ruling."

Shea: "Mr. Kane."



Kane: "Ah, parliamentary inquiry?"

Shea: "Yes, sir."

Kane: "On a motion to reconsider, does it take the same number of votes as the main question?"

Shea: "Our rules say it takes 89. On this question there are 95 ayes, 33 nays and the gentleman's motion to reconsider carries. I...I'm sorry, Mr. Hill. No, it's not the..."

Hill: "I requested a verification and I thought you would..."

Shea: "All right. It's still in order..."

Hill: "Recognize me..."

Shea: "Well, you did ask for it. I should not have held that it carried and you will get your verification, sir. Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "I don't want the absentees polled so go right into the verification."

Shea: "All right. Verify the people voting in the affirmative."

Selcke: "Anderson, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Birchler, Bluthardt, Borchers,..."

Shea: "Mr. Hill."

Hill: "...Fast in watching for the Membership, I wish you'd slow down a bit."

Shea: "Would you slow down please, Mr. Clerk?"

Hill: "Mr. Beatty is the last one I heard."

Selcke: "Beaupre, Birchler, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brummet, Byers, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Catania, Coffey, Craig, Cunningham, Deavers, DiPrima, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn,..."

Shea: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, as a courtesy, could those who are in attendance simply raise their hand when their...name is called, please?"

Shea: "Would those Members please raise their hand as their name is called?"

Selcke: "Dyer, Fennessey, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Gene Hoffman, Huff, Dave Jones, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent,



Kosinski, Kurcharski, Lauer, Leon, Leverenz, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Madison, McAuliffe, McMaster, Miller, Mollov, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Palmer, Patrick, Peters, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Sanzmeister, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Simms, Skinner, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Cissy Stiehl, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Tipword, Tuerk, Van Duyn, Waddell, Washburn, White, Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any questions of the affirmative roll call, Representative Hill? Representative Hill."

Hill: "White."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Hill: "Duff."

Speaker Redmond: "Clear the floor. Representative Duff is in his seat."

Hill: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Hill: "Giorqi."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorqi here? How is the gentleman recorded? Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland is here."

Hill: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler, is he here? How is he recorded? Remove him."

Hill: "Giglio."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio? Is he on the floor? How is he recorded? Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Griesheimer is here. He's gone fishing."

Hill: "Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly. How is he recorded? Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon. How is he recorded?"



Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn. Who's behind the newspaper, is that... How is he recorded? Remove him."

Hill: "Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "John Dunn. Representative Kosinski? How is he recorded? Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "Luft."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? Representative Luft, did you say?"

Hill: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe, is he here? How is he recorded? Remove him."

Hill: "Miller."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller here? How is he recorded? Remove him."

Hill: "Nardulli."

Speaker Redmond: "Just a moment. Taking of pictures is forbidden, the lady in the gallery may not take pictures without permission. Nardulli. Take him off."

Hill: "Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli. How is he recorded? Remove him."

Hill: "Porter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter is here, I think. Representative Porter? Yeah."

Hill: "DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima. Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney. Remove him from the roll call."

Hill: "Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan is here."

Hill: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt here? Remove him."

Hill: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty. Remove him."



Hill: "McLendon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McLendon. Is he here?
Remove him."

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off the affirmative roll."

Hill: "Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff. He's here."

Hill: "Okay. Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers. He's here."

Hill: "That's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Ewing: "Change that to yes, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as yes. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, change my yes vote to a present vote,
please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the gentleman to present. Repre-
sentative Friedrich, do you seek recognition?"

Friedrich: "What is the status of this motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know yet. What's the status? What's
the score now?"

Selcke: "Well, let's see. ...80."

Speaker Redmond: "80 ayes, indefinite number of nays. Any
further questions? On this question there's 80 ayes, 31
nays and the motion is lost. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I want to protest the treatment I've
had in connection with this Bill. I got it called twice
when there wasn't a handfull of people in here because it
was early on the roll call. I finally got a chance to go
to bat and we had a 105 votes with 3 people, including me,
trying to get the attention of the Chair. The Chair announ-
ced the roll call, bangs the gavel and walks off the floor.
Now I don't know anyone else that's had that treatment here
because there were people wanting their attention to vote



for this Bill. I was assured after that by the Chair that I would get a fair time to call it and I get it when everybody's gone home. Now I protected the Chair and tried to defend the Chair on many occasions during this Session, even from some people on this side of the aisle when I thought they were abusing the Chair. But I want to complain bitterly about the treatment I've had on this Bill. I...I... I've resented...I think it's been delivered on somebody's part and I don't know who it is but I can tell you now that I resent some of the other things that's taken place here in the last few minutes and I'll be around a long time."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Supplemental Calendar '#1 under motions and I may advise the Members that that clock is not correct it is now four minutes after ten and we're...the witching hour will come at midnight. House Bill 3162. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, this is a Bill that probably could be referred to as let's get those printing presses downstairs running on our Stationery Envelopes and Newsletters Bill. Ah, this is a motion to place to place on the calendar under the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Day without reference to Committee a Bill which would empower the Legislative...the Legislative Council specifically to do what it was doing before Senator Osinga asked the Attorney General for an opinion. It would also strengthen the nonpartisan nature of the legislative service unit by providing that everything they do must provide...must be non...nonpartisan. I'll read the Section 2.... 2.02 which I proposed the Legislative Service Unit provided for in Section 2.01 shall also provide services to Members of the General Assembly. Such services shall include but shall not be limited to the preparation and printing of nonpolitical materials that Members consider necessary to the performance of their Legislative duties."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The gentleman has moved



that House Bill 3162 be placed on the calendar under the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Legislative Day with reference to Committee. All in favor indicate by voting aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 125 ayes, no nays. The motion carries. House Bill 3162 placed on the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Legislative Day. House Bill 3163, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "The motion on House Bill 3163 is precisely the same as the preceding Bill. I'd like to move to place this Bill on the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day without reference to Committee..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Same roll call? The question is shall...."

Tuerk: "Teacher's Retirement."

Speaker Redmond: "...Leave of the same roll call, any objections? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would explain the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the Bill."

Tuerk: "Be glad to. This is a Teacher's Retirement Bill as you recall earlier this year we appropriated some \$186,000,000 to take care of the downstate and Chicago teacher's retirement and it was amended to some extent downward because of some duplication in a couple of Senate Bills and since that time, and the Governor also amended it downward to the extent of 6% cut. What this would do, what the amendments did was take the fund down below normal payoff. Now I haven't moved to restore the entire amount of \$20,000,000 because it isn't necessary. What I'm attempting to do with this new piece of legislation is to just restore the amount of funds necessary to meet normal pay outs for teachers retirement pension funds."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Leave granted to have the same roll call on House Bill 3163? Representative Hoffman, votes aye. Representative Mautino, aye. Take the



record. 127 ayes, no nay and the motion carries. The Bill will be so reported...placed on the calendar on the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Legislative Day.

61...3166. Representative Skinner. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, be...before we proceed to this Bill, there is an amendment on that Bill we just moved to Second Reading and I'd just as soon adopt the amendment, if that's in order."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have to take the Bills down, go to the order of Second Reading. We're still on motions, now."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker on the possibility that some of the rather large vetoes would be overridden, I had a Bill drafted that provides that no state agency may spend more than 90% of two specific line items without prior approval from both Houses of the General Assembly. Those two line items are personal and contractual services. There are basically four things the General Assembly can do now. We can...well, we can next...next year, or we're going to have to do next year when we run out of money. We can have some short term borrowing; we can increase some state taxes or fees. We can transfer money from various funds or we can slash state expenditures. Now in all likelihood we will have a combination of those four alternatives. This will provide a vehicle for the fourth alternative, that is, slashing state expenditures. There's approximately \$1,000,000,000 in personal services and contractual services throughout the state budget in the General Fund and I think that we ought to give this, well this alternative a very high priority. For that reason I would ask for adoption of the motion which has been filed with the Clerk. With the same roll call unless there are more conservatives who would like to add their names to it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor of the motion yield..."

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Skinner, would your 90% limitation apply to the personal services of the budget from the General Assembly?"

Skinner: "Oh, absolutely."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Questions on the motion...Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very controversial and complicated issue that Representative Skinner it's one solution to a particular problem we have driven ourselves to but I'm not sure is the best solution. And I think it does require Committee Hearing and some analysis by the staff and I would recommend that this go to Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the gentleman's motion to...to place the...House Bill 3166 on the calendar under the order of House Bills Second Reading without reference. All those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, if the gentleman could explain to me possibly through an explanation of his vote how this could apply to the General Assembly when the Legislators get their entire years' pay the first day of the year. Ah, unless he's talking about their salary being cut by 10% for calendar year of 1976, I would be inclined to change my vote. Otherwise I'll remain on a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, as I'm sure the Representative will remember when I remind him, we are paid on a calendar basis not on a fiscal year basis. And so we have six months salary



coming during this fiscal year, during the next calendar year so I think we have time to make that judgment after the turn of the year. I would point out that the \$100,000,000 that this might save is the upper limit and I would suspect that numerous departments would have legitimate claims to spending more than 90% of those two line items. But I think sometime someone has to make some hard choices and I think that the Governor of this State has not shown a propensity to make such hard decisions. And I think the Legislature ought to be given a chance."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for the proponent of this measure; however, the subject matter is a very important and very deep matter and I don't think it should be lightly taken without Committee. And therefore I...going to vote present on this only because I think we need to have this matter discussed more fully even though I may agree with him fully."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 69 aye and 13 no; the motion fails. 3203. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that I described earlier today before we had gone to the Rules Committee. It is the Bill which has the language that was deleted in a piece of legislation that we had passed. It was deleted by error in Enrolling and Engrossing and I would ask that it be moved to Second Reading Second Legislative Day."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved that House Bill 3203 be advanced to the order of Second Reading without reference. The question is on the motion. All those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. It takes 107. Have all voted who wish? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what the Bill does."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the language that was left out. All it does is restore that language and it very simply says if you don't restore the language, indebtedness incurred by school districts to finance the school construction project for which a school construction project grant is to be made by the State Board of Education could be included under indebtedness limitations found in other statutes. So this could result in serious problems for school districts. Normally that indebtedness is not included in this. We knocked out language...the Enrolling and Engrossing people knocked out a sentence which changes the law considerably. And that was an accidental error."

Lechowicz: "Without this provision the school districts going to be able to build any new school buildings or remodeling within the State, is that correct?"

Schneider: "...That's in case...they have a debt limitation as you know but I...when you get a school construction project that's not included in the debt limitation. So when you, ah,...include the school construction projects it affects the limitation therefore they may not be eligible for it."

Lechowicz: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Takes 107 votes.
How does Representative Schneider vote?"

Schneider: "Explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, again just want to remind you that the Bill was passed out of the House and the Senate; the error was Enrolling and Engrossing, had nothing to do with the proposition and would seem this is the only way we can restore the language."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 ayes and 1 nay. And the motion carries, be placed on the calendar on the order of Second Reading. House Bills 3181, 82 and 83 Representative J. D. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in



the last...Mr. Speaker, shall we take this in two sections 30..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. What's your preference?"

Jones: "3183 first and then..."

Speaker Redmond: "3183 first."

Jones: "And then 3181 and 82 together. In the last day of the Spring Session this Legislature approved payments of some 245 invoices due individuals and firms for services or commodities supplied to the 1974 State Fair. The payments were subject to approval by the Auditor General and the Governor before being paid. The Auditor General has presented his audit and placed these invoices and obligations in two categories. One that approved, recommended for payment and the other in...must go to the Court of Claims and there is supplemental legislative change in the Court of Claims Act to accommodate those claims being presented to the Court of Claims. These obligations are now over a year overdue creating a great hardship to many individuals. Many are in...small businessmen or individuals who have had to borrow money to keep operating while they wait for the State to pay its due obligations. For example, the local sign shop has a bill for \$1300...\$13,000 for signs that they painted and they're...they're calling everyday to see what the State's going to do about making payments to them. All down to, for instance, the young man that's the photographer with Channel 20, TV camera, they owe him \$33 for pictures that he took. And among others, they're not just all vendors but the American Red Cross for \$1500 for services or some of the scope of these obligations. And we voted the.. these bonds appropriated them and the last in 3017...House Bill 3017, the last day of the Session. And these people we vote money for victims of crimes, victims of economic circumstances, these people are victims of the malfunctioning of the present administration because these bills are due these people and has been authorized by the...the Auditor General and as I've explained. And I'm joined in



this by Representative Kane, Representative Londrigan. This is a joint presentation to you and we ask the Bill be considered in two parts, the 3183 or the bills that have been approved by the Attorney General and I would like to call to your attention that these are not just all local, parochial interest. They're invoices on these lists from Taylorville, Carlinville, Peoria, Matton, DesPlaines, Evanston, Decatur, Oregon, Carbondale, Urbana, Bloomington, Lincoln, Pana, Chicago Heights, Chicago, Jacksonville, Roanoke, Bensenville, Oak Brook and Petersburg. There's an interest throughout the State not just from here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's motion. He has been heard twice before the Rules Committee of the House on his proposition and the Rules Committee has twice refused to give him the necessary votes to clear this as a matter that should be heard on an emergency basis in a veto Session. It is a controversial kind of matter. It does deserve Committee Hearing. People are entitled to be heard on this kind of issue and I believe that this 11th hour it should not appropriately be before us. Two hearings really are enough and I will regretfully have to oppose the gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy. Representative... Representative Downs."

Downs: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, do we have the Bill? I...I'm now looking for them here and I heard somebody say they did..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are the Bills on the desks of the Members? If they're not on the desk of the Members we can't consider them Representative Jones. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I oppose the gentleman's motion. I handled that 3017 and I don't want to go through the debate on the floor that we did that day. Based upon the actions of the State Fair..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."



Lechowicz: "I want to also point out the fact..."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I make the point of order since the Bill was not on the desk, this motion is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're correct, now. ...Say the point is well taken, Representative Jones. Same situation on 3182 and 3181? Representative Jones."

Jones: "...Couple of days ago. Two days ago."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm advised it's not on the Speaker's...not on the desk of the Members. There is a further objection that Representative Katz has poised and that's that inasmuch as the Rules Committee have not permitted them to be considered as emergency measures they...this motion is improper in my opinion."

Jones: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could I appeal that? This is an Appropriations Bill which is not exempt anyhow as a corporation, right? This is that 183, I'm not talking about the other two Bills. These three as..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Rules are rather clear though, Representative Jones that these did not receive the permission or the approval of the Rules Committee and therefore this motion is inappropriate. I think that those appropriations which are exempt are the ordinary and contingent expenses of state government and I don't consider that this appropriation is...this...in that category so reluctantly I will have..."

Jones: "...Supplemental to the action of this House on June the 30th."

Speaker Redmond: "Reluctantly I'll have to hold that the point of order is well taken, Representative Jones. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Katz didn't make a point of order, he made an objection. And if he would have commented further on the number of people who were present in the Rules Committee that day, it would have been apparent to every..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."



Lechowicz: "...Speaker, I'll make the point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of order is well taken. Call your attention to the fact that it's now 10:25 and..."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...Remember what happened on May the 23rd when some people did not get their Bills called..."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Representative Jones and another Member of this House who have asked...on this side of the aisle, who have asked for the same consideration a few others have a few moments ago have not received it. There were not enough people present at the Rules Committee where the...possibility of an objection of one or two people to allow Representative Jones to get a fair hearing and the Chairman, the acting Chairman of the Committee at that time knows that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I believe you've ruled and there's nothing before the Chair, I'd like to move on."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Representative Jaffe... take those out of the record. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like...I'd like to have leave to have House Bill 3055 put on the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it now?"

Jaffe: "It's on consideration postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "What page?"

Jaffe: "Ah, page 2."

Speaker Redmond: "We go to the order of business on consideration postponed. Any objection to placing House Bill 3055 on the Spring Calendar? Hearing none, Representative Van Dyne."

Van Dyne: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have the same consideration for House Bill 3053 for the Spring Calendar if I have leave for the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Leave granted. Spring Calendar. On Supplemental Calendar #1 there's a motion... Representative Mulcahey, I don't know what the number of



is. ...The motion..."

Mulcahey: "...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House failed to adopt the motion to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 1691, which amends the Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Downs."

Downs: "I do not find this on the Supplemental Calendar #1.

Is this not a point well taken, is there such a thing as a Calendar that contains these?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's a written motion on the Speaker's table."

Downs: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1691 by which the Governor's veto was ...to House Bill 1691 failed to be overridden. All those in favor of the motion to reconsider vote aye and opposed vote no. 89 votes. ...All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question 106 aye and 5 nay and the motion... Representative Downs."

Downs: "Request a verification, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has...gentleman has requested a verification of the affirmative roll call. Representative Luft, aye. Representative Grotberg, for what purpose do you arise?"

Grotberg: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the verification procedure at this time is dilatory and the first time we ran this Bill through we were accused of dilatoriness and I would like to now ask the Chair to rule the gentleman out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will...Representative Downs."

Downs: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, it was very kindly called to my attention by persons here that we can accomplish the same purpose by verifying the roll call on the motion and I certainly would not engage in dilatory tactics and so why don't we do that and I withdraw my request for verification on this



motion...I believe I am not out of order, is that not correct, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're in order."

Downs: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion for verification has been withdrawn. On this question there's a 106 ayes and 5 no and the motion to reconsider prevails. ...Other motion, Representative Grotberg, do you have one?"

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do then move that we reconsider House Bill 1691. Oh, the motion, yes. The motion is to override the veto of the Governor notwithstanding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "From the Calendar under Amendatory Vetoes appears the motion to override the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1691. On that motion, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, thank you again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I apologize to the Representative for asking him ruled out of order because I realize everyone has that right. ...Ah, this Bill has been thoroughly explained, there are a number of people off the Floor at the time it was called and we would like very much to solicit your support again in the overriding of the Governor's amendatory veto to House Bill 1691, the...contractual language being objectionable."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1691 pass the Governor's specific recommendation for change notwithstanding. All in favor indicate by voting aye. Opposed vote no. Requires a 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote let me re-word the situation as it stands on House Bill 1691. I only wish to say that Bill itself passed this House a 130 to nothing. The Amendatory Veto that we are concerned about today introduces the language pro or con, a written contract, by the Department and the agencies involved in that those



agencies and the Department all ready have contracts and they are not working out too well. It's a paranoid situation in the field. This is step number one, Ladies and Gentleman, to repairing that situation and we'll make every attempt to accommodate the Administration in the final resolution of the contractual situation it is so much a concern of the Department and I would plead with that Department to ease up and let the thousands of children that are being taken care of in a private agency structure of the State of Illinois have their opportunity to be dealt with fairly and equally across the great State of Illinois. There are thousands of kids involved in this and at least 87 agencies some of whom have ten or twelve divisions so that you're always dealing with somewhere in the two or three hundred mark of quantitative contractual arrangements and they've been working at it three years and almost got it finally devised, a written contract that works, if they could just get them back. The language of the Governor said it included a termination period for the reaching of the agreement on these contracts in the time necessary to bring them to a successful conclusion. And we will dedicate ourselves to working toward that goal as starting...as soon as this Session is over with."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff, do you seek recognition? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a lll yes, 16 no. Representative Downs."

Downs: "I request a...verification..."

Speaker Redmond: "Request a verification..."

Downs: "...45 that didn't get pushed. I'm disappointed in the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman...gentleman has requested a verification, the Clerk will read the...verify the affirmative roll call. Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "I think I have the right to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "...Call the absentees. I'm glad that you pointed out the dilatory tactics to Representative Downs."



Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, Borchers, Boyle, Brandt, Caldwell, Carroll, Coffey, Deuster, Ebbesen, Epton, Fleck, Getty, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jacobs, Katz, Klosak, LaFleur, Laurino, Leon, Londrigan, Mahar, Mann, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McGrew, Meyer, Mudd, Mugalian, O'Daniel, Palmer, Pierce, Randolph, Rayson, Sangmeister, Schlickman, Sevcik, Sharp, Stearney, Stone, Tipsword, Von Boeckman, Wall, and Washington."

Speaker Redmond: "Now proceed with the verification of the affirmative roll call."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Jack O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes, J. M. Barnes, Beatty, Berman, Bluthardt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Catania, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, DiPrima, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Grieman, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Hart, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Emil Jones, J. D. Jones, Kane, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Luft, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Maragos, Marovitz, Mautino, McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Miller, Molloy, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, Patrick, Peters, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Satterthwaite, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Shea, Simms, Skinner, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Taylor, Telczer, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Waddell, Walsh, Washburn, White, Willer, Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Younge, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative roll call? Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as aye. Representative Downs. Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Could...could we have the beginning count at this



point?"

Speaker Redmond: "112 to 16. Representative Downs."

Downs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Cunningham. Daniel."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Where?"

Speaker Redmond: "Sitting down over there."

Downs: "D'Arco."

Speaker Redmond: "...here."

Downs: "Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis here? Is he in the office? Representative Davis is in his office, Representative... He's all right."

Downs: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Ray Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Downs: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Repr...Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell here? "

Downs: "Ewell."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Downs: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt, here? Take him off."

Downs: "Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland here? He's here."

Downs: "Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. Representative



Greiman here? Take him off the roll call."

Downs: "Greisheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greisheimer here? Remove him."

Downs: "Representative Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart here? Representative Hart."

Downs: "Representative Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him from the roll call."

Downs: "Hoffman, G. L."

Speaker Redmond: "Not voting."

Downs: "Hudson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson is here."

Downs: "Huff." Keller."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly here?"

Downs: "...Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Kempiners is here."

Downs: "Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski? Oh. So small. He's here."

Downs: "Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz is here."

Downs: "McPartlin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Downs: "Miller."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller. How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Downs: "Porter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter. Remove him from the roll call."

Downs: "Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney. Remove him from the



roll call."

Downs: "Rose."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rose? Remove him."

Downs: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler. Remove him."

Downs: "Schraeder."

Jack O'Brien: "...voted present."

Speaker Redmond: "Well,..."

Downs: "Schraeder."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder. Remove him from
the roll call."

Downs: "Sevcik."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik."

Downs: "Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is not voting."

Downs: "Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "Here."

Downs: "C. M. Stiehl."

Speaker Redmond: "Here."

Downs: "Miller."

Speaker Redmond: "You had him once before."

Downs: "Totten."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Downs: "Palmer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. They're calling
people that haven't voted and I've lost track because you
said take him off the record and they...never were voted.
Is there a count now that we can deal with at all before
they proceed?"

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, I finished the...finished calling."



Grotberg: "What is the count, sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "103 ayes, 16 no."

Grotberg: "103 ayes and 16 no?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Ah, how am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting aye."

Ewing: "Leave it that way, please."

Speaker Redmond: "On this...take the record. Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Here, Mr...Mr. Speaker. I think that we could have equal time with...calling people that's never voted, protecting on those who are here that may have voted and are not here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byer."

Byer: "Mr. Speaker, this has been verified twice and I did not have enough votes and I think that it's getting late. We've been here since ten o'clock this morning, let's announce the roll call and get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, was I removed from the roll call?"

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Marovitz: "Was I removed from the roll?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. On this question there's a 103 ayes..."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'd like to remind the...the Members here that midnight is fast approaching. Now we did this on...May 23rd and many people were left out including Representative Neff and some others. Now..."

Speaker Redmond: "103 aye and 16 no and the motion is lost. Representative Walsh. What is it 1730? On House Bill 1730, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, about three hours ago, two and a half perhaps, House Bill 1730 was called and we moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendation. When the roll call was finally taken, we had 97 votes. We accepted that in



error and it was declared by the temporary speaker to have been accepted. We realized almost immediately that we were in error and should have attempted to get 107 votes and call that to the attention of the temporary speaker. It turned out the temporary speaker was more aware of what we needed than we were and he refused to recognize us to move to reconsider the vote in order that we may attempt at that time to get the necessary 107 votes so that House Bill 1730 could become effective immediately. And if so, the Democrat National Convention could under Illinois law accept one of the options available. The temporary speaker refused..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea. For what purpose do you arise?"

Shea: "Can Mr. Walsh..."

Walsh: "...Temporary speaker."

Shea: "Can Mr. Walsh make this motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. How did you vote?"

Walsh: "I voted on the prevailing side, Mr. Speaker, and the motion prevailed. It prevailed so that..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Okay. Proceed. Proceed."

Walsh: "All right. Back to where I was before I was interrupted by the temporary speaker. What the temporary speaker has done in his action and what he's fully aware of having done is removing what is in the House, apparently, the only vehicle for solving a very serious problem with respect to the Democrat delegation to the National Convention from Illinois. Understand this has almost nothing to do with the Republican delegation because the Republican National Committee has not ruled in the same way that the Democrat National Committee has done. Now his very devious reasons for doing what he did in refusing to recognize me for my motion and as I say, almost immediately, his reasons are that he wants to get an advantage for the Cook County area, not the area he represents understand, the area his Representative represents. That's what he wants. Now Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you because I think you have some



complicity in this. I think you should have come out, should have assumed that Chair, so that we could have gotten on with this thing and could possibly have gotten the 107 votes. I'm not all sure we could have gotten 107 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Isn't it funny that Mr. Walsh wants the Walsh Rules when they're dilatory and if the Walsh Rules are followed after he fouls up or did something that wasn't right then we 've got another set of rules we want to follow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff, what's your..."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the respective Majority Leader who has sat in that Chair and told us about the House Rules knows so well that at the moment he is completely violating the rules of decorum of this House. I refer him specifically to Rule 57 which says he may not use another Member's name in debate nor make comments referring to motivations or personal attitudes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, bring your remarks to a close."

Walsh: "I'll do that Mr. Speaker. In any event, yeah, no more Mr. Nice Guy, Mr. Speaker, that's right...it does indeed irritate me and it is the height of irresponsibility what you and what the temporary speaker have done. You have foreclosed, you have foreclosed the avenue for sending a delegation from the Democrat Party to the Democrat National Convention in the hope, in the hope, that you can get some advantage for Chicago over the rest of Cook...the rest of the State of Illinois in the Democrat National Convention. So if you think I've been had, Mr. Temporary Speaker, look around you at the people on your own side; the ones from downstate, the ones from suburban Cook County; bear in mind the Democrats, not the Republicans, they're the ones who've been had with...oh, I'll let you, Mr. Temporary Speaker, answer to those people. You need not answer to me."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the motion? Motion withdrawn. I suppose I should leave the...the podium to comment but the



temporary speaker was elected in my district to represent me in the Democratic Convention and I was very happy with it and if he runs again I'll support him again and I hope maybe he'll go again. On the order of total veto motion consideration postponed appears House Bill 364. Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, this is the inheritance tax exemption bill. Now I cosponsored and I have supported at all points Representative Friedrich's Bill. I would think that we would have the same mutual respect from each other, unfortunately apparently we have had some breakdown in communication. Some of you said you did not vote for my Bill whereas you voted for his Bill because it would be more costly. I do not believe this is so. In that my Bill would cost between six and ten million tax savings to the people by doubling the exemptions from one hundred to two hundred and from five hundred to one thousand and ten thousand to twenty are very, very small raises. I would estimate the additional cost of this Bill over Friedrich's Bill is probably only one million dollars. Certainly much...not much more there. But what my Bill does that the other Bill does not do is to save a tremendous amount, possibly \$20,000,000 in cost. Now part of this cost is to the State of Illinois. The Attorney General must hire lawyers to take care of the State's business when we file these inheritance tax returns. They must keep a big staff to do all of this. We will have the savings and a staff to the State of Illinois if we go ahead with these suggestions. I supported his Bill, it was a companion to my Bill, both Bills could have passed and should have passed. I would ask you since this is our last opportunity to pass any tax relief and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 364 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor indicate by voting aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? ...All voted who



wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 ayes, 24 nays and the motion fails the Governor's veto's sustained. On the order of motion appears House Bill 3147, Representative Schneider. 3148, Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3148 appropriates \$10,000,000 from the School Construction Bond Fund to the State Board of Education for the purpose of reimbursement to over 400 school districts in Illinois for special education construction. It's a companion Bill to 3147 which is the substantive Bill and Representative Schneider and Representative Hoffman have made the same motion. And Mr. Speaker, I move that House Bill 3148 be placed on the Calendar under the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Legislative Day without reference to Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 3148. Oh, you want 3147 Representative Boyle? What...calendar indicates 3147 is Representative Schneider. Does that matter? Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well, if Representative Schneider is not here then I'd ask leave to move 3147 and 3148, place these Bills, these two House Bills on the order of Second Reading Second Legislative Day without reference to Committee. These..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Is it my understanding the Sponsor 3147 is not here?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't see him on the floor."

Berman: "Well, I object to moving his Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well, is Representative Gene Hoffman on the floor? He's cosponsor of that Bill. Is Hoff...all right then, I'll leave 3147 off and I'll get my own Bill up there if I can. I'd like to get 3148 which is the appropriation bill. Huh?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Can we move the appropriation without the substantive bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, we do tonight."



Lechowicz: "You'll be held, right?"

Boyle: "I don't hear the question?"

Lechowicz: "Will that appropriation bill be held?"

Boyle: "It'll not only be held, Ted, it'd be dead."

Lechowicz: "I know that. Why do you want to move it?"

Boyle: "Well, because, ah, I'd like to get it where it should be. It's not my fault that Mr. Schneider is not here and I am. And I'm here and I've waited here all night while we ran other Bills up and down four or five times and I just kind of like to get it up over there."

Lechowicz: "...Fine..."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved that House Bill 3148 be moved to the order of Second Reading without reference. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, he's...he's making the motion to suspend the Rules, is that correct, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Placed on the calendar on the order of House Bills Second Reading Second Day without reference to..."

Walsh: "Without reference to a Committee and it takes a 107 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "107." That's correct."

Walsh: "Well, I rise, Mr. Speaker, to oppose the gentleman's motion. And, yeah, if the Bill...if the Bill's been distributed do we..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Walsh: "All right. I oppose the Bill for the...gentleman's motion for this reason. This is a very serious question. What we are doing here is substituting to the Capitol Development Board and providing for expenditures from revenue from bonds what had been up until now expenditures from the General Revenue Fund. Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one way, this is one way of course that we can make it appear that we're not spending as much as we actually are. I think this occurred to them in New York probably twenty years ago. And you'll see



the condition they're in. This is a bad practice, Mr. Speaker, the Governor simply cannot do that. He can't... he can't veto out \$10,000,000...."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Walsh: "...General Revenue Fund and then ask us to authorize the issuance of bonds for the same purpose. It's wrong, Mr. Speaker, it's dead wrong and we ought to oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the motion. All in favor indicate by voting aye. Opposed, no. Takes 107 votes. Representative Mudd, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that the content of this Bill is so important that there were three...four vehicle Bills of this type. And to restore \$10,000,000 that was cut out earlier to build schools for special education, I think it's very important, and we should try to give it a chance. But I see..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, to speak in support of this motion. I don't know, y'know because the hour is late and because somebody's mad about something is not a reason to take out on this program. This program is for the repayment at a thousand dollars per professional worker and a reimbursement formula toward the special education building program. And there isn't a downstater in this General Assembly that doesn't have something near and dear at stake here. This ...70% of this \$10,000,000 goes downstate. Now let's quit kidding ourselves because somebody wants to get mad about another issue is no reason to not allow this motion to proceed because these funds are desperately on the construction fund formula in every school district that has a special education building in the state. I urge an affirmative vote there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle, for what purpose do you arise?"

Boyle: "I'd like to explain my vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Explain it."

Boyle: "In the past this program...explained it in the past, this program's been funded as Walsh said from the General Revenue Fund. Now we know the condition and the shortage that exists in this fund and I would urge the Membership in keeping in...with what Representative Hanahan said. If we do not act on this appropriation and also on House Bill 3147 as soon as possible, the construction, and I point out to you, that this construction money; the construction of special education facilities in the State of Illinois could come to an abrupt halt. And I point out to you downstaters that 70% of this \$10,000,000 is...goes for this purpose and we're in eleventh hour at at 11 o'clock and I would urge the foolishness to stop and you better take a serious look at this or there's going to be some serious problems with this program. And I'd like to see a 107 votes and I see now that Mr. Schneider has arrived on the scene so perhaps that will help my cause."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just noticed those first three rows over there, I think, everybody in those seats has voted and there's only three people in the entire three rows."

Speaker Redmond: "Imagine how many there'd be if they were here. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "...Get a roll call,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's...Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is an important piece of legislation and those of you in this room know I haven't been voting in a spendthrift fashion but this is important. This is a one year program. This is not an ongoing program. Let me tell you one example in Peoria where we have constructed a special education building; it's finished, it's dedicated and yet the State owes the final payment of \$266,000. Now that's what this Bill's all about."



I would urge an aye vote. It's a one year program only."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The money that also...may be it should be...has been explained at least I'll add a... addition to that, this money is match money on behalf of the State to match that has been levied all ready by that district for special educational facilities. It is clearly bricks and mortar kind of stuff; it has nothing to do with operations and Kenny Boyle and Representative Hanahan are both right. That if you don't allow this to pass, what you do is stop a lot of construction midway and that's pretty much what the experience of Representative Tuerk's community in Peoria is and I would ask for a 107 votes if it's possible and if you're here."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if you're going to continue to allow explanation of votes, wouldn't it be a good idea to open the Board?"

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. ...I understand the record has been taken. On this question there's 83 aye and 26 no. Representative Kane, aye. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "I'd like to poll the absentees at the appropriate time, if I can find the other necessary bodies. I think the Clerk locked the Board and I think the people would like to ah..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison." I...open the Board again. We're opening the Board up again. All...no, you can not. All those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. ... This question there's 95 ayes, 17 no and the motion fails. The order is Messages from the Senate. Representative Shea. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker,...there was one item I'd like to have clarified. Wasn't that the item that was, Represen-



Hanahan took out of his Bill this afternoon? Oh, so it's dead. Oh."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed the following bills to veto the Governor's contrary notwithstanding and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence from the House to wit; Senate Bills #16, 32, 55, 103, 200, 279, 526, 911, 944, 946, 1175, and 1460 passed by the Senate by three-fifths vote. The veto of the Governor contrary notwithstanding. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed the following Bills, the amendatory veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representative to wit; Senate Bills #45, 1152, and 1153, passed by the Senate by three-fifths vote. The amendatory veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that pursuant to the recommendations of the Governor the Senate has adopted amendatory provisions of the following Bills, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills #24, 37, 66, 223, 267, 445, 518, 522, 617, 699, 701, 707, 827, 845, 1022, 1108, 1157, and 1392. I'm further directed to deliver to you the Governor's objection to the Bills which are contained in the attached copies of his letters to the Senate. Action taken by the Senate. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble joint resolutions



adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representative, to wit. Senate Joint Resolution 55 adopted by the Senate November 5, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House on the adoption of the following preamble and joint resolution to wit. House Joint Resolution #73, concurred in by the Senate November 6, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "We've got one more thing here. We're back on the order...Representative Shea, pardon me."

Shea: "I just move that those be journalized."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved that the messages from the Senate be journalized. Now back on the order of motions appears Motion 3155, Representative Mudd. I guess Representative Mudd has flown the coop. Representative Shea. Is there anything that hasn't been called on the regular session. Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Giglio, Mr. Collins and I are co-sponsors of, we think, the Resolution to submit a matter without reference to a committee to investigate an occurrence in our district by the IBI in the State of Illinois which, I think, is one of the most outstanding examples of entrapment of an attempt to get a civic individual. I'd like Mr. Giglio, at this time, to move that motion to have this particular investigation made without the necessity of sending it to committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the House move that this by-pass committee and we adopt this House Resolution 548."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, could either Representative Maragos or Representative Giglio give a little more detail on the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to read the motion, Mr. Clerk?"



NOV 6 1975

306

Selcke: "House Resolution 548, Giglio, et al. Whereas, allegations have been made that Illinois Bureau of Investigation hereinafter referred to as the IBI secretly purchased a tavern in Calumet City, borderline tavern for \$15,000 and a three year lease, requiring a \$250 monthly payment and falsified a liquor license application and whereas it is alleged in the Spring of 1975, the IBI ordered two of its agents, Forrest Chaney and David Ember, to operate this tavern as an investigative front and for the purpose of providing Calumet City officials, particularly Mayor Robert Stefaniack, with an opportunity to solicit bribes and whereas it is alleged that this IBI secret investigative front operated an operation which was conducted with the knowledge and cooperation of federal, state and county law enforcement agencies and whereas neither Mayor Robert Stefaniack, nor any Calumet City officials solicit any bribes nor act improperly in any way and whereas, it is alleged that when the above agents refused to continue operating the tavern, they were fired by IBI Superintendent Wayne Curstetter and whereas, the above allegations which appeared in the November 2, 1975 St. Louis Post Dispatch if true, raised very serious questions regarding the propriety and legality of the IBI's activities in this matter and whereas is in the best interest of the people of the State of Illinois that a full investigation of the above allegations be made, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, State of Illinois that we direct the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission to investigate the above allegations regarding the IBI's ownership of a tavern in Calumet City, the falsification of liquor license applications, attempts to solicit and bribe some Calumet City officials to the extent of cooperation of involvement of federal, other State or county law enforcement agencies including the source of all funds used in this operation and report



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOV 6 1975

307.

its findings to the General Assembly as soon as practical."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos. Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker we move that this Resolution be adopted without reference to Committee because of the onerous effects of the actions of this group and besides, of the emergency nature of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that they have got to suspend Rule 41A and it's kind of late and I doubt if you have got 107 votes to do it. I think this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Might as well take and, the motion is to bypass Committee, it takes 107 votes. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, truthfully I can't see where anybody could object to this Resolution, this investigation which carries such serious overtones to it. To think that it's been alleged that agents of the IBI were ordered to go into a town which happens to be the town I reside in and buy a tavern with public funds, sign leases..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "He is speaking to the issue, I make the point of order..."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the motion."

Collins: "I think he is absolutely right. I will explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that House Resolution 548 be placed on the order, on the calendar on the order of Resolutions without reference to Committee. All in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Downs."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, I recall earlier in the session Representative Mann introduced a Resolution that had to do with the equally



serious business of police spying and infiltration of various citizen groups and those allegations were subsequently followed up with and shown to have great substance. Now, the Lord only knows what happened to that Resolution but it certainly did not proceed with the speed that you seek for this one. I think it is a serious matter and I think it certainly should be heard by the Committee and I certainly hope that others will join me in voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? And we will seek a verification. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 97 'ayes', 9 'nays', the motion fails. Anything further in the regular session? Further Resolutions."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 547, Kempiners et al., House Joint Resolution 71, Shea et al., House Joint Resolution 74, Garmisa et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, in the order of Second Reading aren't there some Bills that should be read a second time and advanced to the order of Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "You are right. On the order of House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 3162."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3162, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 2.01 of and to add Section 2.2 to an Act to create the Legislative Council and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. 3163."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3163, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Board of Education, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, Tuerk, amend House Bill 3163, page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this Amendment



does is reduce the appropriation by \$1,000,000 for the Chicago Teacher's Retirement. We found through investigation that we are getting this appropriation down to a workable level and therefore, don't need the \$2,000,000 which was originally put into the Bill. We are reducing it by \$1,000,000. It's down below a million. I think it's \$644,000. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "the Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments, Third Reading. House Bill 3203. Representative Schneider."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3203, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Board Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions. Representative Shea. Representative Shea. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, while we are getting the Agreed Resolutions together could the Clerk read the Ajournment Resolution for this session?"

Jack O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #56 resolved by the Senate in the 79th General Assembly in the State of Illinois. The House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 6, 1975 they stand ajourned until Tuesday, November 18, 1975 at 1:00p.m. Adopted by the Senate November 6, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move that the House do now concur in the Senate Ajournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "You have heard the motion. All those in



favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Agreed Resolutions, Representative Giorgi."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 546, Kornowicz, House Resolution 547, Kempiners, House Resolution 549, Choate, House Resolution 550, Choate, Senate Joint Resolution 55."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Resolution 546 by Kornowicz, honors Mr. Mitchell Vernick and Miss Helen Traves on their golden wedding anniversary. 547 by Kempiners asks the agencies in the private care sector to monitor their information. House Resolution 549 by Choate honors Representative Louie Capuzi on his birthday today. House Resolution 550 by Choate honors Walter, Major Walter Aiken after 26 years of distinguished service in the Illinois State Police. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 55 honors the Waukegan High School who captured the golf championship. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I have a little non-controversial Resolution that I have been waiting to have when we get on the order of Resolutions but we never seem to get there except the Agreed ones. This is non-controversial, I think. It just merely memorializes Congress to let New York pay their own bills. I would like to have it included with those."

Speaker Redmond: "An objection has been raised. Representative Keller. The question is on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Introduction First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3204, Kosinski, Sangmeister, a Bill for an Act to require imposition of the mandatory death penalty for the commission of certain crimes involving



murder, First Reading of the Bill. Representative Shea, the Adjournment Resolution has been approved, has it not?"

Shea: "It has. Are we ready to adjourn?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, are we ready to adjourn? Hearing no objection..."

Shea: "I move that the House do now stand adjourned until October or November 18 at 1:00p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House adjourns the regular session November 18 at 1:00. The first regular session now come to order. First special session come to order. Representative Shea."

Jack O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #1 resolved by the 79th General Assembly in the State of Illinois in the first special session thereto, the House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 6, 1975 they stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 18, 1975 at 2:00p.m. Adopted by the Senate November 6, 1975 at the first special session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move that the House do now concur in the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in the Senate Adjournment Resolution. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House concurs in the Senate Adjournment Resolution. Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move that the House, the first special session of the 79th General Assembly do now stand adjourned until the hour of 2:00p.m. on November 18, 1975."



Speaker Redmond: "You have heard the motion. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The first special session now adjourns until November 18 at 1:30. was that, 2:00p.m. The House will come to order on the second special session. Representative, no. Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #1 resolved by the 79th General Assembly in the State of Illinois, second special session thereto. The House of Representatives concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 6, 1975 they stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 18, 1975 at 3:00p.m. Adopted by the Senate November 6, 1975 in the second special session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move that the House do now adopt the Adjournment Resolution in the second special session."

Speaker Redmond: "You have heard the motion. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion is carried. Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move that the House, I move that the second special session of the 79th General Assembly now stand adjourned until 3:00p.m. on November 18, 1975 at the hour of 3:00."

Speaker Redmond: "You have heard the motion. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. The second special session now stands adjourned until November 18 at 3:00p.m. The 79th General Assembly has met another deadline."



INDEX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

November 6, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:00	Speaker Redmond	
	Rev. Krueger	Prayer
	Speaker Redmond	
	Speaker Redmond	
	O'Brien	
	Speaker Redmond	Introduction First Reading
10:03	O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
	Speaker Redmond	
	Giorgi	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:04	O'Brien	Resolutions Adopted
	Speaker Redmond	Death Resolutions
	Giorgi	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:05	O'Brien	Resolutions Adopted
	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 313, 2nd Reading
	Giorgi	One Committee Amendment
10:07	O'Brien	
	O'Brien	House Bill 3154, 2nd Reading
	Speaker Redmond	No committee amendment
	O'Brien	
	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 3156, 2nd Reading
	O'Brien	No committee amendment
	O'Brien	Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 3169, 2nd Reading
	O'Brien	No committee amendments
	O'Brien	House Bill 3170, 2nd Reading
	Speaker Redmond	No committee amendments
		Third Reading



	O'Brien	House Bill 3179, 2nd Reading, 1 CA
	Speaker Redmond	
	D'Arco	Move to adopt CA #1
	Speaker Redmond	CA adopted, Third Reading
	O'Brien	House Bill 3180, 2nd Reading, No CA
	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
	O'Brien	House Bill 3186, 2nd Reading, 1 CA
	Getty	Move to adopt CA #1
	Speaker Redmond	Vote - CA #1 adopted
	O'Brien	House Bill 3187, 2nd Reading, 1 CA
	Bradley	Move to adopt CA #1
	Speaker Redmond	CA #1 adopted, Third Reading
	Bradley	Motion to recess to Special Session
	Speaker Redmond	House in Recess
10:15	Speaker Redmond	House to Order, Special Session
	Rev. Krueger	Prayer
	Speaker Redmond	
	Bradley	Roll Call
	Speaker Redmond	Introduction and First Reading
10:17	O'Brien	House Resolution
	Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted
10:18	Bradley	Move First Special Session recess till 1:00
	Speaker Redmond	House Recessed
	Speaker Redmond	House to Order, Second Special Session
	Rev. Krueger	Prayer
	Bradley	Move for roll call



	Speaker Redmond	
10:22	Bradley	Moves Second Special Session Stand in Recess till 1:30
	Speaker Redmond	
	Bradley	Question
10:24	Speaker Redmond	
	Geo-Karis	House Bill 169
	Speaker Redmond	
	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:27	Bradley	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:30	Friedrich	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Friedrich	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hirschfeld	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:33	Bradley	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:34	Beaupre	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:37	Schlickman	Support
10:38	Speaker Redmond	
	Brinkmeier	
	Speaker Redmond	
10:39	Dyer	



	Speaker Redmond	
10:41	Waddell	Question
	Speaker Redmond	
10:41	Geo-Karis)	
	Waddell)	Question
	Geo-Karis)	Discussion
	Speaker Redmond	
10:46	McGrew	Moves Previous Question
	Speaker Redmond	Ayes have it.
	Geo-Karis	To Close, urges override of veto
	Speaker Redmond	
10:47	Walsh	Explain no vote
	Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
10:49	Schlickman	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hart	Vote yes
	Speaker Redmond	
10:50	Geo-Karis	House Bill 174, Motion to override
	Speaker Redmond	
10:52	Griesheimer	Support
	Speaker Redmond	
	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Schlickman)	Yields?
10:54	Geo-Karis)	Discussion
	Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
 STATE OF ILLINOIS
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:57	Matijevich	Against
	Speaker Redmond	
	Skinner	Question
10:59	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Matijevich	Point of Personal Privilege
	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Matijevich	
	Speaker Redmond	
11:02	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Geo-Karis	To Close
	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 174 motion failles
11:05	Friedrich	House Bill 182
	Speaker Redmond	
11:06	Borchers	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Mugalian	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Friedrich	
	Speaker Redmond	Vote
	Geo-Karis	Support
	Speaker Redmond	
	Borchers	
	Speaker Redmond	Vote



	Byers	Explain Vote
	Speaker Redmond	Vote - Veto Sustained
	Friedrich	House Bill 342
	Speaker Redmond	Asks for Poll
	Dunn	New Roll Call
11:15	Griesheimer	House Bill 342, Urges override
	<u>Chapman In Chair</u>	
	McClain	Yields
11:17	Greisheimer	
	McClain	Opposes
	Chapman	
	Hoffman, Ron	Moves Previous Question
	Chapman	Ayes have it.
11:22	Griesheimer	To Close
	Chapman	
11:24	Stone	For Override
	Chapman	
11:26	McDonald	For Override
	Chapman	
11:27	Cunningham	For Override
	Chapman	
11:29	Borchers	
	Chapman	
11:30	Griesheimer	
	Chapman	
11:33	Ewell	For Override



	Chapman	
	Skinner	
11:35	Chapman	Motion adopted, override
	Londrigan	House Bill 364, Move to override
11:38	Chapman	
	Schlickman	Oppose
	Chapman	
11:40	Bradley	Support
	Chapman	
11:42	Mugalian	Oppose
	Chapman	
11:44	Friedrich	Support
	Chapman	
	Londrigan	To Close
11:45	Chapman	HB 364
	Londrigan	
11:48	Ewell	
	Chapman	
11:49	Dunn, J.	Support
	Chapman	
11:51	Hart	
	Chapman	
11:53	Stone	
	Chapman	
11:54	Londrigan	Poll absentees
	Chapman)	



A handwritten mark, possibly a signature or initials, consisting of a stylized 'L' or '7' shape.

O'Brien)

Londrigan)

Chapman

Matijevich

Objects

Chapman

Sangmeister

11:59

Sangmeister

House Bill 184, vote on prevailing side

Chapman

Friedrich

Chapman

12:00

Matijevich

Point of Order

Chapman

Sangmeister

Chapman

Borchers)

Point of Personal Privilege

Chapman)

12:09

O'Brien)

Announcement - Calendar

Chapman

Fennessey

Withdraw motion to override 2989

Chapman

Matijevich

House Bill 1510, withdraw motion

Chapman

Geo-Karis

Tipsword

Chapman

Matijevich

Chapman



	Geo-Karis	
	Chapman	
12:15	Shea	
	Chapman	
	Geo-Karis	
	Chapman	Motion withdrawn
12:15	Shea	Explains rules of the House
	Chapman)	
	Palmer)	
	Chapman	House Bill 729, moves for override
12:18	Daniels	
	Chapman	
12:21	Greiman	Vote no
	Chapman	
12:23	Palmer)	Yields
	Daniels)	Discussion
	Chapman	
	Stubblefield)	Yield
12:25	Daniels)	Discussion
	Chapman	"Break for Lunch"
12:30	Mugalian	
	Chapman	
12:34	Grotberg	
12:35	Chapman	
	Williams	Support
	Chapman	
12:37	Pierce	



12:41	Chapman	
	Skinner	
12:45	Peters	Moves Previous Question
	Chapman	Ayes have it.
	Daniels	To Close, moves to override veto
12:47	Chapman	
	Beaupre	To explain yes vote
	Chapman	
12:49	Dyer	
12:52	Chapman	Explains yes vote
	Catania	
	Chapman	
	Geo-Karis	
	Chapman	
12:55	Epton	
	Chapman	Motion is Lost
	O'Brien	Introduction of Bills
	Speaker Redmond	in Chair
	Tipsword	Point of Personal Privilege
	Speaker Redmond	
12:57	Matijeich	
	Speaker Redmond	Lunch Break?
1:00	Bradley	Moves Regular Session Recess
	Speaker Redmond	Ayes have it.
	Speaker Redmond	
1:00	Bradley	Move on 2nd Motion of House Bill #2



1:04	Speaker Redmond Bradley	Change my motion
	Speaker Redmond	
1:05	O'Brien Speaker Redmond	Committee Reports
	Bradley Speaker Redmond	Take from Speaker's table
1:07	Berman Speaker Redmond	Point of Order
	Bradley Speaker Redmond	"No testimony etc."
	Berman Speaker Redmond	Urge no Vote
1:09	Hoffman Speaker Redmond	Urge no vote
	Schneider Speaker Redmond	No
	McGrew Speaker Redmond	Move Previous Question
1:11	Bradley Speaker Redmond	Ayes have it.
1:13	Duester Speaker Redmond	Wait to explain vote
	McGrew	
1:15	Duester Speaker Redmond	Explain Vote
		Urge aye vote



Bradley
 Speaker Redmond
 1:18 Hoffman, G.
 Speaker Redmond
 L;20 Brinkmeier
 Speaker Redmond
 Berman
 Speaker Redmond
 O'Brien
 Lechowicz
 Speaker Redmond
 Jaffe
 Speaker Redmond
 Schneider
 Speaker Redmond
 Jaffe
 Speaker Redmond
 Berman
 Speaker Redmond
 Madison
 Speaker Redmond
 Schlickman
 Speaker Redmond
 Hoffman
 Speaker Redmond
 Jaffe

Vote fails
 House Bill, First Reading, 1 CA
 House Bill 4 move to put on 2nd day



Speaker Redmond	Support motion
Madison	
Speaker Redmond	To Close
Jaffe	Vote
Speaker Redmond	Explain vote
Madison	"92" ayes - Motion fails
Speaker Redmond	Move 1st Spec. Session Adjourn
Bradley	Recess
Speaker Redmond	
Shea	
Speaker Redmond	
Fennessey	
Speaker Redmond	
Walsh	
Speaker Redmond	
Bradley	
Speaker Redmond	Recess & adjournment of Spec. Sess.
Schneider	return to Reg. Session
Speaker Redmond	House Bill 3203
Schneider	
Speaker Redmond	Order of veto motions
Collins	Override veto
Speaker Redmond	
Totten	
Collins	
Speaker Redmond	
Geo-Karis	Question



Collins

Speaker Redmond Vote

Geo-Karis

Speaker Redmond

Byers

Collins Poll absentees

O'Brien

Speaker Redmond Vote

O'Brien Verification of poll

Speaker Redmond

Hirschfeld

Speaker Redmond

Stone

Speaker Redmond

Hudson

Speaker Redmond

Mann

Speaker Redmond

Yourell

Speaker Redmond

Sangmeister

Speaker Redmond

Giglio

Speaker Redmond

Lundy

Speaker Redmond

Madison



Speaker Redmond
Duff

Speaker Redmond
Nardulli

Speaker Redmond
Vote #130 ayes - prevails
House Bill 1317

Laurino

Speaker Redmond

LaFleur

House Bill 1615

Speaker Redmond

Totten

Speaker Redmond

McCourt

2:07 Speaker Redmond

2:08 Schneider

Speaker Redmond

Houlihan, J.)

Yield?

2:10 McCourt)

Speaker Redmond

Beaupre

Speaker Redmond

House Bill 1615 - Motion last

2:15 Taylor

House Bill 1592 - Move to override

Speaker Redmond

Schlickman)

Speaker Redmond)

Taylor)

Speaker Redmond

House Bill 1592

2:17 Mann

Explain aye vote



Speaker Redmond
 ?
 Taylor
 Speaker Redmond
 2:20 Shea Explain vote
 Speaker Redmond Explain vote
 Stone
 Speaker Redmond
 2:24 Duff Explain vote
 Speaker Redmond Motion adopted - override
 Connell HB 1659
 Speaker Redmond
 2:29 Kempiners
 Speaker Redmond
 Geo-Karis
 Speaker Redmond
 2:31 Borchers
 Speaker Redmond HB 1659 - motion carries
 Geo-Karis HB 1704 - move to
 Speaker Redmond
 2:37 Bluthardt
 Speaker Redmond
 Taylor Leave to Hear HB 1716 & 1717 together
 Speaker Redmond Leave granted
 Taylor Move to override
 Speaker Redmond
 2:43 McClain



	Speaker Redmond	
	Friedrich	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Palmer)	Yield
	Taylor)	
2:46	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 1716 & 1717
	Lundy	Too late to explain votes?
	Speaker Redmond	
	Taylor	Poll the absentees
	O'Brien	Polls absentees
	Speaker Redmond	
2:51	Jacobs	
	O'Brien	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jaffe	Change to aye
	?	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Ryan	
	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 1716
2:52	Lundy	Explain vote
	Speaker Redmond	
	Madison	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Schlickman	Point of order
2:54	Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
	Schlickman	"Remaining motions be tabled"



	Speaker Redmond	
2:56	Kelly	House Bill 1851, move to override
	Speaker Redmond	
	Madison)	Yield
	Kelly))	
	Madison	Speaks on Bill
	Speaker Redmond	
	Leinenweber	
	Huff	Yield
3:07	Kelly	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:10	Kelly	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:11	Catania	Opposed
	Speaker Redmond	
	Downs	Opposed
	Speaker Redmond	
	Marovitiz	Opposed
	Speaker Redmond	
	Simms	Opposed
	Speaker Redmond	
	Geo-Karis	Opposed
	Kelly	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Griesheimer	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hudson	



Speaker Redmond	
Madison	
Speaker Redmond	
Lundy	Verification
Speaker Redmond	
Gaines	Explain vote - no
Kelly	
Speaker Redmond	
Fred Selcke	Polls absentees
Speaker Redmond	
Fred Selcke	Affirmative roll call
Speaker Redmond	
Cunningham	Vote me
Fred Selcke	"Count"
Lundy	
Speaker Redmond	
Davis	"Record me as no"
Speaker Redmond	
Lundy	Questions affirmative roll call
Speaker Redmond	
Kelly	What's the number?
Fred Selcke	
Speaker Redmond	
Getty	Change to aye
Speaker Redmond	
Beaupre	Change to aye



Speaker Redmond

HB 1851 passed over veto override

Schuneman

Point of Personal Privilege

Speaker Redmond

Katz

Leave for rules committee to meet

Speaker Redmond

Skinner

Katz

Schneider

Shea

Speaker Redmond

Washburn

Speaker Redmond

Leave Granted

Younge

HB 1996, move to override

Speaker Redmond

Madison

Speaker Redmond

Younge

Speaker Redmond

Miller)

Younge)

Speaker Redmond

Schlickman

Speaker Redmond

3:56

Huff

Speaker Redmond

3:59

Geo-Karis



	Speaker Redmond	
	Lucco	For
	Speaker Redmond	
	Walsh	Against
	Speaker Redmond	
4:03	Davis	For
	Speaker Redmond	
	Taylor	Move Previous Question
	Speaker Redmond	Ayes have it.
	Younge	HB 1996 move to override
4:11	Madison	Support
	Speaker Redmond	
4:13	Borchers	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:13	Mann	Explain aye vote
	Speaker Redmond	
	Gaines	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Washington	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Leinenweber	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Choate	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Lauer	Urge 'aye' vote
	Speaker Redmond	



Taylor	
Speaker Redmond	
Geo-Karis	
Speaker Redmond	
Hart	
Speaker Redmond	
Ewell	
Speaker Redmond	
Shea	
Speaker Redmond	Vote '97' ayes
Younge	Poll of absentees
Fred Selcke	
Speaker Redmond	Motion
Younge	Postponed Consideration
Matijevich	Agreed
Speaker Redmond	HB 2042 (withdraw)
Lechowicz	HB 2068 & 2069 (withdraw to override)
Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
	House Bill 2147
McCourt	Withdraw Bill
Speaker Redmond	House Bill 2560
Collings	Override veto
Lechowicz	
Speaker Redmond	Vote, fails, veto sustained
	House Bill 3070
McPartlin	



LaFleur
 Speaker Redmond
 Byers
 Speaker Redmond
 Geo-Karis
 Speaker Redmond
 Duff
 LaFleur
 Washington
 Speaker Redmond
 Byers
 LaFleur
 Lechowicz
 Flinn
 O'Brien
 Dunn
 Speaker Redmond
 Lechowicz
 Klosak
 Speaker Redmond
 ?
 Schlickman
 Speaker Redmond
 Dyer
 Lechowicz
 Cunningham

Verification
 Poll absentees

Vote, fails, veto sustained
 House Bill 3122
 Ask for override



Speaker Redmond Vote aye

Choate

Kane

Speaker Redmond House Bill 1947

Houlihan

Totten

Speaker Redmond

Geo-Karis

Houlihan

Skinner

Speaker Redmond

Houlihan

Speaker Redmond

Skinner

Ryan

Duff

Speaker Redmond

Matijeovich

Speaker Redmond

Darrow

Speaker Redmond House Bill 1947, motion adopted

Waddell

D'ARco

HB 1079 moves to override

Speaker Redmond

Totten

Speaker Redmond

Gaines



Speaker Redmond

Meyer

Speaker Redmond

D'Arco

To close.

Speaker Redmond

Ryan

Speaker Redmond

House Bill 1079. Motion carries.
Out of Record.

Speaker Redmond

House Bill 2989.

Hanahan

Speaker Redmond

Hanahan

Speaker Redmond

Mudd

Speaker Redmond

Page 16 line 2 - 6.

Hanahan

Withdraw these.

Speaker Redmond

Duff)

Dividing his own motion.

Hanahan)

Right.

Speaker Redmond

Question.

McClain)

Hanahan)

Speaker Redmond

Leave to amend the motion.

Walsh)

Question.

Hanahan)

No.

Speaker Redmond

Duff

Speaker Redmond



Mudd
 Speaker Redmond
 Hanahan
 Matijevich
 Byers
 Hanahan
 Speaker Redmond
 Hoffman
 Madison
 Speaker Redmond
 Matijevich
 Speaker Redmond
 Hanahan
 Walsh
 Stone
 Hanahan
 Hoffman
 Speaker Redmond
 Berman
 Speaker Redmond
 Duff
 Rayson
 Hanahan
 Speaker Redmond
 Pierce
 Skinner
 Schraeder
 Dunn

Moves previous.
 To close.
 Vote.
 Vote fails.
 House Bill 2989.
 Move previous?
 Vote



Speaker Redmond

Walsh

Consider whole thing?

Speaker Redmond

Mudd

Question.

Speaker Redmond)

Walsh)

Speaker Redmond

Mudd

He had leave.

Speaker Redmond

Walsh

Journal to show opposition.

Speaker Redmond

Journal so note.

Schlickman

Speaker Redmond

Hanahan

Speaker Redmond

Schlickman

Speak to the motion.

Speaker Redmond

Hanahan

Speaker Redmond)

Schlickman)

Speaker Redmond

Madison

Point of inquiry.

Speaker Redmond

Mudd

Speaker Redmond

Mudd)

Gaines)

Explain votes.

Madison)



Hoffman

?

Mautino

Huff

Berman

Boyle

Speaker Redmond Vote.

Davis

Darrow

Beaupre

Verification of roll
Poll absentees.

Speaker Redmond

Affirmative Roll. Vote adopted.
House Bill 3164 - 3165.

Barmisa

Selcke

Garmisa

Speaker Redmond

Kelly

Speaker Redmond Vote adopted.

Maragos

Leave to put 3100 on Speaker's
calendar.

Speaker Redmond

House Bill 3036.

6:47

Beaupre

Verification.

Speaker Redmond

Berman

Poll absentees.

Speaker Redmond

Selcke

Speaker Redmond

Selcke

Affirmative roll call.



	Speaker Redmond	
6:53	Beaupre	Question of affirmative roll call.
6:57	Speaker Redmond	Motion adopted. Out of record.
	Selcke	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Garmisa	House Bill 3164-3165-3rd Reading.
	Shea in Chair	
7:05	Kelly)	Question.
)	
	Garmisa)	
	Shea	House Bill 3164 & 3165 passed.
	Mann	Leave to place HB 3100 on Speaker's calendar.
	Shea)	
)	
	Maragos)	Leave 3036 & 3011 placed on Speaker's calendar.
7:07	Washington	HB 574 motion to accept.
	Shea	
	Tuerk	
	Shea	
	Beatty)	
)	
	Washington)	Yield?
)	
	Shea)	
7:15	Collins)	Point of information.
)	
	Shea)	
	Washington)	
)	
	Shea)	
	Washington)	Defer to Terzich
)	
	Shea)	



7:17 Selcke
 Terzich .. Motion #2.
 Shea
 Collins
 Shea Move confused.
 Skinner
 ?
 Shea
 Washington

7:21 Shea
 Washington House Bill 574.
 Shea
 Collins
 Shea Oppose

7:25 Madison
 Shea Parliamentary Inquiry.
 Madison HB 574. Changes adopted.
 Shea Renew parliamentary inquiry.

7:28 Grotberg
 Shea Leave to hear HB 600 & 601 together.
 Grotberg Leave.

7:30 Shea Acceptance.
 Greisheimer HB 600 & 601 motion prevails.
 Shea HB ?

Fennessey
 Shea HB 898 moves acceptance.

7:34 Lauer)
)
 Fennessey) Yield.



	Shea	Motion adopted.
	Beaupre	HB 1127.
	Shea	Motion adopted.
	Rayson	HB 1133 move to out of record.
	Shea	
7:38	Collins	
	Shea	Clear the floor.
	Rayson	
	Shea	
7:42	Leinenweber)	Question.
	Rayson)	
	Shea	
	Mann	
	Shea	
	Rayson	To close.
	Shea	HB 1133.
	Choate	
	Borchers	Aye.
7:53	Anderson	
	Shea	
	Rayson	Explain vote.
	Shea	
7:55	Skinner	
	Shea	Motion fails.
	Kelly	HB 1287 motion to out of record.
	Shea	Motion.
	Downs	
	Shea	



	Washburn	
	Shea	
8:00	Grotberg	HB 1287 Motion fails.
	Shea	Motion to table HB 1691.
	Grotberg	HB 1691 mo
	Shea	
	McClain)	
)	Question.
	Grotberg)	
)	
	McClain)	
	Shea	Speak on the Bill.
8:07	Downs)	
)	Question.
	Grotberg)	
	Shea)	
8:10	Chapman)	
)	Question.
	Grotberg)	
	Shea	
8:12	Grotberg	To close.
	Shea	HB 1691.
	Kempiners	
	Shea	
8:15	McClain	
	Shea	
	Geo-Karis	
	Shea	
	Grotberg	
	Shea	
	Jack O'Brien	Byers requests verification.
	Shea	Polls absentees.
		Proceed with affirmative vote.



	Jack O'Brien	
	Shea	
8:26	Giglio	How am I recorded?
	Shea	
	Waddell	Change to aye.
	Shea	
	Byers)	Questions of affirmative roll call.
	Shea)	
	Jack O'Brien)	
	Madison	
	?	
	Lechowicz	
	Byers	
	DiPrima	Vote me aye.
	Shea	
	Lauer	How am I recorded?
	Shea	
	Campbell	How am I recorded?
	Shea	
	Matijevich	Dilatory.
	Shea	
	Keller	How am I recorded?
	Grotberg	Motion fails.
	Shea	HB 1730.
	Walsh	Explain vote.
	Shea	
	Catania)	Question.
	Walsh)	



Shea	Motion carries. Governor's recommendation for change adopted.
Craig	Moves HB 1758 take out of record.
Shea	
Craig	
Shea	Motion fails.
Yourell	HB 1849 moves to accept.
Shea	Motion carries.
Walsh	HB 1999 move to accept.
Shea	Motion carries.
Farley	HB 2249 lve to consider motion on Amendment #2.
Shea	Motion carries.
Borchers	HB 138 leave to consider 138 and 139 together.
Shea	Leave granted.
Borchers	
Shea	
Hoffman, G.	Motion. HB 138 and 139.
Shea	
Jack O'Brien	Selcke come to Clerk's desk.
Shea	
Borchers	Explain vote.
Shea	Motion lost.
Cunningham	HB 437 moves for out of record.
Shea)	Motion fails.
Walsh)	Discussion.
Mautino	HB 1588 moves to out of record.
Shea	



Byers)	Yield?
Mautino)	
Shea	
Skinner)	Question.
Muatino)	
Shea	
Skinner	Speaks to Bill.
Shea	
Mudd	
Shea	
Muatino	To close.
Shea	HB 1588.
Mudd	Explain vote.
Shea	
Mautino	Explain vote.
Shea	
Hill	Explain vote.
Shea	Motion lost.
Younger	HB 396 move for out of record.
Shea	
Schlickman	Urge no.
Shea	
Catania	Uge out of record.
Speaker Redmond	
Mann	Support.
Shea	
Madison	Support.
Shea	



Younge		To close.
Shea		
Huff		
Shea		Motion lost.
Schlickman)	Discussion.
Shea)	
Kane)	HB 1809 leave to hear with 1808.
Shea)	Leave granted.
Schlickman)	
Kane		HB 1808 & 1809 out of record. Move.
Shea		Motion lost.
Berman		HB 1147 move to out of record.
Shea		Motion fails.
Younge		HB 1996 moves to out of record.
Shea		
Schlickman		
Shea		
Madison		
Shea		
Younge		To close.
Shea		Motion fails.
Borchers))	HB 1494.
Shea)	
Tuerk		HB 2972.
Shea		
Hanahan		Asks leave to withdraw motion.
Shea		So ordered.
Sangmeister		HB 182 move to reconsider vote.
Shea		



Madison	Parliamentary inquiry.
Shea	
Duff	Yield to Sponsor.
Shea	
Hill	
Shea)	
)	
Schlickman)	
Shea	
Hanahan	Point of order.
Kane)	Parliamentary inquiry.
)	
Shea)	Motion carries.
Hill	I requested verification.
Shea	You will get it.
Sangmeister	
Shea	Verify affirmative roll call.
Hill	Slow down.
Selcke	Continues.
Shea	
Schlickman	As a courtesy, etc.
Shea	
Selcke	Continues
Speaker Redmond	
Hill	Questions affirmative roll call.
Speaker Redmond	
Ewing	Change to yes.
Boyle	Change to present.
Speaker Redmond	



Friedrich	Wat's the status?
Speaker Redmond	Motion lost.
Friedrich	Protest.
Speaker Redmond	HB 3162.
Skinner	HB 3162 Move be placed on calendar without reference to a committee.
Speaker Redmond	Motion carries Placed on Second Reading 2nd Legislative Day.
Tuerk	HB 3163 Mtove to place on 2nd Reading 2nd Legislative Day. Without ref Comm.
Speaker Redmond	Same roll call?
Madison	If gentleman will explain Bill.
Speaker Redmond	
Tuerk	
Speaker Redmond	
Mautino	Aye.
Speaker Redmond	Motion carries.
Skinner	Mr. Speaker.
Speaker Redmond	
Tuerk)	Amendment on that Bill.
Speaker Redmond)	
Skinner	
Speaker Redmond	
Madison)	Question.
Skinner)	
Speaker Redmond	
Houlihan, J.	Place 3166 on Calendar 2nd Reading without reference to Committee.
Speaker Redmond	
Madison	Explain vote.



Speaker Redmond	
Skinner	
Speaker Redmond	
Maragos	Vote present.
Speaker Redmond	Motion fails.
Schneider	HB 3023.
Speaker Redmond	
Lechowicz	What the Bill does?
Speaker Redmond	
Schneider	
Speaker Redmond	
Schneider	Explain vote.
Speaker Redmond	Motion carries.
Jones, J. D.	HB 3181 take 3183 1st.
Speaker Redmond	
Katz	Oppose.
Speaker Redmond	
Downs	Do we have Bills?
Speaker Redmond	
Lechowicz	
Speaker Redmond	
Matijevich	Point of order.
Speaker Redmond	
Jones, J. D.	
Speaker Redmond	
Jones, J. D.	
Duff	
Speaker Redmond	



Lechowicz	Point of order.
Speaker Redmond	
Duff	Rep. Jones, etc.
Speaker Redmond	
Berman	
Speaker Redmond	
Jaffe	Leave HB 3055 on Spring Calendar.
Speaker Redmond	
Von Duyne	Same 3053 Spring Calendar.
Speaker Redmond	Leave granted.
Mulcahey	
Speaker Redmond	Move to reconsider vote on HB 1691.
Downs)	
Speaker Redmond)	Motion.
Downs	Verification.
Speaker Redmond	
Grotberg	Point of order.
Speaker Redmond	
Downs	Withdraw request.
Speaker Redmond	In order. Motion to reconsider prevails.
Grotberg	Move we reconsider HB 7691.
Speaker Redmond	Motion to out of record HB 1691.
Grotberg	
Speaker Redmond	
Grotberg	Explain vote.
Speaker Redmond	
Downs	Verification.



Speaker Redmond	
Grotberg	Poll absentees.
Speaker Redmond	
Jack O'Brien	
Speaker Redmond	
Jack O'Brien	Affirmative roll call.
Speaker Redmond	
Londrigan	Record me as aye.
Speaker Redmond	
Grotberg	Begining count.
Speaker Redmond)	112 to 16.
Downs)	Questions affirmation roll call.
Speaker Redmond	
Grotberg	Gripes.
Downs	I've finished.
Grotberg	What's the count?
Speaker Redmond	
Ewing	How am I recorded?
Jack O'Brien	
Speaker Redmond	
Grotberg	Equal time, etc.
Speaker Redmond	
Byers	Verified twice.
Speaker Redmond	
Marovitz	Was I removed?
Speaker Redmond	Motion lost.
Walsh	HB 1730.



Speaker Redmond		
Shea)	Question.
Speaker Redmond))	Proceed.
Walsh)	
)	
Speaker Redmond		
Shea		
Speaker Redmond		
Duff		
Speaker Redmond		
Walsh		
Speaker Redmond		Mike shut off.
Londrigan		Motion withdrawn.
Speaker Redmond		HB 364 move to out of record.
Schneider		Motion fails.
Boyle		HB 3147.
Speaker Redmond		HB 3148 move be placed on 2nd Reading 2nd Legislative Day - Calendar.
Boyle		
Berman		Ask leave to move 3147 & 3148. 2nd Reading 2nd Leg Day without reference to Committee.
Speaker Redmond		Objects.
Boyle		
Speaker Redmond		G. Hoffman on Floor? Leave 3147 off get 3148.
Lechowicz))	
Boyle))	Point of order.
Speaker Redmond		
Walsh)	
)	
Speaker Redmond))	Question.



Walsh

Rise to oppose.

Speaker Redmond

Mudd

Speaker Redmond

Hanahan

Support.

Speaker Redmond

Boyle

Speaker Redmond

Collins

Speaker Redmond

Tuerk

Speaker Redmond

Schneider

Speaker Redmond

Madison

Speaker Redmond

Boyle

Poll absentees.

Speaker Redmond

Open Board again. Motion fails.

Duff

Item clarified.

Speaker Redmond

Message from Senate.

Jack O'Brien

Speaker Redmond

Shea

Move they be journalized.

Speaker Redmond

Maragos

IBI

Speaker Redmond

Giglio

Ask House bypass & adopt HR 548.



Speaker Redmond
 Houlihan, J.
 Speaker Redmond
 Selcke Reads HR 548.
 Speaker Redmond
 Maragos Move resolution be adopted without
 reference to Committee.
 Speaker Redmond
 Matijevich
 Speaker Redmond
 Collins
 Speaker Redmond
 Matijevich Point of order.
 Speaker Redmond
 Collins
 Speaker Redmond Moiton
 Downs We will seek verification.
 Speaker Redmond Motion fails.
 Selcke Further resolutions.
 Speaker Redmond
 Shea
 Speaker Redmond
 Selcke HB 3162 2nd Reading No Committee Amend.
 Speaker Redmond Third Reading.
 Selcke HB 3163 2nd Reading No C.A.
 Speaker Redmond Third Reading.
 Selcke Amendment #1 - Floor.
 Speaker Redmond

